

Durham E-Theses

Savagery and the State: Incivility and America in Jacobean Political Discourse

LAUREN NOEMIE WORKING

How to cite:

WORKING, LAUREN NOEMIE (2015) *Savagery and the State: Incivility and America in Jacobean Political Discourse*. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/11350/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Savagery and the State: Incivility and America in Jacobean Political Discourse

Lauren Working

This thesis examines the effects of colonisation on the politics and culture of Jacobean London. Through sources ranging from anti-tobacco polemic to parliament speeches, colonial reports to private diaries, it contends that the language of Amerindian savagery and incivility, shared by policy-makers, London councillors, and colonists alike, became especially relevant to issues of government and behaviour following the post-Reformation state's own emphasis on civility as a political tool. Practices such as tobacco-smoking and cannibalism were frequently invoked to condemn the behaviour of disobedient English subjects and to encourage orthodoxy, while justifying a more extensive level of interference in the habits and customs of subjects as well as native peoples. By focusing on the interrelation between the state's twin projects of civilising others and consolidating authority within the realm, this thesis challenges the scholarly tendency to view colonisation as existing outside state politics prior to the development of empire, and locates a distinct vogue for cultivation – both of landscapes and of the civil subject – that played a role in James' own conception of sovereignty.

This engagement with America and its indigenous populations indicates a significant colonial moment in London in the 1610s and 1620s, located in converging political and 'civilising' centres including Whitehall, parliament, and the Inns of Court. Moreover, a growing familiarity with colonial affairs did not just manifest itself in the rhetoric or the actions of colonists and project promoters, but can be used to identify changing modes of consumption and shifting attitudes in London towards sociability and the articulation of state authority. These initiatives increased the scope for political participation in the metropolis, while shaping the development of civility and status in relation to cultural difference.

SAVAGERY AND THE STATE:
Incivility and America in Jacobean Political
Discourse

Lauren Working

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of History
Durham University

2015



Quartz crystal Powhatan arrowhead and 1607 silver sixpence, Historic Jamestowne, 2106-JR/80A (Image is author's own.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations.....	i
Abbreviations	ii
Statement of Copyright	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
England and the Atlantic	3
Civility and Regulation in Jacobean England	7
The English Appropriation of Native American Tropes.....	15
Sources and Parameters	19
CHAPTER TWO: CULTIVATING CIVILITY: THE COLONISING PROJECTS OF THE JACOBEAN STATE	30
Historiography	31
The Vogue for Planting: The Court	37
The Vogue for Planting: Parliament and the Localities	44
Civility as Cultivation	53
Cultivation and Behaviour	59
Violence and Planting	65
Conclusion.....	71
CHAPTER THREE: CIVILISING THE BODY: THE RULES OF APPAREL IN IRELAND AND LONDON	74
Historiography	75
States of Undress	81
Regulating Attire	88
Clothing as Resistance	97
Degeneration and Anti-Savagery.....	102
Conclusion.....	112
CHAPTER FOUR: AMERINDIANS AND LAWYERS: CONCEPTS OF SAVAGERY AT THE INNS OF COURT	117
Historiography	118
The Taste for Expansion	124
Degrees of Savagery	132
The Sociability of Smoking.....	138
Enacting Savagery	144
Incivility in Political Discourse.....	149
Conclusion.....	156
CHAPTER FIVE: ‘THE SAUAGES OF VIRGINIA OUR PROJECT’: THE POWHATAN IN ENGLISH POLITICAL THOUGHT	161
Historiography	162
The Politics of Conformity.....	168
Savagery as Degeneration	175
London and the Massacre of 1622.....	183
‘Our Royal Sovereignty’: Sovereignty Over Savagery	192
Conclusion.....	201

CHAPTER SIX: THE SEDUCTIONS OF SAVAGERY: TOBACCO AND DISSENT IN LONDON.....	206
Historiography	208
Tobacco in England	210
Incivility and Disorder	216
Smoke and Treason.....	225
Effacing Savagery.....	233
Conclusion.....	239
CHAPTER SEVEN: THE RITES OF VIOLENCE: CANNIBALISM AND THE POLITICS OF BLOODSHED	242
Historiography	244
English Encounters with Cannibalism	248
Political Theophagy	253
Cruelty and Factionalism	266
Savagery and the State	274
Conclusion.....	283
CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION.....	287
Bibliography	304

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figures

1.1. <i>Table-observations</i> , 1615	9
1.2. Watercolours of King James and an Algonquian in St James' Park, c. 1614	20
1.3. John Norden's map of Westminster, 1593.....	26
2.1. [Unknown] to the Queen, 1610.....	45
2.2. Sir Walter Cope to the Earl of Salisbury, 1607.....	47
2.3. Francis Seager, <i>The Schoole of Vertue, & Booke of good Nurture</i> , 1593.....	61
3.1. Portrait miniature of an unknown man, attributed to Nicholas Hilliard, 1588.....	83
3.2. Albrecht Dürer, 'Irish Warriors and Peasants', 1521	90
3.3. Virginia Company broadside, 1616, and Algonquian in St James' Park, c. 1614 ...	106
3.4. Simon van de Passe engraving of Pocahontas, 1616.....	109
3.5. Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton, <i>The roaring girle</i> , 1611	111
4.1. Inventory of apparel and books for Cambridge and Gray's Inn, 1603	120
4.2. Portrait miniature of Francis Bacon by Nicholas Hilliard, 1578.....	122
4.3. Richard Brathwaite, <i>The lawes of drinking</i> , 1617	131
4.4. Petition from benchers of the Middle Temple to Sir Edward Phelips, 1614	148
4.5. Middle Temple Drake lantern and desk.....	158
5.1. List of investors in the Virginia Company, 1610	163
5.2. Thomas Hariot, <i>A brief and true reporte</i> , 1590.....	172
5.3. Grooming tool uncovered from Jamestown site, c. 1607	178
5.4. John White watercolour of Algonquian woman and child, c.1585	184
5.5. Letter from the Virginia assembly to King James, 1624	197
6.1. <i>A proclamation for the reformation of abuses, in the Gaole of New-gate</i> , 1617	221
6.2. Orders touching Ludgate, 1602.....	223
6.3. <i>An excellent medley</i> , 1630	231
6.4. English and Algonquian pipes, c. 1608	240
6.5. Robert Cotton pipe, stamped with Walter Raleigh's name, c. 1608.....	240
7.1. Human skull found at Jamestown, c. 1609	254
7.2. <i>The crying Murther</i> , 1624.....	268
7.3. Engraving of the Gunpowder Plot conspirators, 1606, and Theodore de Bry woodcut, c. 1590s	275
8.1 Engraving of Amerindian couple, c. 1620s	290
8.2. Engraving of English couple, c. 1620s	291

ABBREVIATIONS

BL	British Library, London
BM	British Museum, London
CP	Cecil Papers, Hatfield House, Hertfordshire
<i>CSP</i>	Calendar of State Papers
EEBO	Early English Books Online
FP	Ferrar Papers, Magdalene College, Cambridge
KJV	English Bible, King James Version
NPG	National Portrait Gallery, London
STC	<i>A short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English books printed abroad, 1475-1640</i> , compiled by A.W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, revised, revised and enlarged by W. A. Jackson, F.S. Ferguson and K.F. Pantzer (3 vols., London, 1986-1991)
TNA: PRO	The National Archives, Public Record Office, Kew
V&A	Victoria and Albert Museum, London
<i>VCR</i>	<i>The Records of the Virginia Company of London</i> , ed. Susan Myra Kingsbury (4 vols., Washington DC, 1906-1935)
Wing	<i>Short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English books printed in other countries, 1641 – 1700</i> , compiled by Donald Wing (3 vols., New York, Index Society, 1945-1951)

Conventions

To retain the flavour of the language, original spellings and punctuation have not been altered. Manuscript contractions have been expanded for clarity, designated in the text with brackets. While the legal calendar in early modern England began on 25 March, the year has been taken to begin on 1 January and adjusted in accordance with modern dating.

STATEMENT OF COPYRIGHT

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Knowledge, wrote Marcel Proust, is a journey of discovery no one else can take or spare us. Luckily I have received abundant assistance along the way. I am indebted to the unstinting support of my supervisor, Adrian Green, whose breadth of knowledge and discerning approach to the past (as well as the present) has always inspired in me the utmost admiration. His unflagging encouragement and good humour were, like I imagine George Percy's featherbed at James Fort must have been, a constant comfort in unfamiliar terrain. I would also like to thank my second supervisor, Natalie Mears, for her insight and ready advice. Her questions challenged and strengthened my claims about early modern political practice.

This research would not have been possible without the funding provided by my Durham Arts and Humanities Doctoral Scholarship. The research grants awarded by the Durham History Department, Durham Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Institute of Medieval and Early Modern Studies, and John Simpson Greenwell Memorial Fund further contributed generously to my archival work in London. I would also like to thank my fellow doctoral candidates in the history department for offering camaraderie as well as academic support and collaboration, and to Ludmilla Jordanova for encouraging my involvement with the National Portrait Gallery.

I am beholden to the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Library for granting me a one-month fellowship in Virginia. The Jamestown site is an evocative place, and proved vital in helping me mentally and physically reconstruct the experiences of Jacobean colonists. I would like to extend my warmest thanks to Jim Horn, Merry Outlaw, Bly Straube, and the other historians and archaeologists at Jamestown and Preservation Virginia, and to the staff at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture for being so generous with their time and support.

I am also grateful for the friendship provided by my housemates, with whom the sheer pleasure of debating history was rather extravagantly indulged. Niall Oddy, Tom O'Neill, Christian Schneider, James Archer, and Gašper Jakovac – thank you for keeping me sharp. My family, though bemused by my talk about cannibals and courtiers, have provided wholehearted support even 5,000 miles away. The road to a PhD was companionably shared with my father, Randal Working, who completed his doctorate as I earned mine. He has, since my earliest days, wholeheartedly encouraged my fixation with the past.

Chapter One

Introduction

Forty-two years after the 1607 establishment of James Fort in Virginia, John Ferrar – London merchant, member of parliament, and one-time deputy of the Virginia Company – reflected on the first English colonial enterprises to North America in which he had been so invested. One of the most poignant aspects of Ferrar’s commentary, scrawled in the margins of a later text on Virginia, were the policies towards the Algonquian-speaking peoples populating the Chesapeake. He described them with a benign sense of superiority, conforming to commonplace tropes of savagery when he deemed them ‘a good loving harmelesse peopell [who] dwelt in Villages together yeat went Naked’, but he also referred to them in the past tense, as if they had irrevocably disappeared.¹ English policy-makers’ express desire to ‘civilise’ Amerindians in the early seventeenth century had seemed, at least to Ferrar, to be a genuine aim, but this goal had already proven unattainable by the end of James’ reign. Where William Bullock’s text suggested the English might quell Algonquian power by turning chiefs into royal favourites, Ferrar’s marginalia noted that this

was the Deliberation of the Counsell and Company 30 yeares agoe in the time of the Government heere of that Most Noble Earle of Southampton and all this and much more determined and Ordered for the Civilizinge of the Indians as a matter of the greatest consequence.²

This thesis explores the effects of colonisation on the politics and culture of Jacobean London, at a time when the English were exposed to prolonged encounters with native Americans for the first time. It takes as a departing point that ‘matter of the greatest consequence’, the English concern with ‘civilising’ those they considered savage, in order to examine the interplay between colonisation and Jacobean concepts of civility and political authority in the metropolis. Moving beyond perceptions of ‘savages’ as ‘others’, it is interested in the ways that English writers and policy-makers used their knowledge of North and South America to comment on English behaviour, in ways that reveal

¹ John Ferrar’s marginalia is reproduced in full in the online appendix to Peter Thompson, ‘William Bullock’s “Strange Adventure”: A Plan to Transform Seventeenth-Century Virginia’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 61:1 (2004), pp. 107-28 <<https://oieahc.wm.edu/wmq/Jan04/ThompsonWeb.pdf>> [accessed 11 April 2015].

² Ibid.

significant changes underway in London itself. As Ferrar himself noted, the ‘bayne of Virginia’ had not been the ‘strength of Indians’ so much as the English willingness to behave transgressively, in everything from entertaining ‘pagan’ natives at their dinner tables, to their adoption of tobacco-smoking.³ Expansion put conformity to English norms in peril, but it also, more worryingly, seemed to highlight the ease with which the English abandoned their values when given the chance. This came to be reflected in discourse beyond that which promoted the colonising projects themselves.

This thesis addresses these issues of expansion and conformity in several interrelated ways. Firstly, it establishes the extent of colonial interest in Jacobean London, locating these initiatives in several key political and ‘civilising’ spheres including the royal court(s), parliament, and colonial councils. Secondly, it examines the language of civility and savagery that not only framed the charters and letters of policy-makers, but that provided a shared language through which ideas of obedience and internal order were articulated by a wide range of subjects. Finally, it traces the effects of colonial experiences, and encounters with native peoples, on concepts of civility and government in the metropolis. Elizabethan and Jacobean England saw a distinct and intensive reformation of manners following the Reformation, characteristic of the Crown’s ‘centralising tendencies’ and strengthened by the shared ethos of responsibility by local governments.⁴ This period also saw a ‘pivotal’ redistribution of the benefits of patriarchy, in which concepts of manhood were understood increasingly in terms of civility and social status.⁵ Over a fifth of those born in England in the first two decades of the seventeenth century never married, and the social changes wrought by this, alongside the anxieties of younger sons who did not benefit from primogeniture, affected the demographics of those who went to colonise the Chesapeake.⁶ It is the contention of this thesis that the ‘Civilizinge of the Indians’ was not distinct from, but entwined with, these changes in the realm. What materialises is a

³ Ibid.

⁴ Steve Hindle, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, 1550 – 1640* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), pp. 1-3.

⁵ Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 252-3.

⁶ Ibid., p. 252; Joan Thirsk, ‘Younger Sons in the Seventeenth Century’, *History*, 54:182 (1969), pp. 358-77; Martin H. Quitt, ‘Immigrant Origins of the Virginia Gentry: A Study of Cultural Transmission and Innovation’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 45:4 (1988), pp. 629-55.

distinct relationship between an emerging imperial impulse and developing ideas of state.

England and the Atlantic

In 1975, J.G.A. Pocock urged British – especially English – scholars to broaden the geographical parameters of their historical inquiry, partly as a response to the process of decolonisation and the legacy of expansion on British politics.⁷ Pocock argued that ‘marches’, or frontiers, were essential to understanding the heterogeneity of British concepts of citizenship and sovereignty. ‘I am using “British history”’, he wrote, ‘to denote the plural history of a group of cultures situated along the Anglo-Celtic frontier and marked by an increasing English political and cultural domination’.⁸ In seeking to move beyond the imperialist histories of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Pocock argued that it was impossible to understand the British people without looking beyond the British Isles.

The ‘New British History’ has tended towards revisionist studies of the ‘three kingdoms’ in relation to the civil conflicts of the mid-seventeenth century more than any other area, and Pocock explicitly sought to disassociate himself from David Armitage’s concept of ‘Greater Britain’, rejecting the insinuation that ‘New British History’ is Atlantic history.⁹ Nonetheless, British and Atlantic scholarship from the 1970s has significantly broadened the scope of historical inquiry. As Pocock wrote in his original article, ‘in no case has the process of Anglicisation been the simple one-way imperial success story’ that seemed so prevalent in earlier scholarship, and the English colonial system in Ireland and North America has been integrated within this approach.¹⁰ Fruitful studies have emerged from these correctives on traditional imperial history by Jane Ohlmeyer,

⁷ J.G.A. Pocock, ‘British History: A Plea for a New Subject’, *The Journal of Modern History*, 47:4 (1975), pp. 601-21.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 605.

⁹ J.G.A. Pocock, ‘The New British History in Atlantic Perspective: An Antipodean Commentary’, *The American Historical Review*, 104:2 (1999), pp. 490-500. For the continuing use of Pocock’s ideas, see Richard Bourke, ‘Pocock and the Presuppositions of the New British History’, *The Historical Journal*, 53:3 (2010), pp. 747-70.

¹⁰ J.G.A. Pocock, ‘British History: A Plea for a New Subject: Reply’, *The Journal of Modern History*, 47:4 (1975), pp. 626-8, p. 626; David Armitage, ‘Greater Britain: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis?’, *The American Historical Review*, 104:2 (1999), pp. 427-45; Audrey Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013); Alison Games, *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560 – 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

David Quinn, and Nicholas Canny, who have sought to explore the consequences of expansion and frontier experiences on indigenous people, as on wider political and social processes.¹¹

Assumptions continue to prevail, however, that the ‘colonised’, and the process of colonisation, bore little influence on English society. In the 1970s, J.H. Elliott argued that the ‘impact’ of America on Europe was overwhelmingly one of ‘resounding silence’, characterised by a slow process of interest and assimilation.¹² This was certainly the case on many levels, especially in the immediate aftermath of Columbus’ voyages, and Elliott considered a very different colonial paradigm by focusing on Spain rather than England. Yet perhaps the question of impact is itself too narrowly conceived. Elliott’s conclusion that the ‘European reading public displayed no overwhelming interest in the newly-discovered world of America’ did not engage with who, exactly, this ‘reading public’ was, nor how they may have engaged with visual and auditory Americana in the form of sermons, broadsides, or the visible presence of Amerindians beyond print. This would have included the Taíno accompanying Sir Walter Raleigh from South America after his Guiana voyage in 1595, the Patuxet native, Squanto, who lived in Cornhill in the City of London around 1605, and the Powhatan ‘princess’, Pocahontas, and her entourage in London in 1616.¹³ Further, Elliott seemed to insinuate that impact could be gauged quantitatively on the basis of printed references, whereas the patronage of courtiers, councillors, lawyers, and merchants who displayed interest in colonisation were more influential in disseminating colonising ideas in London.

Through propaganda in print and sermons, but also through speeches in parliament, financial investment in joint-stock companies, schemes to educate native children, and sitting on colonial councils, colonisation had significant

¹¹ Jane Ohlmeyer, ‘Seventeenth-Century Ireland and the New British and Atlantic Histories’, *The American Historical Review*, 104:2 (1999), pp. 446-62; *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbours*, eds. Allan I. Macinnes and Jane Ohlmeyer (Portland: Four Courts Press, 2002); Nicholas Canny, ‘Writing Early Modern History: Ireland, Britain, and the Wider World’, *The Historical Journal*, 46:3 (2003), pp. 723-47; Nicholas P. Canny, *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560 – 1800* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1988); *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Vol. I*, ed. Nicholas Canny (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485 – 1725*, ed. Steven G. Ellis and Sarah Barber (London: Longman, 1995).

¹² J.H. Elliott, *The Old World and the New, 1492 – 1650*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1992, p. 14.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 12; Alden T. Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters: American Indians in Britain, 1500 – 1776* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 22, 71.

impact among the political elite precisely because of who chose to endorse it. Governors and lord deputies in Ireland and in America were often court favourites, and the state rhetoric of ‘civilising’ others was considered of real use to securing royal authority. The same men who sat on colonial councils served as members of parliament and wrote treatises on English and continental politics. Lawyers who helped draft joint-stock company charters also attended the Inns of Court, an important milieu for gentlemen from the localities who sought political careers. Governors and colonial administrators had generally received the traditional, rigorous humanist training at Oxford or Cambridge, and might serve in high-ranking government positions included secretary of state, as James’ secretary of state and future Maryland colonist Sir George Calvert had. The privy councillor and treasurer Sir Robert Cecil, like his father William before him, was a prime supporter of overseas expansion: Cecil encouraged the publication of Richard Hakluyt’s prospectus for colonisation, *The principal nauigations, voiages, traffiques and discoveries of the English nation* (1589), and amassed a large collection of Irish maps which both Cecils annotated in their own hand. The second edition of *Principal nauigations* (1599) was published by the king’s printer, Robert Barker, who also published the somewhat shorter King James Bible twelve years later. Migrants to America may have been encouraged by printed propaganda, but friendships and networks of patronage played a far more significant role in establishing English plantations in these early stages, seen in the tireless efforts of Elizabeth’s favourite, Raleigh, or in the members of parliament and treasurers of the Virginia Company Edwin Sandys and Henry Wriothesley, third earl of Southampton.

Atlantic history is in many ways a de-centred history, one that sees expansion as ‘an empire built on the ground, in the peripheries, in colonies and trading posts’.¹⁴ Jacobean policy-makers would have thought rather differently, and colonial governors themselves were frustrated by the ambiguous policies from London that made life in the colonies harder to stabilise. Whether complaining about mismanagement from Bermuda, or recounting stories of cannibal tribes in the Amazon, the networks of patronage that made colonisation possible render terms such as ‘centre’ and ‘periphery’ misleading. Prior to mass migration in the 1630s, ideas and news between policy-makers in London and colonial

¹⁴ Games, *The Web of Empire*, p. 11.

administrators in Virginia and Bermuda was characterised by a certain intimacy, especially since the Virginia Company council oversaw both colonies. ‘For as your disgraicing and undoeing violent Factions [in London],’ wrote a scathing Nathaniel Butler to Sir Nathaniel Rich, earl of Warwick, in 1620, ‘they not only make all such unhappy as are in service to you, but must needs, unlesse speedily quench’t, sore ruine both the Plantations [of Virginia and Bermuda]’.¹⁵ These tenuous, contested relationships between colonists and London councillors offer a means of assessing the overlap between political ideas and practice, their exchanges informed by the links of patronage and familiarity that allowed officials in the colonies, like Butler, or George Sandys, brother of the influential parliamentarian Edwin Sandys, to speak with relative freedom about the hard conditions they faced.

While scholarship has sought to advance a less insular view of English history, the place of America in English politics and culture lacks concerted study. Whereas American scholars tend to view the 1610s and 1620s as the prelude to the foundation of a nation, English historians continue to assume that colonisation schemes were the fancies of merchants and poets, largely outside the domain of concerted state interest. The separation in the state papers at the National Archives between ‘colonial’ and ‘domestic’ further emphasise this rift. After the deaths of 347 Englishmen and women in Virginia in 1622 at the hands of the Powhatan, there were more subscribers to westward joint-stock companies in England than there were survivors in the colonies. The literal fear, voiced by colonists in Jamestown, of being subsumed by ‘savages’ only reinforced more abstract notions of the need for civility to maintain stable societies. ‘O[u]r Colonyes,’ reflected Sir Nathaniel Rich of the earliest years of settlement, ‘were made almost subiectes to the Sauages’ precisely because English authority remained weak.¹⁶ This thesis is a response to the fact that a more integrative, comparative approach to English history ‘remains the ideal not the practice, particularly as [the study of] political thought remains disconnected from the political process’.¹⁷ The very names ‘Virginia’ and ‘Jamestown’ are reminders of the fundamental connection between the monarchy and imperial expansion.

¹⁵ Governor Nathaniel Butler to Sir Nathaniel Rich, 23 October 1620, in *The Rich Papers: Letters from Bermuda, 1615 – 1646* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), p. 188.

¹⁶ Sir Nathaniel Rich, ‘Draft of Instructions to the Commissioners to Investigate Virginia Affairs’, 14 April 1623, in *VCR: IV*, p. 118.

¹⁷ *The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 15.

As Ohlmeyer has noted, an attention to the ‘Atlantic archipelago’ does not only affect the study of British history, but serves as ‘a corrective to the divergence in domestic and imperial historiography’.¹⁸ While the chapters below primarily seek to contribute to understandings of James’ reign, they are informed by recent comparative approaches in order to acknowledge the influence of English expansion on internal change. Somewhat ironically, the popularity of Atlantic and global history has in some ways discouraged integration. English historians tend to relegate the issue of colonisation to American or Atlantic historians, and the effects of expansion have been left out of most studies of early Stuart history, and early modern history more generally.¹⁹ This thesis addresses some of the deficiencies that arise in assuming that colonisation had little effect on English society prior to a more secure presence in North America and the Caribbean in the mid-seventeenth century. Moreover, it argues that these effects on English attempts to endorse and realise colonial projects in these early stages were of a distinct nature, where the language of savagery lent itself to the fraught politics of the anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish discourse that reached their pitch in the 1620s. This relationship is lost when studying colonial history over the duration of the ‘first’ (Atlantic) English empire as a whole.

Civility and Regulation in Jacobean England

J.H. Elliott’s influential claim that the ‘new’ world bore little on the ‘old’ continues to provoke scholars to respond to, and modify, his conclusion.²⁰ One key method in doing so is to focus more closely on concepts of civility and the state’s regulation of uncivil behaviour in Jacobean England. The promotion of civility allowed the ‘state’ – not just the Crown, but its ‘network of agencies’ that exercised political influence on local levels – to consolidate its authority more effectively.²¹ Michael Braddick’s study of English state formation found that the

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Linda Levy Peck, *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994); Mark Kishlanksy, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603 – 1714* (London: Penguin, 1996); Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

²⁰ Elliott, *The Old World and the New, 1492 – 1650*, especially Chapter One.

²¹ Michael Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England, 1550 – 1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 96; Steve Hindle, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, 1550 – 1640* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000); *The British Atlantic World, 1500 – 1800*, ed. David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

‘languages of Protestantism and of civility were of crucial, transnational importance’, where ‘[o]rder lay in the relations between these roles... in which decency and civility were sustained through proper displays of deference and obligation’.²² This can be seen the *Table-observations* printed by the king’s printer, Robert Barker, in 1615 [Figure 1.1]. The series of negative imperatives addressed civil conduct – ‘[p]icke no Quarrels’, ‘[l]aie no Wagers’ – but these were explicitly connected to matters of state.²³ Smoking tobacco appeared in the same cluster as discussing politics, where its role in the rites of sociability was often seen as a conduit to less decorous table-talk.

Elizabeth’s and James’ reigns saw a remarkable frequency in the severity of punishments prescribed to offenders, with the prosecution of misbehaviour on local levels often supported by harsh measures in parliament.²⁴ Steve Hindle has argued that central and local authority was equally concerned with social problems to ‘paranoid levels’, where justices of the peace and county administrators displayed a conscious responsibility towards preserving order.²⁵ Giving due attention to the civilising initiatives undertaken by the state contextualises overseas engagement, but it also indicates why authorities invoked Amerindian behaviour to reflect on the political state of the realm. The state effectively used violence to ‘reassert moral hierarchies and confirm patriarchal expectations’ of subordination, while humiliation was employed to incite more civil behaviour.²⁶ Brutal correction was ‘broadly prescribed’ to varying purposes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.²⁷ Policy-makers, united in a Protestant vision of a stable orthodoxy underpinned by civility, projected the horrors of the religious wars across the channel as representative of the consequences of lax authority. Subjects who deviated from established norms were seen to undermine the foundations of political and social order. Actions towards Amerindians in the colonies must be understood in the context of this relationship between authority and violence in England, and in real fears of post-Reformation confessional disputes ushering societal degeneration.

²² Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England*, p. 222.

²³ *Table-observations* (London, 1615; STC 23634.7).

²⁴ Hindle, *The State and Social Change*, p. 177.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 178; Alison Wall, *Power and Protest in England, 1525 – 1640* (London: Arnold, 2000).

²⁶ Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, p. 133.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 140.



T A B L E
observations,

Picke Make Maintaine	no	Quarrels Comparisons Opinions
Report Repeat Reueale	no	Sad newes Greiuances Secrets
Tell Take Touch	no	Longtales Tobacco State-matters
Laie Vrge Vfe	no	Wagers Healthes Long meales

Odi memorem compotatorem.

Figure 1.1. *Table-observations* (London, 1615; STC 23634.7)

The ruthless destruction of Powhatan temples in Virginia, and the hysterical anti-Catholic rhetoric that emerged after the Gunpowder Treason of 1605, were both Protestant reactions to the threats against the regime they perceived as emerging from unorthodoxy. In the drive to establish orthodoxy and legitimise state uses of violence, invoking ‘savage’ rituals like devil-worship and cannibalism partly served to condemn Catholic non-conformity in ways that justified corrective force.

The Crown's centralising mechanisms, and the networks of state that sought to promote stability within the realm through an emphasis on hierarchical obedience and moral behaviour, can be connected to Norbert Elias' conception of a 'civilising process'. Elias argued that the sixteenth century saw a shift in aristocratic values from an aggressive, knightly ethos to one that centred on new codes of manners and principles of shame.²⁸ He explicitly connected this to state centralisation, dividing his book into two related parts that focused on changes in behaviour and its relation to the development of the court as the central locus of increasingly absolute power. Elias' argument has been enormously influential in re-integrating the idea of civility as a political tool in the early modern period, apparent in Michael Braddick's work on civility and the state. James actively promoted himself as a king engaged in the civilising of his subjects, urging his son and heir, Henry, to 'follow forth the course that I haue intended...planting ciuilitie' in the lives of the 'barbarous and stubborne sort'.²⁹ Engaging with Elias' thesis becomes a means of exploring many of the themes that James himself endorsed in his own conceptions of authority in relation to civility.

At the same time, Elias wrote as a sociologist, not a historian, and his work can be both complicated and enhanced by considering particular historical contexts. There are convergences, but also significant gaps, between what James ordained and what his subjects actually did. Further, Elias, in his search for the social and psychological foundations of modern civilisation, did not clearly distinguish the 'civilising process' from the concept of civilisation.³⁰ This can be problematic when investigating colonisation, since pitting more 'civilised' peoples against the 'less civil' risks downplaying the human cost of state centralisation and expansion. Though the wider trajectory of large-scale violence beyond the control of the state was largely in decline within England by the seventeenth century, this should not obscure the capacity for violence by the English, who were all too willing to release their own brutality against any they considered 'savage', or the passionate advocacy for war that James' subjects often propounded during James' peace with Spain. Elizabeth's own use of royal favourites to carry out 'civilising' missions, including Robert Devereux, the earl of Essex, in Ireland in 1599, and James' 'Gentlemen Adventurers of Fife' in the

²⁸ Norbert Elias, *The Civilising Process*, tr. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Blackwell, 1978).

²⁹ James I, 'Basilikon Doron', in *Workes* (London, 1616; STC 14344), sig. O2r.

³⁰ Stephen Mennell, *Norbert Elias: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), p. 30.

Isle of Lewis in the 1590s, only emphasises the Crown's use of high-ranking members of the nobility to subjugate native peoples and restore order to the territories claimed by the Crown.³¹ Similarly, the colonisation of Ireland from the 1560s would not have been possible without the presence of powerful and enterprising aristocratic families like the Sidneys to implement law with force. More helpful is to consider the civilising *initiatives* of the Crown, a term which better acknowledges the violence used in promoting civility, as well as the ways in which the state occasionally failed in its aims to establish civility.

Expanding Elias' thesis in the context of England, Anna Bryson extensively engaged with the role of civility in status interaction in *From Courtesy to Civility*. Her book traced a 'major cultural shift' occurring in England from the sixteenth century, in which civility became a primary element in discourse on social and political order.³² She cited the court as a 'fluid milieu' of self-presentation, a world of shifting social relationships which became all the more fraught under James, who knighted more people in his first month as king than Elizabeth did in her entire reign.³³ In the unstable world of the court, Bryson highlighted, status interaction was strategic; it was meant to show superiority over others. Bryson acknowledged that civility 'increasingly involved the notion of the historical development of a civil state of polity and society out of an original condition of savagery', but otherwise left this unexplored.³⁴ No scholarly discussions of state formation, then, have drawn connections between expansion and changes in civility in England, despite the state's consistent declaration that the aim of expansion was to bring civility and religion to those who had none.

The hard edge to moral regulation in Protestant England is sometimes lost in works that focus on English curiosity towards native peoples. The recent tendency to emphasise moments of intercultural negotiation, depicting the English rather anachronistically as 'globetrotters', risks downplaying the uses of violence

³¹ Jenny Wormald, 'A Very British Problem: the Stuart Crown and the Plantation of Ulster', *History Ireland*, 17:6 (2009), pp. 20-23, p. 21; Steven G. Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447 – 1603: English Expansion and the End of Gaelic Rule* (London: Longman, 1998).

³² Anna Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 276.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 281; Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558 – 1641* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 41.

³⁴ Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, p. 277.

and humiliation in maintaining authority.³⁵ English civility can hardly be understood without attention to its opposite. Concepts of cultural, religious, and political inferiority – blanketed under the term ‘savage’ – were consistently pitted against the virtues of Protestant civility. The English rhetoric of civilising those they considered savage, whether the Gaelic Irish, Scottish Highlanders, or native Americans, was the primary means through which they justified their actions in frontier territories, often contrasted against the perceived cruelty of Spanish methods in the Indies.³⁶ As Anthony Pagden noted, ‘the dual experience of administration and acculturation which colonisation involved brought the hitherto semi-mythical, and often mythologised “savage” far closer to the European world’ than before settlement.³⁷ Though travellers themselves were often impelled to meet those they encountered on their own cultural terms, as Karen Kupperman has written about extensively, there were limits to acculturation.³⁸ The member of parliament George Thorpe, who sold parts of his own estate to finance his settlement to the Berkeley plantation in Virginia, gave an indication of the true nature of Anglo-Algonquian relations despite mutual curiosity. ‘[T]here is scarce any man amongst vs that doe soe much as affoorde [the Indians] a good thought in his hart,’ he wrote in 1621, ‘and most men w[i]th their mouthes giue them nothinge but maledictions’.³⁹

This is not to suggest that Amerindian ‘savagery’ was the only model of cultural difference from which authorities legitimised their authority. The English were profoundly critical even of other European nations, especially Spain. Stereotypes of cruel Ottomans enslaving Christians could be found in printed books, letters from the Mediterranean, and on the Elizabethan and Jacobean stage, and cosmographies often perpetuated tales of human consumption and moral

³⁵ Games, *The Web of Empire*, pp. 9, 13. Games’ work is typical of an Atlantic history approach that tends to downplay the role of subjugation on expansion.

³⁶ Nicholas P. Canny, ‘The Ideology of English Colonisation: From Ireland to America’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 30:4 (1973), pp. 575-98; Jane H. Ohlmeyer, ‘Civilizing of those Rude Partes’: Colonisation within Britain and Ireland, 1580s – 1640s’ in *Oxford History of the British Empire*, pp. 124-47; Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England*.

³⁷ Anthony Pagden, *European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), p. 13.

³⁸ Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2000); Karen Ordahl Kupperman, ‘Presentment of Civility: English Reading of American Self-Presentation in the Early Years of Colonisation’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 54:1 (1997), pp. 193-228. For a sensitive portrayal of the limits to which both the English and Amerindians were unwilling to culturally compromise, see Quitt, ‘Trade and Acculturation at Jamestown, 1607 – 1609’.

³⁹ George Thorpe and John Pory to Sir Edwin Sandys, 15 May 1621, in *VCR: IV*, p. 446.

corruption based on the ‘intemperate’ climes of hot Africa or icy Russia.⁴⁰ An interest in savagery should be placed within the larger context of exploration and engagements with other peoples, and the focus on westward enterprises should not blind historians to a much larger process of commerce and intercultural engagement happening to the east.⁴¹

Further, the relationship between savagery and political disorder was rooted in Greco-Roman political theory. The term ‘civility’ stemmed from the Latin word for ‘city’, containing ‘the clear implication that townspeople were better behaved, more capable of political participation, and so more human’ than those who inhabited less cultivated landscapes.⁴² ‘You can see for yourselves that a happy life,’ wrote Aristotle, ‘belongs more to those who have cultivated their character and minds to the uppermost’, whereas ‘the man who is isolated, who is unable to share in the benefits of political association’ was a ‘savage being’.⁴³ The language of civility also involved a theory of historical progression as expressed by Cicero, who argued that men had evolved from feral creatures to citizens capable of structured government and society.⁴⁴ The humanist and privy councillor Thomas Wilson expressed this commonplace view in 1553 when he wrote that in the beginning of time ‘al thinges waxed sauage’, while language transformed wild men into articulate beings, capable of rule and endowed with the eloquence needed to persuade others to live virtuous, Christian lives.⁴⁵ This concept of historical progression, including the rhetoric that the English themselves had benefited from Roman conquest, contained profound implications for colonisation in Ireland and America, which was largely justified through a language of improvement, while savagery was increasingly portrayed as political

⁴⁰ Games, *The Web of Empire*; Linda Colley, *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600 – 1850* (London: Pimlico, 2003); Anthony Munday, *The admirable deliuerance of 266. Christians by Iohn Raynard Englishman from the captiuitie of the Turkes* (London, 1608; STC 18258); Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005); Richard Hakluyt, *The principall nauigations, voyages and discoueries of the English nation* (London, 1589; STC 12625).

⁴¹ Pagden, *European Encounters with the New World*; Patricia Seed, ‘Review: *European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism* by Anthony Pagden’, *The American Historical Review*, 99:2 (1994), pp. 535-6.

⁴² *Civil Histories*, ed. Peter Burke, Brian Harrison, and Paul Slack (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. v.

⁴³ Aristotle, *Politics*, tr. Ernest Baker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 252, 11.

⁴⁴ *Civil Histories*, p. v.

⁴⁵ Thomas Wilson, *The Arte of Rhetorique* (London: 1553; STC 25799), sig. Aiiir.

resistance to English ways of life.⁴⁶ Individuals who conformed to the Aristotelian definition of uncultivated man were therefore a ‘perversion of what was natural and good’.⁴⁷

Nonetheless, there are risks to grouping all cultural ‘others’ together, which fails to acknowledge the specific meanings found in certain associations. The classical characterisations of savagery were revived with the European ‘discovery’ of America, but these were given modifications and new meanings through settlement. Had the English never pursued colonising projects, things might have been different; but the act of settlement made the ‘problem of paganism’ stretch beyond the abstract to real issues of culture and governance.⁴⁸ After the failed settlement of Roanoke in 1585, and an aborted attempt to build a settlement in Maine in 1607, English success in Virginia made confrontations with ‘savages’ a political reality through prolonged contact. The mathematician and Roanoke colonist, Thomas Hariot, presented a sympathetic account of Amerindian life in his *Briefe and True Report* (1588), but he was no less intent on promoting his associate Walter Raleigh’s colonising projects. Hariot described resourceful natives who lived in houses ‘after the maner as is vsed in many arbories in our gardens in England’.⁴⁹ They were simple, having ‘no such tooles, nor any such craftes, sciences, and artes; yet in those thinges they doe, they shewe excellencie of wit’.⁵⁰ Hariot did not support the destruction of native life, but his conclusions echoed those of countless others before and after him: ‘Whereby may be hoped if meanes of good gouernment bee vsed, that they may in short time be brought to ciuilitie, and the imbracing of true religioun’.⁵¹ The potential found in North America therefore necessitated intervention.

⁴⁶ For discussion of civility in colonisation and dispossession, see the works of Anthony Pagden, *The Fall of Natural Man: the American Indian and the origins of comparative ethnology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). See also *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Vol. I*; Nicholas Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1976).

⁴⁷ Pagden, *The Fall of Natural Man*, p.6; Stephen L. Collins, *From Divine Cosmos to Sovereign State: An Intellectual History of Consciousness and the Idea of Order in Renaissance England* (Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 24.

⁴⁸ John Marenbon, *Pagans and Philosophers: The Problem of Paganism from Augustine to Leibniz* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), p. 1.

⁴⁹ Thomas Hariot, *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia* (London, 1588; STC 12785), sig. Ev.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, sig. E2v.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

The English Appropriation of Native American Tropes

As J.H. Elliott argued, America entered the European imagination through various stages, where descriptions came from first-hand observation, and comprehension from the dissemination of these observations, largely fuelled by print.⁵² By James' reign, stock descriptions of 'savages' were often supplanted or enhanced by more specific descriptions of Amerindian practices that allowed subjects to engage creatively with ideas about government in a range of discourse beyond the expected. Tropes, images, and references to Amerindians appeared in a vast array of contexts, serving as a striking example of the perils of spurning the civil life. 'Let such as beare the face and haue the feature of men,' urged John Moore in 1612, 'ceasse now to be such monsters...let not those that are called, and would needs be accompted Christians, be worse then Cannibals'.⁵³ Murder pamphlets likened remorseless and violent criminals to cannibals, and the novelty of tobacco-smoking became a contested means of showing disdain towards certain norms or political ideas. At the same time, this sophisticated level of refraction, because it was informed by actual – and often chaotic – events in the colonies, did not just reflect, but altered, pre-existing concepts of civil behaviour.

Studying fears of savagery and political dissent in relation to expansion therefore reveals much broader processes at work, including the extent to which subjects engaged with colonisation under James I. Scholarly assessments of James have become more favourable in the last two decades, but revisionist readings of the king have mainly focused on the issues surrounding the Union of the Crowns in 1603, James' written works and religious policies, parliamentary disputes, and his dire handling of Crown finances.⁵⁴ On the nature of Jacobean colonial interest, these scholars have remained silent. The state's colonising initiatives are generally

⁵² Elliott, *The Old World and the New, 1492 – 1650*, p. 18.

⁵³ John Moore, *A target for tillage* (London, 1612; STC 18058), sig. E3v.

⁵⁴ Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I (1566-1625)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <www.oxforddnb.com> [accessed 13 April 2015]; Roger Lockyer, *James VI and I* (London: Longman, 1998); Alan Stewart, *The Cradle King: A Life of James VI & I* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2003); *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, ed. Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); Pauline Croft, *King James* (New York: Palgrave, 2003); *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Maurice Lee, *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990); *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*, ed. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002); John Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance Under James VI and I, 1603 – 1625* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002).

tacked on as appendices or seeming afterthoughts at the end of broader studies.⁵⁵ The following chapters aim to illustrate the extent to which colonial efforts shaped the political and cultural landscape of Jacobean England. John Ferrar's passionate investment in expansion was not unique, and indicates a sense of real, personal involvement, shared between various subjects with similar imperial impulses who were equally committed to other aspects of the political life of the realm.

The support for expansion was, in many ways, an extension of the English's interest in their own history. As Colin Kidd argued, the outward-looking ideological imperatives of the English in the seventeenth century were shaped by conceptions of their own past, itself marked by repeated conquests and new settlements by the Romans, Saxons, and Normans.⁵⁶ Amerindians were placed within a civil history of mankind that had begun in Genesis, and an emphasis on their savagery implied that they required the civility and religion of the English, who had earlier benefited from Roman intervention.⁵⁷ This theological, progressive vision of history prized an adherence to the established institutions of the Protestant Church and sovereign state as central to the maintenance of order and authority.⁵⁸ Notable Elizabethan and Jacobean antiquarians including William Camden, John Selden, and Robert Cotton were also lawyers and politicians, and did not see history as distinct from, but integral to, explaining the legitimacy of English institutions.⁵⁹

Jacobean colonising initiatives were therefore closely related to this renewed interest in the past. Walter Raleigh's *Historie of the World* (1614) is seen as a significant example of the biblically-framed conception of the history of man, but Raleigh was also one of the most successful promoters of English colonisation in North and South America until his death in 1618. The career of the antiquarian Sir Henry Spelman is a prime example of how the English awareness of their own past underpinned their confidence in bringing their customs to new territories. Spelman helped found the Society of Antiquaries in the 1580s, and served as

⁵⁵ Roger Lockyer, *Tudor and Stuart Britain, 1485 – 1714*, 3rd ed. (Harlow: Pearson, 2005); Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain, 1603 – 1714*.

⁵⁶ Colin Kidd, *British Identities Before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600 – 1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 75.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁵⁸ Kidd, *British Identities Before Nationalism*, p. 289.

⁵⁹ See Graham Perry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

sheriff and justice of the peace in Norfolk between 1604 and 1616.⁶⁰ He served as commissioner in Ireland, fought legal battles to secure patents for the New England Company, and became treasurer of the Guiana Company in 1627.⁶¹ His devotion to colonisation can be seen in his willingness to send his own wayward nephew, the fourteen-year-old Henry, to Jamestown in 1609, where Henry lived among the Powhatan and served as a sympathetic interpreter until his death in 1623.

Through the process of seeking to establish their system of rule in a new territory, the English were forced to confront the issue of governance in relation to conflict with the Algonquian-speaking Powhatan in Virginia, just as they did in relation to the Gaelic Irish in Ireland, and, to a far lesser extent, the Taíno in Brazil and the Beothuk of Newfoundland.⁶² Policy-makers drew explicit links between Anglo-Amerindian conflict and the factions and difficulties of government within London itself. ‘Wee have hadd a Massacre...no lesse unexpected nor daungerous, then yo[u]rs’, wrote the House of Commons to the Virginia governor Francis Wyatt in 1622, ‘not uppon mens bodys...butt upponn the Honour Credit & reputac[i]on’ of the London council.⁶³ This remarkable chastisement emphasises one of the prevailing realities of Jacobean attitudes to expansion – that although intercultural relations might indicate curiosity and even, in some instances, respect, this was more often true in the context of trade than politics.

In matters of policy-making, ‘savagery’ endured as a primary category of analysis. Focusing on English views towards savagery reveals that the often callous attitudes towards native Americans did not become unfortunate side issues, but a significant factor in policies regarding expansion and conformity as they were understood in London. While humanist theory praised political systems for mobilising passion and operating through reason, representations of these perfect ideals were constantly evoked through examples of passion and disorder. Encounters with native peoples – both literally, but also through texts,

⁶⁰ Stuart Handley, ‘Spelman, Sir Henry (1564-1641)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26104> [accessed 5 May 2015].

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² Games, *Web of Empire; The Oxford History of the British Empire: Vol. I.*

⁶³ Copie of a Letter to S[i]r Frauncis Wyatt and M[aste]r George Sandys by the seat lower, 18 December 1622, FP 437, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virgionacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 18 September 2014].

performances, and debates – became part of the process through which English policy-makers and writers engaged with civil behaviour as they sought to define its parameters and participate in the political life of the realm in creative ways.

In relation to concepts of savagery more specifically, what articulations towards ‘savages’ achieved, as much as validate expansion and implement authority, was to encourage English subjects to articulate their own concepts of behaviour through an interaction with the behaviour of others. This occurred on the stage and in printed polemic as much as in the council chamber, while commonplace books encouraged collecting a range of information on various topics for moral purposes. Here, too, descriptions of native customs appeared alongside rules of sociability and transcriptions of political libels. While some of James’ courtiers were committed to the more practical side of colonisation, others saw it as a more fanciful and status-driven endeavour. Hopes for silk cultivation existed alongside promises, by the earl of Lincoln in 1618, to send some of his finest horses to set up a race track in Virginia.⁶⁴ Tobacco-smoking became a significant component of the typical Inns of Court student. Dozens of printed satires conjured an image of changing modes of sociability through smoking, where friends met in the streets and carried their conversations ‘vnto his Chamber...[for] the best *Tobacco* that he euer dranke’.⁶⁵ Yet this form of sociability did not see tobacco as an abstract indulgence, but one specifically rooted in the Jacobean colonial enterprise:

Such as himselfe did make a voyage for,
And with his owne hands gatherd fro[m] the ground.
All that which others fetcht, he doth abhor,
His grew vpon an Iland neuer found:
Oh rare compound...
Of English Fire, and of India smoke.⁶⁶

This ‘rare compound’, the English adoption of American cultural habits, was a commentary on English behaviour informed by the wider context of the vogue for plantation.

⁶⁴ A report of S[i]r Yeardlyes going Governor to Virginia, 5 December 1618, FP 93, *Virginia Company Archives*, <<http://www.virginiacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 9 September 2014].

⁶⁵ Samuel Rowlands, *The letting of humors blood in the head-vaine* (London, 1613; STC 21397), sig. A5r.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

This thesis does not suggest that Anglo-Amerindian comparisons were the only lens through which the English viewed themselves, but it does contend that the peak in American interest in the 1610s and 1620s was unprecedented, thereby offering invaluable insight into how the English engaged with ideas of cultural difference and political ideas in relation to expansion. While branding an Englishman a ‘savage’ might not have always meant to invoke Amerindians, comparisons to Amerindian practices such as cannibalism and tobacco-smoking were used to attack specific areas of English behaviour. All westward joint-stock companies, including the Plymouth and Virginia Companies (1606), the Newfoundland Company (1610), the Somers Islands/Bermuda Company (1612), and the Amazon Company (1619), were created in James’ reign, and their ‘newness’ and the bid for subscribers brought renewed interests in westward affairs at a time when English relations with the Ottomans and eastern trade experienced a moment of relative peace and stability.⁶⁷ A Flemish soldier visiting London in 1614 included watercolours of the sights he absorbed while visiting – this included King James, but also a Virginian native in St James’ Park, not far from the royal court [Figure 1.2].

Sources and Parameters

Focusing on the political meanings of savagery and representations of Amerindians in discourse involves an extensive amount of printed and manuscript material, including travel accounts, state papers, letters to and from colonial councils, royal proclamations, speeches in parliament, conduct manuals, poems and plays, commonplace books, and records of court performances. These sources offer insight into English attitudes towards authority and conformity in London in relation to colonial expansion, by those who participated in government or who engaged with political ideas in print. Such a focus inevitably offers a largely intellectual approach to English political culture, and the central concern here is to explore how savagery was conceived and articulated in relation to authority, as well as how encounters with native Americans generated new modes of participation and interaction in London. Nonetheless, this thesis has also attempted to reconstruct, as much as sources allow, the broader engagement with

⁶⁷ Anders Ingram, ‘English Literature on the Ottoman Turks in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’ (University of Durham, unpublished PhD thesis, 2009), p. 194.



Figure 1.2. King James (above) and an Algonquian in St James' Park (below), both from Michael van Meer, *Album amicorum*, 1614-1615, Edinburgh University Library, MS.La.III.283, ff. 149v, 254v [detail].



America that does not only explore colonisation on a state level, but examines the interplay between ideas and the way that subjects enacted, or resisted, civility through tobacco-smoking, apparel, performance, and encounters with indigenous peoples.

It should also be stated that the nature of the sources used in this thesis should not be seen as an attempt to downplay the complexities of colonial encounters ‘on the ground’, which were far more entangled than London discourse allowed for. Rather, having located savagery as an integral part of how Jacobean writers conceived and promoted government authority, it seeks to explore the effects of colonisation on those expressions. Colonial historians often emphasise that the ‘cant of London expansionists’ served actual settlers very little, but a different picture emerges when exploring the lives of these policy-makers in London.⁶⁸ The Jesuit John Floyd’s accusation that the courtier Sir Edward Hoby smoked too much tobacco, thereby undermining his political credibility and religious zeal, does not say much about Algonquian tobacco rituals, but it does say a good deal about status interaction and civility as it was engaged with in London in the early seventeenth century.⁶⁹

The use of a range of material serves to contextualise ideas of savagery and civility within the range of sources policy-makers themselves would have engaged with. The privy councillor and bencher Sir Julius Caesar, for example, collected news from Jamestown written by colonists alongside the Virginia Company’s printed propaganda, and likely attended the Whitehall masque to celebrate the marriage of James’ daughter, Elizabeth, to Frederick V in 1613, which featured American motifs. Further, the relationship between print culture and political engagement renders textual analysis an important means of understanding how subjects engaged with ideas, enabling historians to reconstruct these ideas as they were understood by contemporaries.⁷⁰ James himself delighted in debate, and was unique among English monarchs in the sheer output and

⁶⁸ Quitt, ‘Trade and Acculturation at Jamestown, 1607 – 1609’, p. 227.

⁶⁹ John Floyd, *The overthrow of the Protestants pulpit-Babels* (St-Omer, 1612; STC 11111), sig. R4r.

⁷⁰ Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Jason Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013).

intellectual quality of his writings, invoking the authority of the text as a means of articulating, and asserting, his monarchical authority.⁷¹

The term ‘political discourse’ in the title is taken to broadly encompass colonial policies as well as the letters, tracts, and literature written by those who practiced politics or were concerned with the theory of politics in print. It also, however, subscribes to the idea, informed by cultural history, that metaphors, images, and social practices are all ‘the materials of the political theorist’, and that an assessment of politics through culture allows historians to ‘interrogate the changes in, and tensions between, a range of texts and terms, discourses and concepts in early modernity’.⁷² What unites these sources is their engagement with sixteenth and seventeenth-century attitudes to savagery and political discourse. While textual analysis provides the primary basis for this research, material culture including tobacco-pipe fragments and clothing informs the interest in gesture and visual resistance to civility. The state’s desire to instil conformity involved an attention to outward appearances that made the visual an important aspect of establishing authority.

Religion is not the main focus of this study, but it is in many ways inseparable from the primary issues with which this thesis is concerned, in that it framed the mindsets of those who governed. The concentration on civility is not understood here as an alternative to religion, but as a tool that enabled the Protestant state to claim, and enforce, political supremacy at a time when English monarchs no longer subjected themselves to the supremacy of the pope. It is the contention here that formative first-hand experiences in America can contribute to Jacobean conceptions of Protestant society even when not focused on religion alone; like religion, civility ‘exerted mental pressure upon the whole person’ and ‘set people in motion’, and provides another facet to politics and culture that does not suppress, but rather supplements, religion.⁷³ The church historian Alec Ryrie, for example, opens his book, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, by invoking the ‘reformation of manners’ that ‘imposed austere ideals of civilised

⁷¹ James VI and I: *Ideas, Authority, and Government*, p. 1. The relationship between James’ conception of authority and order, and American savagery, was the basis of the author’s MA thesis, submitted to the University of London. Its approaches differ significantly from the argument employed here, focusing instead on rhetoric and literary texts.

⁷² Kevin Sharpe, ‘Virtues, Passions and Politics in Early Modern England’, *History of Political Thought*, 32:5 (2011), pp. 773-98, pp. 798, 774.

⁷³ Elias, *The Civilising Process*, p. 294.

behaviour'.⁷⁴ Combatting the tendency to view sixteenth and seventeenth-century Protestants as either emotionless or morbidly inclined to spiritual despair, Ryrie argued for a religious culture characterised by 'intensity' and 'dynamism'.⁷⁵ Yet, his exploration of this vigour overlooked the impetus to look outwards, which can partly be seen as a *consequence* of that dynamism – one that nonetheless affected the character of the Protestantism that provoked it. A more concerted study of the religious aspects of colonisation, in everything from theories of savagery informed by biblical exegesis and the legacy of medieval theology against pagans, as well as the Puritan networks that laid the foundation for the colonisation of New England in the 1630s, lies beyond the scope of this project, but would in many ways expand and complement the material here. A focus on civility is particularly apt when assessing the first two decades of English colonisation, since, as Nicholas Canny argued, the immediate concerns of colonisation demanded that indigenous peoples be taught civility before they could be converted.⁷⁶

A further means of narrowing the parameters of this project has been to focus on James' English reign. This is partly because the Jacobean contribution to colonisation is often side-lined in sixteenth and seventeenth century studies. The concept of an Elizabethan 'empire' is an enduring component of the myths surrounding an Elizabethan 'Golden Age', while English historians tend to locate English ascendancy in the Atlantic as emerging from Oliver Cromwell's 'Western Design' of the 1650s, in which the Council of State decided on a series of initiatives that targeted Dutch and Spanish control of the Caribbean.⁷⁷ Couched between Elizabeth's endorsement of anti-Spanish activities in the Indies, and the economic crises and religious controversies that drove the Great Migration to New England and the Chesapeake from the 1630s to the 1650s, the overseas projects propounded by James fail to do justice to the level of activity undertaken in the first two decades of the seventeenth century.

⁷⁴ Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 17.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

⁷⁶ Nicholas Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonisation: From Ireland to America', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 30:4 (1973), pp. 575-98, p. 586.

⁷⁷ David L. Smith, *A History of the Modern British Isles, 1603 – 1707: The Double Crown* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), p. 188; David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

The sense of failure and disappointment expressed by Jacobean policy-makers themselves following the demise of the Virginia Company in 1624 has contributed to the misleading assumption that colonisation in the 1610s and 1620s was an uninspired affair. Yet England under James enjoyed a moment of relative peace following the Anglo-Spanish treaty of 1604, one that allowed the English to pursue colonisation in ways that would not have been possible under the strain of war. The desire to check Spanish power contributed to the sense of urgency and the hopes of capitalising on a colonial moment: ‘No nation in Christendom is so fit for this action [of colonisation] as England’, pressed Edward Hayes in 1602, ‘by reason of...our long domesticall peace’.⁷⁸ John Ferrar’s sense of disappointment did not come out of a lack of interest, but the opposite; he had, after all, named his daughter Virginia, three years after the company went bankrupt. Englishmen far beyond London, complained Richard Eburne in 1624, had been so enamoured by the idea of supporting the Virginia Company, despite the risks, that they had lacked ‘the wit, not to run out by it, to their vndoing’.⁷⁹

James’ own commitment to see a unified ‘Britain’, and his extensive writings on political sovereignty in the context of monarchical expansion, makes the colonisation of America an important component to his reign. His ability to instil civility became a prime justification of sovereignty in his writings, since civility was the mode through which justice, law, and Christianity operated. James’ attempts to enforce Crown control of the Gaelic Highlands and Hebrides through civility partly derived from his commitment to unify Scotland and England under a single government, and he increasingly saw Virginia in the same way. John Speed’s rhetoric, in which he praised ‘the royall Person of our now-*Soueraigne*’ for unifying ‘Britannia’ was commonplace, where ‘[t]he Cordes of whose *Royall Tents*, we pray, may be further extended, that those naked *Virginians* may be couered vnder the Curtaines of his most Christian Gouernment’.⁸⁰ In his attempts to eradicate local customs that opposed his idea of Protestant kingship, and to plant ‘a value system in which submission to the

⁷⁸ Edward Hayes in John Brereton, *A briefe and true relation of the discouerie of the north part of Virginia* (London, 1602; STC 3611), sig. C2r.

⁷⁹ Richard Eburne, *A plaine path-way to plantations* (London, 1624; STC 7471), sig. Ir.

⁸⁰ John Speed, *The theatre of the empire of Great Britaine* (London, 1612; STC 23041), sig. Ppppp3r.

king's justice was a hallmark of civilised behaviour', James rendered civility a key tool in claiming and asserting his authority.⁸¹

In addition to framing this study on James' reign, the research has concentrated on London. The greater metropolis is taken here to encompass both the City and Westminster, though Westminster, and the royal government, lay outside the jurisdiction of the City itself.⁸² These two entities, by 1600, 'thoroughly established as the English national lodestone' and the 'emergent centre of industry and empire', and was the locus in which many of these various changes occurred.⁸³ Colonial councils met in London to discuss policies, including the houses of Sir Thomas Smyth and John and Nicholas Ferrar. Letters to the council from the colonies generally arrived at London ports. Algonquian and Taíno natives from Virginia and Guiana who returned with colonists and merchants to England stayed in households in the City and were seen strolling through St James' Park or visiting Walter Raleigh during his imprisonment in the Tower.⁸⁴ The English central government met at the royal court at Whitehall, adjacent to nearby parliament. John Norden's map of Westminster from 1593 indicates the proximity of London sites in relation to each other, clustered around the banks of the Thames [Figure 1.3]. The royal court and St James' park is visible on the left-hand side, while the right side includes such sites as Walter Raleigh's Durham House, where his Algonquian interpreters likely resided, Anne of Denmark's Somerset House, and the Temple Stairs adjacent to Middle Temple. To the east of Westminster, within the Roman City walls, merchants and guilds offered the crucial funds and resources for realising colonising projects.

Meanwhile, the patrons of colonial projects, as members of the elite, were increasingly resident in London for the 'season'.⁸⁵ Members of the Inns of Court – a prime locus for the education of the governing class in the early seventeenth century – embraced the vogue for planting, writing poems about America and

⁸¹ John Cramsie, 'The Philosophy of Imperial Kingship and the Interpretation of James VI and I', in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government*, p. 44.

⁸² J.F. Merritt, *The Social World of Early Modern Westminster: Abbey, Court, and Community, 1525 – 1640* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), p. 2.

⁸³ *Material London, ca. 1600*, ed. Lena Cowen Orlin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000); Deborah Harkness and Jean E. Howard, 'Introduction: The Great World of Early Modern London', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 71:1 (2008), pp. 1-9; *London, 1500 – 1700: The Making of the Metropolis*, eds. A. L. Beier and Roger Finlay (London: Longman, 1986).

⁸⁴ Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters*, pp. 54, 25, 37.

⁸⁵ See Ian Warren, 'The English Landed Elite and the Social Environment of London, 1580 – 1700: the Cradle of an Aristocratic Culture?', *English Historical Review*, 76:518 (2011), pp. 44-74.

investing in joint-stock companies. A short walk away, citizens could visit the printers' shops around St Paul's Cathedral, where news-writers and gossips, including John Chamberlain, gathered information on everything from the shipwreck in Bermuda in 1609 to Pocahontas' reception at court. The sermons preached at Paul's Cross reached large and broad audiences, where citizens were exposed to expansionist propaganda by the Virginia Company at various points in James' reign.⁸⁶ London, then, housed the multiple political and 'civilising' spheres that advanced colonisation at this particular time.




Figure 1.3. John Norden, *Speculum Britanniae* (London, 1593; STC 18635), sigs. G2v-G3r.

The following six chapters thematically address various aspects of this relationship between civility, policy-making, and colonisation. The world may have opened up to Englishmen by the late sixteenth century, but it was a world that needed government to be settled effectively, one that involved new political

⁸⁶ Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558 – 1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 24-5.

imperatives wrought by the ‘vexed issue of cross-cultural comprehension’.⁸⁷ Following the Introduction, Chapter Two establishes the extent and nature of Jacobean expansionist projects by presenting an overview of the various colonising schemes endorsed by different subjects, arguing for a distinct and dynamic period of colonial involvement shared by courtiers and policy-makers as much as by merchants and churchmen. The involvement by policy-makers contributed to a patriarchal model of plantation whose projects were framed in terms of ‘planting’ and ‘civilising’. These terms innately allowed the use of corrective force against savagery, and invited comparisons between ‘wild’ Amerindians and wayward subjects.

Chapter Three tests the claims in Chapter Two by focusing on how clothing, as a material and visual form of civility, comprised a significant aspect of English plans to achieve cultural ascendancy in other territories. It focuses largely on the Elizabethan and Jacobean colonisation of Ireland, in order to emphasise the role that the Irish experience played on subsequent civilising enterprises in America. By concentrating on intercultural relations within Ireland itself, the chapter seeks to emphasise the extent to which the English struggled to implement ideas of civility ‘on the ground’, while also suggesting that the ultimate failure of English colonists to eradicate local customs only contributed to stereotypes about cultural difference and apparel in London.

Chapter Four establishes the close relationship between members of the Inns of Court and colonisation projects from the 1580s, in order to argue that the particular milieu of the Inns, which encouraged creative license through which to explore ideas of government, allowed concepts of Amerindian savagery to proliferate in political contexts. It further argues that networks of colonial interest and investment, alongside changing modes of sociability in London, contributed to a particular development in ideas of civility that, for the first time, incorporated savagery within its definition. The way that gentlemen themselves used ideas from America to criticise the behaviour of their peers, and to engage with the political life of the realm, suggests that colonial interests at the Inns can contribute to an understanding of changing social habits in England, an element that current studies on masculinity and friendship have completely overlooked.

⁸⁷ Canny, ‘Writing Early Modern History’, p. 740.

Chapter Five considers the ideas of savagery and government that were exchanged between councillors in Jamestown and in London during the Virginia Company years. It argues that fears of cultural compromise through the immediacy of colonial failures marked English discourse in specific ways, while responses to news of native violence hardened stereotypes towards ‘savages’ in London, especially after the Powhatan uprising of 1622. It further argues that the instabilities and crises of the 1610s and 1620s forced James to arbitrate colonial affairs more directly than he had originally envisaged, influencing his own conception of kingly sovereignty in relation to his subjects’ activities across the Atlantic.

Chapter Six examines the tension between savagery and tobacco at a point when the practice of smoking was still closely associated with native practices. While scholars tend to dismiss authorities’ condemnation of smoking as either hysterical or merely rhetorical, this chapter argues that the state’s concern with the moral wellbeing of the realm created tensions between hopes for profit and concerns over degeneration. This was complicated by the onset of the Thirty Years’ War in 1618, and in the realisation, by English policy-makers, that the success of their colonial projects – an important weapon in their struggle against Spanish domination – was bound up with a need to exploit the only immediately profitable commodity emerging from Virginia and Bermuda. It was in finding ways of reconciling these tensions between savagery and economic necessity that a more sophisticated political economy could emerge, following policy-makers’ explicit decision, in the early 1620s, to market tobacco as an industry that would benefit the colonies as well as the metropolis.

Chapter Seven, lastly, examines the frequent use of cannibalism as a metaphor in Jacobean discourse. It argues that the move from ethnographic descriptions of native peoples in Elizabethan cosmographies, to the Jacobean custom of branding Englishmen and women ‘cannibals’ for practicing transgressive violence, indicates changing attitudes towards state authority and its deployment of violence in the context of post-Reformation crises over religious dispute and war. Refuting the idea that European accounts of cannibalism were circulated purely as a means of subjugating cultural others, Chapter Seven argues that the frequent engagement with extreme native violence, often in political discourse that commented on domestic and continental anxieties rather than on

colonisation itself, indicates the pervasive influence of the imperial impulse on how the English conceived legitimacy and articulated the politics of bloodshed.

Taken as a whole, this thesis examines how English encounters with Amerindians and their cultural customs through colonisation affected the way non-travellers articulated ideas of authority and conformity in England. What emerges is a clear connection between colonial involvement and political participation, informed by developing ideas towards civility and status interaction in the metropolis. This adds an element to Jacobean history that is often left out of scholarly work on subjects ranging from political development to civility, modes of sociability to the growth of London as an imperial centre. The English state, at a point of fiscal, military, and bureaucratic development and still relatively weak in these regards, was receptive, and vulnerable, to the encounters and conflicts that played out in new territories. Beyond the macro-politics of state, what emerged from the attempts to redress the realm's financial weakness was a concerted group of humanistically-educated gentlemen who were making colonisation a distinct element of English political culture. Anxieties over the ability to maintain English values were starkly put to the test across the Atlantic for the first time, and the consequences of this would devastate entire human societies even as it developed and sharpened others. The English faith in their own civility, especially among the political elite, rendered it a key strategy in their subjugation of other peoples, but no less so in the subjugation of English subjects. Yet the impulse to condemn savagery invariably bonded Amerindian ideas and imagery within English discourse and their own self-definitions. In the words of Catherine Hall, 'Europeans...made themselves through becoming colonists' – though not always in the way they imagined.⁸⁸

⁸⁸ Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830 – 1867* (Cambridge: Polity, 2002), p. 14.

Chapter Two

Cultivating Civility: The Colonising Projects of the Jacobean State

‘As for the other sort’, James advised his son, ‘follow forth the course that I haue intended, in planting Colonies among them...rooting out and transporting the barbarous and stubborne sort, and planting ciuilitie in their rooms’.¹ Whether in Scotland, Ireland, or Virginia, James’ plans for monarchical consolidation were twofold. They depended on the expulsion of savagery, and the ‘planting’ of civility, and James framed his sovereignty as one to which his subjects would naturally defer precisely because civil beings understood the supremacy of kingship.

The intention of this chapter is to offer an overview of the nature of colonisation under James I. It argues that a vogue for planting took hold at this time, where schemes that were licensed by the Crown and endorsed by a significant number of policy-makers, merchants, and parishioners lent themselves to the pervasive use of ideas of savagery and planting in contemporary discourse, both in projects for expansion but also in tracts and letters discussing governance and control within England. In the pursuit of profit and in the exploitation of potential, colonisation must be situated within the larger enthusiasm for projects and economic gain; but English historians often overlook the fact that the nature of these enterprises generated unprecedented exchanges with native peoples. The reality of the ‘savages’ the English encountered on these ventures overlapped with the cultural project articulated by the state, in which individual resistance to English social and cultural norms became a matter of political concern, wrapped up in fears of undermining stability and conformity. As subsequent chapters will show in more detail, reports from, and experiences in, the first-ever English settlements in the Atlantic reinforced and justified the need to curb savage behaviour in all areas of English dominion, not just among Amerindian societies. Those who made ‘the Taverne their Temple, *Indian-smoake* their incense’

¹ ‘Basilikon Doron’ in James I, *Workes* (London, 1616; STC 14344), sig. O2r.

exposed an age ‘enchanted with rude and ridiculous pasttimes’ that imperilled the soul, but also the stability of the English state in the face of the Catholic threat.²

Looking beyond the purely commercial aspects of privately-funded ventures to America allows scholars to explore alternate ways in which plantation initiatives became so attractive to the English state. Rather than consider the colonies in the context of trade and empire, this chapter considers how the successful ventures to colonise Ulster, Virginia, and the Somers Islands, but also failed attempts to settle Guiana and Newfoundland, provided spheres where a range of members of society could engage with, and even contest, state affairs. In establishing the networks of involvement in colonisation at this time amongst the governing elite, and in exploring how Jacobean projects sought to justify and encourage the encroachment of state power through specific tropes and ideas, it becomes possible to develop existing scholarship by Michael Braddick and Steven Hindle on the role of civility in state-formation by focusing specifically on the role of savagery in this process.

Historiography

Any interest in Jacobean westward enterprises must acknowledge the economic nature of trade and colonisation. Before the Plymouth and Virginia Companies (1606), the Newfoundland Company (1610), the Somers Islands/Bermuda Company (1612), and the Amazon Company (1619), other chartered corporations like the Company of Merchant Adventurers (1553), the Muscovy Company (1555), and the East India Company (1600) conducted international trade under Crown sanction. It is unsurprising to find that the majority of scholars interested in joint-stock companies have been economic historians.³ Historians have tended to view Jacobean joint-stock companies alongside these pre-existing operations, with the Atlantic ventures serving primarily economic functions. Jack P. Green argued that ‘Virginia’s orientation

² John Yates, *A modell of divinitie* (London, 1622; STC 26085), sig. O2r.

³ Walter Minchinton, *The Growth of English Overseas Trade in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London: Methuen, 1969); Ann M. Carlos and Stephen Nicholas, ‘Theory and History: Seventeenth-Century Joint-Stock Chartered Trading Companies’, *Journal of Economic History*, 56:4 (1996), pp. 916-24; Antony Wild, *The East India Company: Trade and Conquest from 1600* (London: Harper Collins, 2000); K.N. Chaudhuri, *The English East India Company: The Study of an Early Joint-Stock Company, 1600-1640* (London: Routledge, 1999); *Routledge Encyclopaedia of International Political Economy*, ed. R.J. Barry Jones (New York: Routledge, 2001); *Trade in the Pre-Modern Era, 1400-1700*, ed. Douglas A. Irwin (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1996).

was almost wholly commercial from the beginning', while Kenneth Andrews believes that 'European overseas expansion in this epoch was fundamentally a commercial movement'.⁴ However, the Atlantic joint-stock companies were unique from pre-existing companies and guilds in that they offered participants a direct stake in shareholding, including the allocation of land to those who 'adventured' funds and service. The Londonderry plantation in 1613 granted Irish land to English merchants and artisans, and the Virginia Company lotteries invited members of the public to place a stake in English expansion. Those who invested in the Atlantic enterprises were often therefore directly involved in the act of colonisation. This is indicated in the maps of the period, where allotments of land were often labelled with the name of investors, including the 'hundreds' in Virginia and the 'tribes' in Bermuda.⁵

Andrew Fitzmaurice championed the political aspect of trade and expansion in his *Humanism and America* (2003), arguing that the Virginia Company 'articulated a political programme' that sought to promote civic values in America, where the humanistic education propounded in parish schools, gentry households, and universities in England brought an emphasis on civil participation that affected attitudes towards luxury, profit, and wealth.⁶ Yet Fitzmaurice's choice to focus solely on the Virginia Company's promotional tracts, and to ignore the Virginia Company manuscript records almost entirely, flattens the many dimensions of seventeenth-century colonisation. The nature of his sources results in a failure to understand how trading companies might function in a variety of roles.⁷ Patrons of the Virginia Company, Fitzmaurice claims, are a tired area of investigation that hardly warrant further observation.

A failure to consider the networks of allegiances between active members of these companies, however, leads to the tendency to gloss over significant crossovers and connections between projects and aims. David Quinn and Nicholas Canny have established the way that the Elizabethan colonisation of Ireland

⁴ Quoted in Andrew Fitzmaurice, *Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonisation, 1500-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 68.

⁵ Wesley Frank Craven, 'An Introduction to the History of Bermuda', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 17:3 (1937), pp. 317-62, p. 339.

⁶ Fitzmaurice, *Humanism and America*, p. 68; Andrew Fitzmaurice, 'The Commercial Ideology of Colonization in Jacobean England: Robert Johnson, Giovanni Botero, and the Pursuit of Greatness', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 64:4 (2007), pp. 791-820; Andrew Fitzmaurice, 'The Civil Solution to the Crisis of English Colonisation, 1609-1625', *The Historical Journal*, 42:1 (1999), pp. 25-51.

⁷ Fitzmaurice, *Humanism and America*, p. 187.

offered essential ideological and experiential developments that directly affected the colonisation of America, but it is also possible to see the ways in which other contemporary projects, such as interest in the Amazon, were supported by the same men who invested in Virginia or Bermuda. Men like Sir Nathaniel Rich, earl of Warwick, invested in all three.⁸ The relationship between England and North America in light of eighteenth-century struggles over empire and liberty dictates this tendency to focus on the Virginia Company, while failed settlements are too often deemed insignificant in comparison. This ignores the fact that many investors were closely involved with a range of colonial affairs that often intersected. There is no reason to assume that investors in the Newfoundland Company, for example, believed their investments would not prove equally fruitful. Walter Raleigh was so convinced by the treasures of El Dorado that he risked his own life, and that of his son and his crew, by looking for it more than once, believing the wealth would transform English commerce, and the reputation of the English in relation to other European countries. This raises the question of what wider concerns impelled policy-makers and investors to involve themselves with such risky engagements, but also what a more detailed understanding of colonisation might indicate about the nature of English values more widely.

An interest in the political element of colonisation does not downplay, but incorporates, the importance of finance in early ventures. The impetus to colonise, and attitudes towards civility and savagery, all fit within contemporary attitudes towards political economy. Colonisation and promoting civility espoused public and private interests in ways that were neither considered hypocritical, nor indicative of a world order moving irrevocably from Ciceronian civic-mindedness to Machiavellian expediency, as Fitzmaurice would have it. Rather than ‘self-evident and narrow economic self-interest’, the approach to economic problems by James’ subjects was ‘inseparable from its...ideological context, characterised by radical transformations and controversies in ways of thinking about the universe, the natural world, and the body politic’.⁹ In a time when the authority of the fiscal-military state was institutionally weak, a crossover existed between

⁸ Sean Kelsey, ‘Rich, Robert, second earl of Warwick (1587-1658)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<http://oxforddnb.com/view/article/23494?docPos=3>> [accessed 12 June 2014].

⁹ Philip Stern and Carl Wennerlind, ‘Introduction’, in *Mercantilism Reimagined: Political Economy in Early Modern Britain and its Empire*, ed. Philip Stern and Carl Wennerlind (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 4.

‘economic interest and the language of public good’, both of which were ‘part of the moral discourse that informed political economy’.¹⁰

The colonisation schemes that James’ subjects proposed were designed to appeal to private investors while incorporating a Protestant morality that would serve to improve the world in meaningful ways. Anxieties over encroaching Spanish power made colonisation a matter of security even as James courted the Spanish in hopes of securing a marriage alliance for his son Charles. When men like Gerard Malynes and Thomas Mun offered economic counsel to the Crown, and James’ treasurers sought to revise the king’s means of securing revenue, they did so with the recognition that the need to find and circulate wealth would not only benefit their and the king’s interests, but contained consequences, whether good or ill, for the realm as a whole.¹¹ Speaking to the Commons on the dire state of economic affairs in 1621, Sir Edwin Sandys showed concern that ‘if we bring [the English] so slender comfort as these poor bills, we make their discontents and dislike of their miserable fortunes reflect upon the higher powers’.¹² Members of parliament expressed a sense of responsibility towards finance and social welfare, and colonisation offered a natural solution to a range of problems the English faced under James, including finding employing the poor and the need for increased revenue. ‘O[u]r cuntrie is strangely anoyed w[i]th ydell, loose and vagrant people’, wrote the brothers Edward and Thomas Hayes in their tireless efforts to promote colonisation schemes, but ‘the State hath wisely in p[ar]liam[en]t sought redress’.¹³

One thing scholarship *does* have in common is a tendency to write James out of the colonisation schemes of his reign. The general assumption is that the king showed little interest in America. Unfavourable contrasts to his eldest son Prince Henry conjures an unflattering image of the king as a ‘pedantic middle-aged father, careless of affairs of state, prepared to accept appeasement at any price...totally unaesthetic...and certainly no model for decorum’, contrasted to a teenager who preferred to consult Raleigh in the Tower than to seek his father’s

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 7.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 9.

¹² Quoted in Theodore K. Rabb, *Jacobean Gentleman: Sir Edwin Sandys, 1561-1629* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), p. 256.

¹³ Edward and Thomas Hayes to the earl of Salisbury, 4 September 1605, Hatfield MS, CP 112/53r.

advice on Atlantic voyages.¹⁴ Even Linda Levy Peck's *Mental World of the Jacobean Court* only mentions America once, noting John Donne's failure to become its treasurer. Peck's work on court patronage and finance equally ignores any strand of colonisation within those relationships.

Compared to his son Henry, who vigorously cultivated the image of the Protestant military prince, James' interests in colonisation can admittedly appear rather scant. Until Robert Cecil's death in 1612, most letters by investors or colonial promoters were sent to Cecil rather than to James or the privy council. Yet assumptions of James' disinterest are misleading in several ways. Firstly, this disinterest should not be indicative of James' reign as a whole, especially from 1619 onwards when he began to take active interest in the affairs and government of the Virginia Company, as discussed in Chapter Five. Secondly, correspondences between Spanish ambassadors hint at James' shrewdness. When asked by Pedro de Zuñiga about English plans at Jamestown in 1607, the king 'answered that he was not informed as to the details of what was going on...and that he had never known that Your Majesty [Philip II] had a right to it...it was not stated in the peace treaties with him and with France that his subjects could not go [where they pleased] except the Indies'.¹⁵ Such a response seems less the rejoinder of a hapless monarch, and more like one who knows when to feign ignorance. 'The King said to me', Zuñiga continued, 'that those who went, went at their own risk, and if they were caught there, there could be no complaint if it were punished' – a remark that may have held true for the Indies, but not for Virginia, with the king having personally signed dispensations for the clergymen Richard Hakluyt, Robert Hunt, and numerous others to venture in late 1606 and early 1607.¹⁶

Other evidence points to a king who at least seemed curious about projects in Virginia. The earl of Southampton wrote to Cecil in 1609, informing the secretary of state of James' interest in acquiring a flying squirrel. 'Talkinge w[i]th the K[ing],' Southampton wrote, 'I told him of the Virginia squirrels w[hi]ch

¹⁴ Roy Strong, *Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Pimlico, 1986), p. 9.

¹⁵ Pedro de Zuñiga to Philip III, 8 October 1607, *The Jamestown Voyages Under the First Charter, 1607 – 1609, Volume I*, ed. Philip L. Barbour (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 118.

¹⁶ Dispensation for Richard Hakluyt and Robert Hunt, 24 November 1606, *The Jamestown Voyages Under the First Charter*, p. 62; Orders for the Council of Virginia, 10 December 1606, *The Jamestown Voyages Under the First Charter*, p. 45.

they say will fly... & hee, presently & very earnestly asked mee if none of them was provided for him'.¹⁷ It may be that Southampton, when 'talkinge w[i]th the K[ing]', had used Virginian fauna to pique the king's interest, but that the conversation had been about colonial plans more generally.

Secondly, James' seeming indifference towards certain aspects of colonisation, or at certain moments of his reign, actually helped plantation schemes flourish in alternate spheres. 'Merchants, chaplains, travellers, companies, and colonists alike' compromised 'decentralised networks' whose fluid and sometimes tense relationship with the Crown actually allowed participation in the colonising and civilising initiatives to become more widespread.¹⁸ The next section will explore James' attitudes towards colonisation alongside the interests of his subjects. It is after establishing the increasing interest in colonisation that attitudes to savagery and savage peoples in the context of plantation can be shown to be such a pervasive presence in Jacobean England, specifically London.

It should also be noted that ambiguous Crown interest in South America under James might be attributed to something other than indifference.¹⁹ Although Elizabeth seemed more encouraging of men like Richard Grenville, Francis Drake, John and William Hawkins, and other West Country gentlemen to explore regions south of the equator – her favourite Raleigh conducted his first voyage to Orinoco in 1595 – this may have been more to do with fears of upsetting the shaky nature of Anglo-Spanish peace than personal disinterest. James' desire to secure an alliance with Spain put him at odds with courtiers who contested his policies towards Spain. Possession of the West Indies was such a contentious issue in the 1604 Anglo-Spanish peace negotiations that the treaty ignored the issue altogether when no concession could be reached; Robert Cecil's refusal to concede to Spanish claims of possession were vital to allowing the English to settle parts of North and South America in subsequent decades.²⁰ It was with immense pressure from the Spanish Crown that James *did* sanction ventures led

¹⁷ Earl of Southampton to Salisbury, 15 December 1609, TNA: PRO, SP 14/50, f. 130v.

¹⁸ Stern and Wennerlind, *Mercantilism Reimagined*, p. 13.

¹⁹ For a discussion of the Elizabethan voyages to South America, see K.R. Andrews, 'Beyond the Equinoctial: England and South America in the Sixteenth Century', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 10:1 (1981), pp. 4-24.

²⁰ Lorimer, 'The Failure of the English Guiana Ventures', p. 12; Pauline Croft, 'Robert Cecil (1563-1612)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<http://oxforddnb.com>> [accessed 2 December 2014].

by Sir Thomas Roe, Raleigh, Roger North, William White, Charles Leigh, and Robert Harcourt, even as Spanish agents beseeched James to ‘looke carefully to the busines of not p[er]mitting such a voyage to be made’.²¹ However much he valued the Anglo-Spanish peace, James did not, therefore, allow English exploration into the Indies to stop altogether.

The Vogue for Planting: The Court

Contemporaries recognised that a policy of peace with Spain allowed the English to devote unprecedented time and resources towards colonisation. ‘No nation of Christendom is so fit for this action as *England*, by reason...of our long domesticall peace’.²² Although these opportunities were largely wrapped in hopes of subduing Spanish power, James endorsed these projects because he needed cash. Given the financial state of the realm in the early seventeenth century, the possibilities of enriching the Crown through alternate trade opportunities, and the tantalising allure of precious metals, appealed to a king who experienced notorious difficulty convincing parliament to subsidise Crown expenses. Insofar as the voyages fit into James’ vision of *imperium*, of a unified Britain strengthened by trade and inhabited by loyal subjects, James was happy to affix the royal seal to these enterprises.

Though the Crown, under Elizabeth, had attempted to restrict expenditure, James inherited significant debts even before he increased the deficit with his lavish spending.²³ The lord treasurers Thomas Sackville, earl of Dorset, succeeded by Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury, were unable to mitigate the long-term consequences that accompanied the Crown’s need to sell its lands to meet expenses. While the king gained immediate cash in return for selling licences, farms, and monopolies, he lost the long-term control of these resources and the

²¹ Julian Sanchez de Ulloa to James, 29 February 1620, in *English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon, 1550 – 1646*, ed. Joyce Lorimer (London: Hakluyt Society, 1989), p. 198.

²² John Brereton, *A briefe and true relation of the discouerie of the north part of Virginia* (London, 1602; STC 3611), sig. C2r.

²³ Mark Kishlanksy, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603 – 1714* (London: Penguin, 1996), pp. 83-5; Michael Braddick, ‘Lionel Cranfield, first earl of Middlesex (1575-1645)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <www.oxforddnb.com> [accessed 3 May 2014]; Linda Levy Peck, “‘For a King not to be bountiful were a fault’: Perspectives on Court Patronage in Early Stuart England”, *Journal of British Studies*, 25:1 (1986), pp. 31-61; Daniel W. Hollis, ‘The Crown Lands and the Financial Dilemma in Stuart England’, *Albion*, 26:3 (1994), pp. 419-42.

benefits of assets.²⁴ A king's right to tax customs on foreign goods became a significant source of income, seen in James' swift decision to raise the impost on tobacco from 3*d* per pound to 82*d* per pound after ascending the English throne.²⁵ The shortage of cash in the realm ensured that the undertakings in Virginia, and its tobacco cultivation, remained a consistent locus for concern in parliamentary debates in the desperate search for sources of revenue.

James' financial difficulties made him likelier to support the plantation schemes that were presented to him by various gentlemen and merchants. Political patronage and kingly bounty depended on the distribution of limited resources within the realm, and James welcomed ventures that promised new sources of wealth. As John Cramsie argues, recent scholarship on the primary role of counsel and patronage in Jacobean finance must also consider commercial projects as an important element in state affairs. James' personal style of kingship made policy-making a matter of 'patronage politics', where 'the Crown...developed a financial stake in the projects themselves' on an unprecedented level.²⁶ Cramsie does not develop this in relation to colonisation, but the Atlantic schemes must be viewed as an essential part of James' interest in colonisation, where finance became embroiled with the political context of expansion and the desire to combat Spanish claims to North and South American dominion. Schemes to find gold, silver, and precious metals, and to cultivate tobacco, iron, timber, silk, and other commodities, underpinned the writings of colonial promoters from Sir Walter Raleigh in the 1580s to Sir Edwin Sandys in the 1620s. The projects that looked eastwards to Europe and Asia by merchants including William Cockayne and Thomas Smythe were matched by schemes centring on Virginia tobacco and Newfoundland cod by Robert Johnson, Richard Whitbourne, Sir Thomas Phillips and Roger North. That the 'fourth part of the world, and the greatest and wealthiest part of all the rest, should remaine a wilderness, subiect ... but to wilde beasts ... and to sauage people, which haue no Christian, nor ciuill vse of any

²⁴ Michael Braddick, 'Lionel Cranfield, first earl of Middlesex (1575-1645)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <www.oxforddnb.com> [accessed 3 May 2014].

²⁵ Jordan Goodman, *Tobacco in History: the cultures of dependence* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 148.

²⁶ John Cramsie, 'Commercial Projects and the Fiscal Policy of James VI and I', *The Historical Journal*, 43:2 (2000), pp. 345-64, pp. 346-7. See also Joan Thirsk, *Economic Policy and Projects: The Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008).

thing’, forged a relationship between the possibilities of wealth and the need to civilise other peoples.²⁷

By 1624, a report from Virginia noted that only 1,275 people occupied the colony, despite the thousands of Englishmen and women who had migrated from England over the past seventeen years.²⁸ Disease, hunger, Anglo-Amerindian conflict, and the 1622 Powhatan massacre all hindered the stabilisation of the community. Though four thousand people migrated between the late 1610s and early 1620s, the population remained reduced to a quarter of that number, with death rates in the early years estimated at over eighty percent.²⁹ George Thorpe and George Sandys wrote desperate letters to the council in London, asking them to stop sending new migrants when the colonists could barely feed – much less house and clothe – themselves. When the state secretary Sir George Calvert finally went to his Ferryland Colony in Newfoundland in 1629 after years of painstaking preparation, he found himself unable to conform to the rhetoric of abundance that had previously lavished his letters. ‘In this part of the world, crosses and miseries is my portion,’ he wrote. ‘I am so overwhelmed with troubles and cares as I am forced to write but short and confusedly’.³⁰ These sources offer some explanation as to why historians have assumed the impact of colonisation was relatively minor during James’ reign. Gaging the role of Jacobean colonisation purely through its successes, or the experiences in the colonies themselves, is to present a misleading picture of its significance to a great number of people.

A different perspective emerges when colonisation is viewed from *within* England rather than its initial settlements. The contentious Nathaniel Butler, who later wrote the scathing ‘Unmasking of Virginia’ that contributed to the dissolution of the Virginia Company in 1624, complained to the earl of Warwick in 1620 that being governor of Bermuda had proved ‘an extreme discouragement’ because ‘every petty Companion and member of your Court and

²⁷ Richard Johnson, *Nova Britannia* (London, 1609; STC 14699.3), sig. A4r.

²⁸ ‘List of the Names of the Living in Virginia’, 16 February 1624, in *Calendar of State Papers: Colonial, Volume I*, ed. W. Noel Sainsbury (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1860), p. 57.

²⁹ Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *The Jamestown Project* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), p. 293; Audrey Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), p. 276.

³⁰ Calvert to [Sir Francis Cottington], 18 August 1629, *Newfoundland Discovered: English Attempts at Colonisation, 1610 – 1630*, ed. Gillian T. Cell (London: Hakluyt Society, 1982), p. 292.

Company...upon the least false and base Intelligence fastened upon their precipitate credulitie...snarle and braule his fill at him'.³¹ This invokes John Chamberlain's remark that debates at Whitehall about Virginia and Bermuda had led to public outbursts and even brawls.³² These reports heavily suggest that the 'snarls and brawls', the debates and political contests over colonisation schemes, were, at this stage, a more formative part of London government than anything else, though it would be those in the colonies who would suffer most from the consequences of inconsistent policies.

While colonists in Bermuda complained that 'ther is not scarce a thought...amongst the Company [in London] of sending us any shippyng from England above once a yeare, and then [only] for our Tobacco', policy-makers in England saw involvement in colonisation as a means not only of benefiting the realm, but protecting themselves from encroaching Spanish power and actively engaging in contemporary politics.³³ The widespread hatred of the Spanish ambassador Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, count Gondomar, who courted James' favour during his diplomatic stays in London from 1613 to 1618 and again from 1619 to 1622, was wrapped up in his involvement with America. He insisted on Raleigh's death after the latter's disastrous voyage to Guiana in 1617, and his determination that the king execute Roger North for his activities on the South American coast in 1620 presented a similar scenario. North was spared his life, but not before the secretary of state Robert Naunton declared that 'we are all busied to revoke [North] and stay all supplies', while the king planned to 'chastise his contempt...[and] publish a proclamation to declare him a rebel'.³⁴

Gondomar's close access to the king, and his attempts to draw the king's attention away from settlement in the Amazon basin and West Indies, made him an unpopular figure among the anti-Catholic faction at court. His aims, in his letters to Philip III and then Philip IV, were to prevent the English from establishing strongholds in Spanish-claimed territories in the Americas, rendering

³¹ Nathaniel Butler to Sir Nathaniel Rich, 23 October 1620, *The Rich Papers: Letters from Bermuda, 1615-1646*, ed. Vernon A. Ives (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), p. 195.

³² Chamberlain to Carleton, 19 April 1623, SP 14/143, f. 30v; Attorney General Coventry to the Council, 8 January 1624, TNA: PRO, SP 14/158.

³³ Nathaniel Butler to Sir Nathaniel Rich, 15 March 1620, *The Rich Papers*, p. 178.

³⁴ *English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon*, pp. 64-7; Secretary Sir Robert Naunton to Sir Dudley Carleton, 13 May 1620, in *Calendar of State Papers: Colonial, Volume 9: 1675-1676, and Addenda 1574-1674*, ed. W. Noel Sainsbury (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1893), pp. 58-9.

colonisation a matter of international diplomacy. For this reason Robert Cecil took a keen interest in English and Spanish activities in South America, asking Richard Hakluyt to translate works that provided intelligence on the possibilities of El Dorado.³⁵ Cecil also gathered information from Raleigh's friend Thomas Hariot concerning English actions in the Orinoco, reading the Jesuit José de Acosta's account of the Indies alongside intercepted correspondences in an attempt to gage plots that might undermine English trade settlements.³⁶ Gondomar's ability to influence James' policies made news from South America a consistent thread in the interests of those who participated in court life.

Other interests can be seen in the tireless schemes pursued by Sir William Alexander, who received substantial support from James and then Charles to conduct voyages to New Scotland (Nova Scotia). After his patron Prince Henry died, Alexander became gentleman usher to his brother Charles. He spent a prodigious 6000*l* of his own money to prepare a voyage in 1622, contributing further funds for two other attempts until Charles I conceded Nova Scotia to the French in 1629. Referencing the first – and only – instance of intercultural marriage as a diplomatic strategy in Jamestown, the planter John Rolfe's marriage to Pocahontas in 1614, Alexander advocated intermarriage with Amerindians: 'lawfull allyances thus by admitting equalitie remouue contempt'.³⁷ Though his advocacy of intermarriage was fairly unique, many of Alexander's attitudes to colonisation were representative of the English and Scottish elite. Plantations were to establish civil life for its inhabitants, 'not to subdue but to ciuillize the Sauages', so that 'by their Posteritie [they] may serue to many good vses', while Europeans must take care not to succumb to 'naturalizing themselues where they are, [lest] they must disclaime their King and Countrey' with their 'affections altered'.³⁸ Alexander's tract showed a clear vision of the colonies in Virginia, New England, Newfoundland, Ireland, and Bermuda all comprising part of a wider, more singular project.

Recent attention to seventeenth-century colonisation tends to focus so closely on the connection between Ireland and Virginia that it downplays the role

³⁵ *English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon*, p. 18.

³⁶ Thomas Hariot to Sir Robert Cecil, 11 July 1596, Hatfield MS, CP 42/36.

³⁷ William Alexander, *An encouragement to colonies* (London, 1624; STC 341), sig. E3r.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, sig. F4r.

of continental affairs on English policies.³⁹ Although there are numerous reasons for fruitfully comparing colonial endeavours in both places, especially when it comes to treatment of indigenous peoples, the Amazon Company must not be left out of studies on expansion and Jacobean politics. James professed that he ‘had never seen an enterprise so supported’ as Roger North’s plans for Guiana in the early 1620s, and the list of investors for the voyage clearly implies a high level of engagement with the project.⁴⁰ Gondomar cited seven of the thirty-four members of the privy council of 1620 as members of the Amazon Company, meaning that twenty-one percent of James’ councillors found the company an arena in which they might advance their political views and pursue an anti-Spanish agenda.⁴¹ The duke of Buckingham, the duke of Lennox, the earl of Pembroke, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the earl of Warwick, and the earl of Southampton were cited as prominent supporters of inference against Spanish colonial designs. Gondomar equally recognised them as ‘the foremost personages of this kingdom’.⁴² The duke of Lennox had conducted campaigns on James’ behalf in parts of Gaelic Scotland in the 1590s. The earl of Southampton was treasurer of the Virginia Company at the time. Robert Rich, earl of Warwick, made his brother Sir Nathaniel an agent for the Bermuda Company and worked closely with him in overseeing plantations in the Somers Islands. George Abbot, the archbishop of Canterbury, was patron to the colonial promoter and author Samuel Purchas, and Sir Francis Bacon would also appear on the patent for the short-lived Guiana Company of 1627.⁴³

The active participation by members of James’ ruling elite was partly possible because of James’ own hesitation to embroil the Crown in territorial disputes by exploring territories already claimed by the Spanish. Elizabeth had granted Walter Raleigh patents to colonise Virginia in 1584, and though Raleigh never found favour with James, he continued to promote and patronise colonial

³⁹ Most recently see Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea*. For a discussion of Jacobean foreign policy regarding Spain and America, see Joyce Lorimer, ‘The Failure of the English Guiana Ventures 1595-1667 and James I’s Foreign Policy’, *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 21:1 (1993), pp. 1-30.

⁴⁰ Count Gondomar to Philip III, 30 May 1620, in *English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon*, p. 208. For Lorimer’s challenge of the ‘traditionalist assumption’ that North America was the most logical arena for English colonisation in this period, see Lorimer, ‘The Failure of the English Guiana Ventures’, p. 1.

⁴¹ Count Gondomar to Philip III, 30 May 1620, in *English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon*, p. 204.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 204, n1.

projects until his execution in 1618. Imprisoned on charges of treason since 1603, Raleigh pursued his advancement of English territories from the Tower. Seeking royal sanction for another voyage to Guiana, had complained to Queen Anne in 1611 that, if anything, James did not show enough desire for wealth. Raleigh had only wanted, he lamented, ‘to haue done him such a seruice as hath seildome bine p[er]formed for any king’, but James continually rejected those ‘riches wich God hath offred him, therby to take all presumption from his enemies, arising from the want of tresor, by which (after God) all states are defended’.⁴⁴

The solution, for those seeking patronage in the first decade of the seventeenth century, was to turn to the courts of Anne of Denmark at Greenwich and Somerset House, and Prince Henry at St James’ Palace. The queen became known for her sumptuous entertainments, especially masques, while Henry cultivated an interest in history and art that reflected his foreign policy, sending an ‘aggressive militaristic message’ that stood in stark contrast to his father’s iconography of divine right and reconciliation.⁴⁵ ‘We suffer the Spanish reputation and powre’, wrote a frustrated Sir Thomas Roe in 1607, ‘to swell ouer us’.⁴⁶ Henry explicitly chose to surround himself with tutors, artists, and counsellors who shared his pro-expansion and pro-Protestant policies, filling the roles of Gentlemen of the Bed and Privy Chamber with men like Roger North (who sailed to Guiana), Sir Philip Carey (later member of the Virginia Company), and the military commander John Holles, first earl of Clare; he cultivated courtiers like Sir Arthur Gorges (whose mother was Walter Raleigh’s cousin), Edward Cecil, and Henry Wriothesley.⁴⁷ Letters from Virginia addressed specifically to the prince reported the safe arrival of the English almost immediately after the establishment of James Fort.⁴⁸

Prince Henry, who resented his father’s favourites – themselves nearer in age to the prince than to his father – set up an alternative arena for political involvement at his court, pursuing policies that were often at odds with the king’s, and less religiously ambiguous. Attendants were expected to accompany the prince to prayers twice a day, while those who failed to participate were

⁴⁴ Sir Walter Raleigh to the Queen, 1611, TNA: PRO, SP 14/67, f. 196r.

⁴⁵ Strong, *Henry Prince of Wales*, p. 103.

⁴⁶ Sir Thomas Roe to the Earl of Salisbury, 1607, Hatfield MS, CP 124/125v.

⁴⁷ Strong, *Henry Prince of Wales*, pp. 16, 25.

⁴⁸ Robert Tindall, Gunner, to Prince Henry, 22 June 1607, *The Jamestown Voyages Under the First Charter*, p. 104.

reprimanded. Henry voiced fears to Raleigh about being forced to take a Catholic bride, and tirelessly sought to secure his sister Elizabeth's marriage to Frederick V, which was realised in London in 1613.⁴⁹ It is in Henry's court that plans for a Guiana Company and North-west Company were conceived, and where playwrights like George Chapman began writing the *Memorable Masque* for Elizabeth and Frederick's nuptials, which featured masquers apparelled like Amerindians in feather headdresses.⁵⁰

Failure to enlist James' more overt interest in colonisation motivated an anonymous letter to the Queen in 1610, beseeching Anne to follow Queen Isabella of Spain's lead by patronising voyages to America [Figure 2.1]. The petitioners asked that Anne be 'the meanes for the furthering' of plantation, not only to 'augment the number of gods church, but also procure great benefitt by plenty of trade' so that 'his Ma[ies]t[ie]s kingdomes might be made the storehouse of all Europa'.⁵¹ The letter emphasised the zeal of the realm's subjects, suggesting that the king might 'erect an order of knighthood...to the w[hi]ch our Lo: the prince of wales his Excellencie to be cheife Lo[rd] Paramount', where 'diuers knights and esquiers of the best sort of noble descent' would provide for 'the planting and discouery' of North America.⁵² An American knighthood, led by Henry, would likely have appealed to the prince's militant sensibilities. The interest Henry fostered in pursuing colonisation, coupled with his contempt for Catholicism, helped create environments where aggressively Protestant courtiers, gentlemen, and even poets and playwrights might advance their political agendas, especially during the years of Catholic Howard ascendancy in James' court. The prince's widely-mourned death in 1612 cut short the more active, militant role that royalty held in promoting colonisation.

The Vogue for Planting: Parliament and the Localities

Through investment in joint-stock companies and interest in the tobacco trade, the crossover between English politics and colonisation schemes also

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 33, 30.

⁵⁰ Strong, *Henry Prince of Wales*, p. 2. Sir John Holles' letter, written the year after Henry's death, credited Henry with 'the industrious spirit...fomented by him, witness the North West passage, Virginia, Guiana, the Newfoundland, etc., to all which he gave his money as well as his word', p. 2.

⁵¹ [Unknown] to the Queen. [1610?], Hatfield MS, CP 196/142r.

⁵² Ibid.

appeared in parliamentary debate. Sir Edwin Sandys, heavily involved in the Virginia Company, considered overseas involvement to be a key part of the duties of the English gentry to promote the good of the realm.




Figure 2.1. [Unknown] to the Queen, 1610[?], Hatfield MS, CP 196/142r.

Sandys played on the changing nature of political roles open to gentlemen in society, particularly in peacetime. ‘What else shall become of Gentlemens younger Sons’, he asked in 1604, ‘who cannot live by Arms, when there is no wars, and Learning preferments are common to all, and mean? Nothing remains fit for them, save only [to] Merchandize’.⁵³ Sir John Oglander expressed similarly: ‘It is impossible for mere country gentlemen ever to grow rich or raise his house. He must have some other vocation with his inheritance... If he hath no other vocation, let him get a ship and judiciously manage her’.⁵⁴ Concerns to prevent ‘our warlike discipline [to] decay not, and so sincke, if not the estate, yet the

⁵³ Sir Edwin Sandys, Report of the Travel and Proceeding of the Committee in the Two Bills for free Trade, 19 May 1604, *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 1* <www.british-history.ac.uk> [accessed 6 May 2014].

⁵⁴ Quoted in Gillian T. Cell, ‘The Newfoundland Company: A Study of Subscribers to a Colonising Venture’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 22:4 (1965), pp. 611-25, p. 618.

honor of our state and Countrey’, in the words of another member of parliament, made involvement in trade a viable option for gentlemen as much as for merchants, indicated in the number of gentlemen who went to colonise Virginia, and those who propounded colonisation schemes in the Commons.⁵⁵ All but three individuals on the initial Virginia charter of 1606 sat in the House of Commons and half held some royal office, clearly indicating ‘a deliberate effort to give political weight and influence to the Virginia enterprise’.⁵⁶ The enthusiasm for Virginia among members of parliament is further seen in the letter by Sir Walter Cope, a director of the Virginia Company, to Robert Cecil, written three months after the first fleet reached Jamestown in 1607.⁵⁷ The letter brimmed with news on the newly-settled areas of Virginia, cataloguing the bounties of America and the Algonquian inability to exploit the potential of the landscape [Figure 2.2].

The heavy parliamentary involvement in overseas enterprise suggests that members of the English gentry saw colonisation as a means through which to exercise power and involve themselves in governing the realm, as courtiers did through the Amazon Company and through patronising voyages to Bermuda, Newfoundland, and the Chesapeake in the 1610s and 1620s. This is not to say that the spheres of court and parliament did not overlap – especially after Buckingham took on a radical and new anti-Spanish policy in the 1620s, enlisting Sir Edwin Sandys as his supporter in the House of Commons – but the new Commons under James, significantly, only contained two privy councillors, offering an alternate sphere for colonial involvement. The speeches and opinions that emerged in debates in Westminster combined the gentry’s sense of ‘magistracy and obligation’ with schemes for colonisation – as one historian has put it, ‘it was their common experience, attitudes and perspectives (forged in the crucible of local administration) that bound them together as they confronted the issues of the day’.⁵⁸ Here, political economy – the morality and social concerns of the realm espoused to trade and expansion – played into conceptions of authority and government. ‘In all contracts’, wrote the MP Thomas Ditchfield, in a debate about

⁵⁵ Thomas Digges, *Foure paradoxes, or politique discourses concerning militarie discipline* (London, 1604; STC 6872), sig. O2v.

⁵⁶ Rabb, *Jacobean Gentleman*, pp. 320-1.

⁵⁷ Sir Walter Cope to the earl of Salisbury, August 1607, Hatfield MS, CP 124/18r.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 59-60.

tobacco, ‘especially of so publique nature, there are two principall qualities thought most considerable, Iustice and Profit’.⁵⁹




Figure 2.2. Sir Walter Cope to the Earl of Salisbury, August 1607, Hatfield MS, CP 124/18r.

Ditchfield, who served on the parliamentary committees for free trade and tobacco impositions with Sandys in the early 1620s, saw the failed attempts to set up iron, silk, and wine industries in the colonies as the result of ‘sundry misaccidents’ that required a serious revision of policy.⁶⁰ The failures in Virginia

⁵⁹ Edward Ditchfield, *Considerations touching the new contract for tobacco* (London, 1625; STC 6918), sig. A2r. For a discussion on the rising role of the gentry in expansion, see Theodore K. Rabb, *Enterprise and Empire: Merchant and Gentry Investment in the Expansion of England, 1575-1630* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967).

⁶⁰ Ditchfield, *Considerations touching the new contract*, sig. A4r.

were not the result of a lack of support from the English, who ‘transported thether at their owne charge, vpon the a foresaid hopes and encouragements’, but from the ‘fatall blow of the Massacrie [of the English in 1622]...and the great molestations and disheartenings of the company and Adventurers’.⁶¹ The debates conducted in parliament over America affected both the colonies and domestic policies. For example, Edward Bennett’s tract on tobacco became an important tool in redefining trade with Spain. Pleased with Bennett’s treatise about the damaging nature of trade with Spain, Sandys disseminated his treatise and made Bennett a free member of the Virginia Company. Samuel Purchas referenced Bennett in his 1625 edition of *Purchas his pilgrimes*, guiding his readers to Bennett’s tract and displaying his own awareness of contemporary debates that arose from American involvement.⁶² ‘It may be some man seeing this, will thinke, I am interrested in the *Virginia* Company,’ Bennett proclaimed. ‘But the Worshipfull of the Company know the contrary. It is the zeale I beare to the good of the State...that makes me speake’.⁶³ The rhetoric of the common good met with contentious disagreement from those who preferred Spanish tobacco, but Bennett held firm: ‘I defie the perticular gaines that brings a generall hurt’.⁶⁴ A desire to curb Spanish power, and with it Catholicism, made the English imperial urge directly related to developments, economic and otherwise, that would benefit the state.

The interest gentlemen had in establishing plantations continued outside parliament. James’ infrequent summons likely contributed significantly to gentry interest in investing in and promoting joint-stock ventures, which provided a means for them to gain access to the court and court patrons. While parliament met infrequently, members of the Virginia Company, for example, met weekly, and their assemblies were important enough for James to forbid them during the company’s long and heated dissolution process in 1624.⁶⁵ Projects were also promoted by captains and churchmen, who voiced similar aims as those presented by gentlemen in parliament. A Captain Baily frequently appealed to the privy council with his plantation schemes, which he believed would simultaneously empty overcrowded English prisons and allow people in the localities to partake

⁶¹ Ditchfield, *Considerations touching the new contract for tobacco*, sig. A4v.

⁶² Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimes* (London, 1625; STC 20509), sig. Mmmmmmm6r.

⁶³ Edward Bennett, *A treatise deuided into three parts* (London, 1620; STC 1883), sig. A5r.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ David R. Ransome, ‘Founders of the Virginia Company’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <www.oxforddnb.com> [accessed 3 May 2014].

in the Christianising mission. He proposed that every man in England and Wales who gave a penny annually for ten years receive the same stockholding privileges than those who ventured 1000*l*. The privy council noted that Baily claimed to have made his project known ‘to many thousands’, some of whom had already subscribed up to 10*l* per annum, and none less than 2*s*6*d*.⁶⁶ Four months later, the council reported to have conferred with Baily about his proposals, but ultimately decided that the sums he promised could not realistically be levied. Baily continued with his petitions, adapting his plans and confident that interest in the localities would change the mind of the king and his council.⁶⁷

The desire to build schools for Virginian natives similarly sought support from parishes. John Brinsley, a schoolmaster with considerable patronage from men like William Cavendish and Edward Denny, developed plans to bring Christianity to ‘the very sauage...whether *Irish* or *Indian*’ in 1622, a project endorsed in sermons by William Crashaw and Alexander Whitaker, the latter of whom actually went to Virginia to help set up a school in Henrico in 1611.⁶⁸ Patrick Copland, Scottish chaplain to the East India Company, became a free member of the Virginia Company after dedicating himself to this project. Though he eventually settled in Bermuda with the intention of founding a school there, it is his interest in raising funds for Virginia that survive. In 1622, after sending the manuscript to the Virginia Company, he published a *Declaration how the monies...were disposed, which was gathered...towards the building of a free schoole in Virginia*, cataloguing the ‘gentlemen and marriners’ who ventured funds for this ‘pious worke’.⁶⁹ Copland listed nearly one hundred fifty names from a range of social backgrounds, including merchants, master’s mates, pursers, stewards, surgeons, and carpenters who donated sums ranging from 1*s* to 30*l*. Copland’s efforts raised 100*l* 8*s* 6*s*, and, unlike investments in the joint-stock companies, contributors expected no economic return from this amount, but

⁶⁶ Project by Captain Baily, July 1623, *CSP: Colonial, Vol. I*, ed. W. Noel Sainsbury (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1860), pp. 49-51.

⁶⁷ Sir Thomas Smythe, John Wolstenholme *et al.* to Secretary Conway, November 1623, *CPS: Colonial, Vol. I*, p. 54; ‘Project concerning Virginia’, December 1623, *CSP: Colonial, Vol. I*, p. 56.

⁶⁸ John Brinsley, *A consolation for our grammar schooles* (London, 1622; STC 3767), sig. Av.

⁶⁹ Patrick Copland, *A declaration how the monies...were disposed* (London, 1622; STC 5726), sig. Ar.

sought to take part in ‘instructing of the children there, in the principles of Religion, civility of life, and humane learning’.⁷⁰

What emerged following the establishment of Virginia, but especially by the early 1620s, was a strongly Protestant arena in which subjects became increasingly interested in developing English involvement in the Atlantic. Sermons and local projects brought an interest in plantation by and to a range of members of society, including sailors and artisans, and this would mould the willingness to migrate to America on a much wider scale in following decades. Diary entries by men like Sir Stephen Powle, who interspersed news from overseas voyages between financial reports and Latin verses, indicate the way in which colonisation had become a matter of interest to gentlemen, offering a window into the daily transactions of individuals that are often so difficult to recover.⁷¹ ‘I deliuered to Sir Thomas Smith Treasurer of the viage to Virginia the summe of fifty powndes’, Powle recorded in 1609, ‘and I am to be one of the Counsell of this expedition...The success of whitch vndertakinge I referre to god allmighty’.⁷² Several months later, Powle noted that the ships under Sir Thomas Gates had departed, and he wished ‘god blesse them and guide them to his glory and our goode’.⁷³

Nor were Powle’s interests for Virginia alone. He also followed Sir Thomas Roe’s plans that following year to command an expedition for Guiana. Southampton had invested 800*l*, Powle noted, and Raleigh 600*l*.⁷⁴ Powle’s contribution was 20*l*, but his reference to ‘my sealf’ suggests a sense of collective association, in which investing made him a significant contributor. A newsletter indicates that by 1611, with settlements in Ulster, Virginia, Newfoundland, and Bermuda under way, information about these ventures were considered worth circulating amongst numerous clientele.⁷⁵ ‘The state and hope of the Bermodes was there fully dyscusc’, reported Edmund Howes of a meeting of the Virginia Company in 1611, ‘and Concluded to send A Collony thither’.⁷⁶ Meanwhile, in

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, sig. A3v.

⁷¹ David B. Quinn, ‘Notes by a Pious Colonial Investor, 1608-1610’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 16:4 (1959), pp. 551-55.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 553.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 554.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ David B. Quinn, ‘Advice for Investors in Virginia, Bermuda, and Newfoundland, 1611’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 23:1 (1966), pp. 135-45.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

Newfoundland, governor John Guy sent deer, wolf, and fox skins ‘for [t]estimony’ of its bounty and prepared ‘for further plantacion...whervnto all men are very forward to put in theyre moneyes, by reason this plantacion is very honest peacefull, And hopefull, And verly lykely to be profytable’.⁷⁷ While profit was an obvious motivation, the risks involved were significant. With the Virginia Company bankruptcy and dissolution in 1624, most investors lost, rather than gained, assets. Investing in more established trading companies in the east, or in domestic projects, would have proved far more profitable. Sir Walter Raleigh, Roger North, and John and Nicholas Ferrar were just a few men who, however briefly, were arrested or imprisoned for their involvement overseas ventures, whether for their outspokenness in public debate or for their actions or failures in the colonies themselves.⁷⁸

Although an increased interest by the gentry and Commons is apparent, there is one influence James exerted that has not yet been considered. Though he may have avoided the risk of marring his relationship with the Spanish Crown, happier to encourage private voyages and less willing to actively involve himself – at least until the Virginia Company disputes of the 1620s, as Chapter Five will explore – there is another element of engagement with America that scholars often ignore. James often employed the *language* of colonisation and the Americas – in ideas and metaphors of savagery, incivility, cannibalism, and tobacco – in innovative ways. These undermine the prevalent assumption that James was, in the aforementioned words of Roy Strong, ‘totally unaesthetic’.⁷⁹

James’ vigorous delight in debate, in conjuring powerful images through words, is seen in the sheer volume of his printed output during his reign. The king often integrated the language of savagery within his royal policies and plantation initiatives. His preoccupation with securing obedience found parallels in ideas of savagery, in which the American context provided rich contemporary examples. In a speech to the House of Lords and House of Commons in 1609, James argued for a new bill for the preservation of forests. Resenting the rejection of his last bill, James asked whether a man who did not like a garment should go naked

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 145.

⁷⁸ *English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon, 1550 – 1646*, p. 64-7; ‘Ferrar, John (1588 – 1627)’ and ‘Ferrar, Nicholas (1593 – 1627)’, *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons, 1604 – 1629* <<http://historyofparliamentonline.org>>.

⁷⁹ Strong, *Henry Prince of Wales and England’s Lost Renaissance*, p. 9.

entirely; without conserving woodlands, he argued, a lack of timber and fires would lead to a decline in civility. ‘You will ill liue’, James told the well-dressed men around him, ‘like the Cannibals’.⁸⁰ Similarly, when James attacked tobacco-smoking, he criticised those who rejected their king’s wishes, turning a seemingly moral issue into a fundamental concern of state. It is possible, in polemic like his *Counterblaste to tobacco* (1604), to see how the dynamism of rhetoric went beyond ‘an internal affair of language and signs ... [to ideas of] power and violence’.⁸¹

Elsewhere, discussing his sovereignty, James proclaimed it a king’s duty to ‘foresee and prevent all dangers, that are likely to fall upon [his subjects], and to maintaine concord, wealth, and civilitie among them’, a sentiment adopted by colonial promoters to justify overseas intervention.⁸² The relationship between the political threat of savagery and the legitimacy of royal government often came to be articulated by paralleling the domestic situation to the American one:

For the intent which his Maiesty hath to vnite his two Kingdomes of *Scotland* and *England*, in one, vnder the Title of Great Bryttaine, what meane can be deuised more effectuall, then ... [to] reduce such as lyue dispersed like sauage and wilde people, to the estate of men, and perfect vse of reason, in ciuill lyfe, teaching them to bridle their passion, and conquer their ill customes, & amend their manners.⁸³

The Catholic author articulated his support for James in a context where religious differences were secondary to the need to implement civility as a unifying element of government. Those who ‘lyued like bruyte beastes vntil they were instructed’ were compared to those ‘in *Brasile*, and many partes of the *Indies*’, who were only subdued by ‘that which souldyuers & Armies could not do, drawing the people out of the caues, mountaynes and woods...to build townes and Cytties’.⁸⁴ This conscious choice to contrast American savagery to domestic disobedience

⁸⁰ ‘A Speech to the Lords and Commons of the Parliament at White-hall’ (1609), James I, *Workes*, sig. Zz3v.

⁸¹ Quote by W. Miller in Stuart Carroll, *Blood and Violence in Early Modern France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 93.

⁸² James I, ‘The true lawe of free monarchy’, in *Workes*, sig. R2r.

⁸³ [Joseph Cresswell?], *A proclamation published vnder the name of Iames King of Great Brittainy. With a briefe & moderate answer thereunto* (St Omer, 1611; STC 8448), sig. T2r.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. T2v. For discussions about the relationship between education and civil obedience, see Aristotle, *Politics*, tr. Ernest Baker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); Margaret T. Hodgen, *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964); Ernest Baker, *The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle*, 2nd ed. (New York: Dover, 2009), pp. 243-4, 204.

enhances Steve Hindle's recognition that manners and behaviour compromised a significant element of 'the policy projects of early modern government', where local administration achieved stability by employing the language of civility and conformity in their drive to implement social stability within the parishes.⁸⁵ Hindle identified the reformation of manners as intensifying in the 1610s and 1620s especially, where a widening range of personal conduct became subject to regulation.⁸⁶ This occurred precisely at the time when plantation ventures in Ulster and Virginia were taking hold, making these parallels particularly salient and suggesting a fluidity of ideas based on news from across the Atlantic.

Civility as Cultivation

From the late 1570s onwards, the distinct language of planting emerged through discussions over which tactics and models would be most effective in achieving colonisation.⁸⁷ The range of classically-inspired treatises from the 1570s to the 1630s catalogue changes in opinion during a distinct time in English history, where new territories were increasingly seen less as trading outposts than places for settlement and land cultivation, and where James' subjects first succeeded in putting plantation to effective practice outside Ireland. The 'Machiavellian' tactics urged by Irish colonial promoters like Edmund Spenser and Richard Becon represented one opinion on how colonisation should be effected, but the language of planting found far more widespread support across the colonising projects. 'The people wherewith you plant', wrote Francis Bacon, 'ought to be gardeners, ploughmen, [and] labourers' rather than rogues, prisoners, or soldiers.⁸⁸ In short, the ideal colonists were those who would effectively efface savagery by cultivating the landscape.

Without fail, all accounts of plantation subscribed to the language of savagery and the benefits of cultural improvement. Ventures were voiced in relation to civility, which would pave the way for Christianity. James granted charters to North America 'for the inlarging of our Gouernment, increase of

⁸⁵ Steve Hindle, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, 1550-1640* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), p. 180.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 177.

⁸⁷ David B. Quinn, 'Renaissance Influences in English Colonisation: the Prothero Lecture', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 26 (1976), pp. 73-93.

⁸⁸ *Bacon's Essays: With Annotations*, ed. Richard Whately (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1858), p. 355.

Naugiation and Trade, and especially for the reducing of the sauage and barbarous people of those parts to the Christian faith'.⁸⁹ The privy council sanctioned voyages to Guiana because the Amazon was 'inhabited with Heathen and savage people, that have no knowledg of any Christean Religion for the salvac[i]on of their Soules, and that are not under the Gover[n]ment of any Christian Prince or state'.⁹⁰ These words emphasised that, at least formally, the primary reason the Crown supported colonisation was to participate in introducing 'savage' people to the civil life, and, by extension, to Christianity. Expansion was to focus on 'a conquest of soules, aboue the Conquest of kyngdomes'.⁹¹ Even the vim of Captain Richard Whitbourne's discourse on Newfoundland did not avoid the usual tropes, declaring the venture useful for industry while noting that the inhabitants, being 'rude and sauage people[,] hauing neither knowledge of God, nor liuing vnder any kinde of ciuill gouernment', were like 'the *Indians* of the Continent...ready to assist' and needful of improvement.⁹² This section considers why colonisation projects specifically took on this language of planting, and how such language mirrored the interests and concerns of those who invested.

Planting colonies was, in many ways, a response to a process already underway in England, one that saw vast changes in attitudes to the English landscape. The spread of print allowed husbandry manuals to take on new importance. Landowners favoured farming their own estates rather than leasing them, reflecting economic but also ideological shifts in which gentlemen felt compelled to take part in running their lands.⁹³ Humanist scholarship, disseminated by print, made classical pastoral works including Virgil's *Georgics* 'increasingly accessible', contributing to 'a culture of active estate management involving experience and improvement'.⁹⁴ The word 'improvement' appeared overwhelmingly in discussions of husbandry during the second half of the sixteenth century onwards, denoting a major shift in contemporary representations of agrarian England with a term that drew together 'legal, moral, and economic

⁸⁹ *By the King. Whereas at the humble suit and request of sundry our louing and well disposed subjects...* (London, 1621; STC 8660) [single sheet].

⁹⁰ Privy Council to Sir Thomas Coventry, 18 April 1619, TNA: PRO, PC 2/30, f. 159r.

⁹¹ Sir Thomas Roe to the Earl of Salisbury, 1607, Hatfield MS, CP 124/125r.

⁹² Richard Whitbourne, *A relation of the New-found-land* (1620), in *Newfoundland Discovered*, p. 117.

⁹³ Joan Thirsk, 'Making a Fresh Start', *Culture and Cultivation in Early Modern England: Writing and the Land*, ed. Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992), pp. 26-7.

⁹⁴ Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor, 'Introduction', *Culture and Cultivation*, p. 7.

implications in order to justify radical processes of change in the English countryside'.⁹⁵

Agrarian improvement mirrored the theme of personal improvement found in conduct manuals and popular pamphlets by Protestant authors. With the Reformation, policy-makers placed new emphasis on an individual's responsibility to cultivate the 'good seeds' of reason, faith, and obedience. 'A religion that stressed the need to preserve God-given hierarchies' appealed to the gentlemen and churchmen who were responsible for law enforcement in local communities.⁹⁶ The language of planting became an especially apt way to describe the need to self-regulate all that seemed contrary to the natural order. Classical authors frequently drew connections between cultivation and an acceptance of social values; the Bible, too, compared culture to moral growth. 'Behold, I am for you', God told his people, 'and I will turn unto you, and ye shall be tilled and sown' (Ezekiel 26:9, KJV). One scholar set out to research husbandry manuals of the sixteenth century and found her sources to be as concerned with human behaviour as with land cultivation.⁹⁷ More specifically, she found that attitudes to land and education reflected wider concerns about the nature of authority and control.

This connection between geography and authority made ideas towards plantation relevant to both England and the colonies. The Jacobean vogue for planting was first and foremost framed as a civilising project that would improve the lives and manners of savage peoples, an aim that converged with attempts to achieve obedience within the realm. An attention to horticulture served a political function, asserting ascendancy over the landscape in a controlled way. Appeals to the dignity of the plough, and the call of work for the poor, was 'consistently raised in arguments in favour of projects', coalescing with 'a traditional paternalist discourse' that was also apparent in overseas plantations.⁹⁸ By contrast, frequent descriptions of Amerindians as nomadic and mobile served to highlight their lack of political allegiance and the absence of hierarchical order in their

⁹⁵ Andrew McRae, 'Husbandry Manuals and the Language of Agrarian Improvement', *Culture and Cultivation*, p. 35.

⁹⁶ James A. Sharpe, 'Social Control in Early Modern England: the Need for a Broad Perspective', *Social Control in Europe: Volume 1, 1500 – 1800*, ed. Herman Roodenburg and Pieter Spierenburg (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2004), p. 41.

⁹⁷ Rebecca Bushnell, *Green Desire: Imagining Early Modern English Gardens* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003).

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

patterns of labour. England became the ‘firmly rooted’ plant, growing healthful branches that ‘much desire to spread themselves abroad’, a contrast to the decidedly unrooted ‘wilde and sauage people, that liue and lie vp and downe in troupes’.⁹⁹ In drawing and publishing detailed maps of English counties, as of the colonies, the surveyor John Norden and John Speed indicated an interest in charting regional boundaries, and surveys of estates allowed the Crown to remain informed on available resources and industries.¹⁰⁰

Developments in gardening further indicates this turn towards a wider participation in cultivation. London underwent the most radical changes, with the city’s rural areas increasingly encroached upon. Maps of the City, Westminster, and the suburban areas outside the City walls chart this transformation.¹⁰¹ By James’ reign, the ‘remarkably rural character’ of late-sixteenth century London had given way to expansive gardens and parks along the Thames and affixed to the houses of the elite; by the mid-seventeenth century, the ‘pleasant fields’ chronicled in John Stow’s survey were considerably reduced, with the open fields around Westminster largely built on.¹⁰² Works like *The Gardeners Labyrinth* (1594), *The Jewell House of Art and Nature* (1594), *Four Bookes of Husbandry* (1601), *The English Husbandman* (1613), and *New Orchard and Garden* (1618) praised gardening as an activity that made edifying toil the means to both virtue and pleasure.¹⁰³ The urge to plant in Ireland, Virginia, and Bermuda, with the soil repeatedly described as abundant and fertile, must be understood within these attitudes. It is often overlooked that initiatives to plant overseas were symptomatic of changes in ideas towards improvement. In many ways, planting colonies was a response to a process of domestic colonisation already occurring in England.

Additionally, the language of planting was relevant to colonisation because it confronted the problem of savagery while simultaneously proposing a practical solution to eradicating it. ‘Planting’ civility was constantly iterated as an aim in both Virginia and Ireland. ‘Ther can not be a greater of more commendable worke of a Christian prince’, wrote Arthur Chichester from Ireland,

⁹⁹ Johnson, *Noua Britannia*, sigs. B2r, B4r.

¹⁰⁰ Hollis, ‘The Crown Lands and the Financial Dilemma in Stuart England’, p. 442.

¹⁰¹ Paula Henderson, ‘The Evolution of the Gardens of the Inns of Court’, *The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court*, ed. Jayne Elizabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), p. 179.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, pp. 179-80.

¹⁰³ Bushnell, *Green Desire*, p. 45.

‘then to plant civility w[i]th the trewe knowledge and service of God in the hartes of his subiectes’.¹⁰⁴ Europeans repeatedly described the wilderness as raw and chaotic, relating the need for cultivation to the ever-present danger of chaos. Descriptions of ‘culture’ under Elizabeth and James did not have the meaning understood by modern anthropology, nor the same connotations of an aesthetic removed from political life.¹⁰⁵ In Latin, *cultura* stemmed from tilling and husbandry, literally signifying the cultivation of land; *colere* was to cultivate or tend to, used by classical authors like Cicero, Ovid, and Tacitus to denote agricultural work but also fostering or nourishing in a metaphysical sense. ‘Culture’ therefore entailed the cultivation of land or industries, but also the development of the mind, faculty and manners – it was therefore a direct means through which civility might be instilled.¹⁰⁶ The artifice of the built environment was praised above the natural for its sophistication, seen as a manifestation of human intellectual achievement. This made culture the opposite to idleness, for, in the words of Cicero, ‘just as a field however fertile cannot be fruitful without cultivation, neither can the soul without instruction’.¹⁰⁷

Being endemic to nature, savagery was expected in America, where the English associated a perceived lack of settled land cultivation with a lack of sophisticated human culture. To implement civility, the English needed to establish a permanent presence there, as degeneration was believed to flourish anywhere that was not continuously cultivated. ‘Nature was everywhere in early modern writings, and always alien’.¹⁰⁸ Thus William Bradford, recounting the Separatists’ first arrival on the shores of Cape Cod in 1620, could describe the initial encounter with the landscape in identical terms to those expressed by Londoners and colonists alike. It was

a hideous and desolate wilderness, full of wild beasts and wild men...the whole country, full of woods and thickets, presented a wild and savage hue. If they looked behind them, there was the mighty ocean which they had passed and was

¹⁰⁴ Chichester to Salisbury, 2 October 1605, TNA: PRO, SP 63/216, f. 165v. See also ‘Imperfections in the state of Munster, with the remedies for the same’, December 1598, TNA: PRO, SP 63/202/4, ff. 6r-v.

¹⁰⁵ See Malcolm Smuts, *Culture and Power in England, 1585-1685* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999), pp. 1-3.

¹⁰⁶ ‘Culture, n.’, *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, <<http://www.oed.com>> [accessed 12 June 2014].

¹⁰⁷ Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, tr. A.E. Douglas (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1990), p. 23.

¹⁰⁸ Bushnell, *Green Desire*, p. 1.

now as a main bar and gulf to separate them from all the civil parts of the world.¹⁰⁹

In many ways, Samuel Purchas' 'Virginia's Verger' (1625) – his only unique contribution to *Purchas his pilgrimes* – is a husbandry manual for state building, describing the way plantation would consolidate English power. Referencing Genesis 1:29 ('Behold, I haue giuen you euery herbe bearing seede, which is vpon the face of all the earth...', KJV), Purchas stated at the start of his tract that 'we haue *Commission from [God] to plant*'.¹¹⁰ Man, created in God's image, had been given dominion over nature. The Indians were 'not worthy of the name of a Nation, being wilde and Sauage'; like the Gaelic Scots and Irish, they were 'bordering rebels, excommunicated and out-lawes...lyable to the punishments of the Law, and not to the priuilidges'.¹¹¹ Unconstrained savagery became a trait of 'rebels' who sought to resist English culture, in all its meanings. Referring to the lost settlers of Roanoke, Purchas evoked the quasi-mystical language of sacrifice and fertility, in which the blood of the dead colonists proclaimed an ownership of the land: 'Their carcasses...haue taken a morall immortall possession, and being dead, speake, proclaime, and cry, *This our earth is truly English*'.¹¹²

In presenting reasons for plantation, Purchas put religion and civility before honour and empire, envisioning a transformation from 'Barbarisme and Sauagenesse to good manners and humaine polity', a process crucial to inspiring '*English hearts in loyal subiection to your Royall Soueraign*'.¹¹³ He described Amerindians as possessing 'little of Humanitie but shape, ignorant of Ciuilitie, of Arts, of Religion', rendering them 'more brutish then the beasts they hunt, more wild and vnmanly then that vnmanned wild Countrey, which they range rather then inhabite'.¹¹⁴ Here Purchas made explicit this link between a lack of husbandry and a lack of sophistication; the apparent absence of a built

¹⁰⁹ William Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1647: the complete text*, ed. Samuel Eliot Morison (New York: Knopf, 1952), p. 62.

¹¹⁰ Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimes.*, sig. Lllllllv.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, Mmmmmmmr.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, sig. Mmmmmmm2r.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, sigs. Mmmmmmm4r, Nnnnnnr.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. Mmmmmmm2v. For overviews of stereotypes of savagery, see Keith Pluymers, 'Taming the Wilderness in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Ireland and Virginia', *Environmental History*, 16:4 (2011), pp. 610-32; James E. Doan, "'An Island in the Virginia Sea": Native Americans and the Irish in English Discourse, 1585-1640', *New Hibernia Review*, 1:1 (1997), pp. 79-99; Hodgen, *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*; Olive P. Dickason, *The Myth of the Savage and the Beginnings of French Colonialism in the Americas* (Alberta: University of Alberta Press, 1984).

environment placed them outside civil confines. The Amerindians' (perceived) ignorance of settlement and their inability to transform their landscapes through industry seemed, to the English, to invite intervention. The hundreds of people who invested money and involved themselves in projects for planting were not only subscribing to the ventures themselves, but to the ideas about savagery that underpinned them.

Cultivation and Behaviour

Disorder in landscapes, as in children and 'savages', sprang from a lack of control that allowed wildness to grow unchecked. A garden may grow to prosperity for decades, wrote Dorothy Leigh in her popular advice book of 1616, but if it be

let but two yeeres alone, it will become vnprofitable, sauage, and of no respect; euen so, if thou dost in thy youth, or many yeeres vse priuate prayer, and hearing of the Word preached, and publike prayer and fasting, & all good means to keepe thy earthly body in subjection; yet if thou becommest negligent and carelesse but a while, it will soone become sauage and wilde, and consequently an vnprofitable member of Christ his Church, or rather manigest thyselfe to bee no member, as the earth will be no garden; and therefore you must have a continual care of your selues.¹¹⁵

Self-rule, indicated by temperance and obedience, became the foundation for civil participation, as it allowed individuals to combat ignorance and develop their rational faculties. Witnessing first-hand life among the Algonquians, Alexander Whitaker felt confident that schools in Virginia would allow Amerindians to embrace English ways of life. 'These vnnurtured grounds of reason', he believed, 'may serue to encourage vs'.¹¹⁶

Universities functioned in a similar vein. Trinity College in Ireland, founded outside the Dublin city walls in 1592, modelled its curriculum on the Puritan syllabus in Cambridge, in which the language of proper manners and appeals to the common good justified its charter and emphasised the stabilising function that such an institution would have on the 'barbarity' of the region.¹¹⁷ Governed as policy-makers were by assumptions that 'ignorance was to blame for

¹¹⁵ Dorothy Leigh, *The mothers blessing* (London, 1616; STC 15402), sigs. E2v-E3r.

¹¹⁶ Alexander Whitaker, *Good neues from Virginia* (London, 1613; STC 25354), sig. G4r.

¹¹⁷ Helga Robinson-Hammerstein, 'The "Common Good" and the University in the Age of Confessional Conflict', *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland*, ed. Ciaran Brady and Jane H. Ohlmeyer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 73-96.

all social evils’, scholars have traced a link between the establishment of new universities in the 1590s to 1610s in Ireland and Germany, and the violent conflicts besetting both realms, where attempts to establish regional stability were ‘clearly fashioned according to the need to stabilise the state’.¹¹⁸ Boys as young as their early teens participated in symbolic ceremonies and traditions that served to ‘bind ruler and ruled together’, with the high walls of Trinity College further reiterating how education might protect impressionable youth from the evils of the world outside.¹¹⁹ To the same purpose, Harvard College in Massachusetts, founded in 1636 – less than ten years after the foundation of the Massachusetts Bay Charter – became the location of the first English printing press in North America in 1638, and the charter of 1650 aimed for the ‘education of the English & Indian youth of this Country in knowledge and godlines’.¹²⁰

The aim of incorporating Amerindians within English colonies through education were part of a more general emphasis on the role of teaching in preparing pupils for public service. The English classroom was a microcosm modelled on the hierarchies of the wider social world. Pupils were often described as ‘pliant’ or ‘twigs’, with the tutor as the setter who directed and bound those branches [Figure 2.3].¹²¹ Such imagery reinforced the connection between planting and implementing values, indicating prevailing assumptions that individuals must be constantly regulated, especially when their rational capacities were considered underdeveloped. Such beliefs also implied that unruly or juvenile behaviour *should* be interfered with, and it granted educated men this authority to intervene. ‘Learning is not a matter of amusement,’ Aristotle wrote. ‘It is attained by effort and pain’.¹²²

This included physical punishment, which James himself likely underwent under the tutelage of the formidable and cantankerous George Buchanan.¹²³ Schoolmasters who advocated corporeal punishment articulated the belief that beating a student taught them submission, producing a fear of authority that would

¹¹⁸ Robinson-Hammerstein, ‘The “Common Good” and the University in the Age of Confessional Conflict’, pp. 74, 85.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 95. See also *A History of the University in Europe, Vol. 2*, ed. Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

¹²⁰ Harvard Charter, 1650, ‘Harvard University Archives’, <ids.lib.harvard.edu/ids/view/6597921?buttons=y> [accessed 10 July 2014].

¹²¹ Rebecca Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), p. 28.

¹²² Aristotle, *Politics*, p. 306.

¹²³ Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching*, p. 64.

transform the pupil into a dutiful subject (or, in James' case, deferent to God). The threat of violence and the necessary humiliation towards one's betters could be expected for any who eventually found themselves in the orbit of government service; debates about flogging were often concerned with larger issues that centred on 'political authority, monarchy, tyranny and resistance'.¹²⁴ Tending to the budding character of subjects was first glimpsed in the microcosm of the schoolroom, where civility was encouraged by a schoolmaster who also held the rod. Education nourished pupils into accepting their prescribed places in society.




Figure 2.3. Francis Seager, *The Schoole of Vertue, & Booke of good Nurture* (London, 1593; STC 22137), frontispiece.

The motivation for bringing civility to other countries stemmed from these trends in humanistic learning, where education became a prime means through which obedient subjects might be fostered and created. New translations of classical texts in both Latin and English glorified the honour and duty that

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 29, 34-5.

accompanied the *vita activa*, encouraging gentlemen to put their learning to practical use by contributing more pervasively to public business.¹²⁵ The ‘new learning’ propounded by humanists and statesmen was part of a curriculum that most members of parliament and court would have undergone, and its influence on their ways of thinking is apparent. Henry Peacham, dedicating multiple works to Prince Henry, wrote that men’s ‘sauage nature & cruell manners...by the mightie power of wisdom...were conuerted from that most brutish condition of life, to the loue of humanitie, and polliticke gouernment’, while negligence returned an individual to that ‘brutish condition’.¹²⁶ It hardly comes as a surprise that the conditions of Amerindians were brought into this model as a fitting contemporary parallel. ‘Maruell not’, wrote the schoolmaster John Brinsley, ‘if honest and vnderstanding Christians be so hardly drawne ouer to these places, as namely into *Virginia*...when as there are in the same so manifold perils...that themselues, of their posterity should become vtterly sauage, as [the sauages] are’.¹²⁷

Brinsley’s educational tract, dedicated to colonial promoters including Henry Cary, the lord deputy of Ireland, and consulted by members of the Virginia council in London, specifically contained advice on bringing a humanist education to Amerindians. To Brinsley, this was a natural extension of the growing access to education in England:

My desire of their conuersion and saluation, with the sauing and preservation of our owne countrie-men there already, and which hereafter shall go to them, and of all other in these ruder countries and places...this course of instruction, to be presented vnto you, being embraced and rightly put in practise, a more speedy and sure foundation, may be layd for all future good learning, in their schools, without any difference at all from our courses receued here at home.¹²⁸

Brinsley saw his treatise as a practical extension of colonisation, in which civility transformed what was rude into something more refined and, by extension, more capable of civil obedience to the king. Teaching the Irish and Amerindians both

¹²⁵ See Daniel Wakelin, *Humanism, Reading, and English Literature, 1430-1530* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, ed. Jill Kraye (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Markku Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570 – 1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

¹²⁶ Henry Peacham, *The garden of eloquence* (London, 1577; STC 19497), sig. Abiiv. See also Henry Peacham, *The compleat gentleman* (London, 1622; STC 19502), sig. C2v.

¹²⁷ Brinsley, *A consolation for our grammar schooles*, sigs. A2v-A3r.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, sigs. A3r-A3v.

English and Latin, Brinsley believed, would ‘reduce them all...to a louing ciuility, with loyall and faithfull obedience to our Soueraigne, and good Lawes, and to repaire a way to pull them from the power and seruice of Sathan’.¹²⁹ Brinsley situated this desire to transform ‘savages’ into the Protestant focus on educating those perceived to be ignorant by overturning their superstition. ‘The chiefe hope of Gods church for all such pleaces so nuzled vp in rudenesse and superstition, was to come out of our Grammar schools...indeede for bringing men vnto ciuility’.¹³⁰

What is remarkable is the way in which English parishioners involved themselves in this process. Whether Pocahontas’ presence in London inspired his interest, or whether the Virginia Company specifically solicited aid, James issued a letter to English archbishops in 1617, detailing plans for an American school and asking them to enlist their dioceses in contributing funds.¹³¹ Hopes for the ‘planting of a college for the training up of the Children of the Infidels in true Religious, moral virtue, and Civility, and for other godly uses’ was an aim that citizens seemed happy to contribute to, and in 1619 the Virginia Company allocated a committee to oversee an English college at Henrico, placing Sir Dudley Digges, Sir John Danvers, Sir Nathaniel Rich, and John Ferrar in charge.¹³² Anonymous benefactors across England contributed to this cause, including a man who styled himself ‘Dust and Ashes’ and gave 550*l* towards the school, promising a further 450*l* if the colony sent some native children to England to be educated.¹³³ A committee in 1621 in London discussed appeals by Patrick Copland to build an East Indian School in Charles City based on the funds he had collected. The council eventually decided there was a greater need ‘of a school than of churches’ to introduce ‘the principles of religion, civility of life, and human learning’.¹³⁴ Education, the council decided, was where ‘both church

¹²⁹ Ibid., sig. A3v.

¹³⁰ Ibid., sig. C4r.

¹³¹ Order to Archbishops of Canterbury and York, 1617, in *Records of the Virginia Company: IV*, ed. Susan Myra Kingsbury (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1933), p. 1. See also Robert Hunt Land, ‘Henrico and its College’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 18:4 (1938), pp. 453-98.

¹³² Quoted in Land, ‘Henrico and its College’, p. 475.

¹³³ Letter from Dust and Ashes, 22 February 1620, in *Memoir of Reverend Patrick Copland: Rector Elect of the First Projected College in the United States*, ed. Edward N. Neill (New York: Charles Scribner & Co, 1871), p. 22; Letter from Dust and Ashes, 30 January 1622, in *Memoir of Reverend Patrick Copland*, p. 41.

¹³⁴ A meeting of the committee, 30 October 1621, in *Memoir of Reverend Patrick Copland*, p. 32.

and commonwealth take their original foundation and happy estate'.¹³⁵ Nicholas Ferrar's father, Sir Nicholas, became so devoted to the cause that he bequeathed 300*l* to the college at his death in 1620, requiring at least ten Algonquian children be educated at his expense, which Nicholas was charged with carrying out.¹³⁶

The English believed educating Amerindians to be a realistic goal because natives were not, at this time, considered to be racially different from them. In depicting Amerindians as possessing the mental faculties required to profit from civility, Elizabethan and Jacobean authors perpetuated the trope that Amerindians were in an early stage of human development, mirroring the state of England in the distant past. Sir Philip Sidney and Arthur Golding's translation of a popular French work, Philippe de Mornay's *A woorke concerning the trewenesse of the Christian religion* (1587), emphasised that the English had also experienced 'former rudeness', and it did no good to 'mocke at the sillie barbarous people [of the newly-discovered lands]' since 'it is not yet ful two thousand yeares agoe, since we were worse than they'.¹³⁷ At 'their first and more sauaged time,' the cartographer John Speed wrote in 1612, the English lived in a state of coarseness until the Romans introduced proper government, whereby 'their [face] *painting* and other like ruder Customes were well nigh forgotten'.¹³⁸ Richard Whitbourne, describing his encounters with the Beothuk of Newfoundland, believed that the English were well-equipped to bring 'a ciuill and regular kinde of life and gouernment' precisely because 'we our selues were once as blinde as they...and as rude and sauage in our liues and manners'.¹³⁹ The writer Henry Peacham, judging prose to be a more sophisticated mode of communication than verse, noted that recent travellers to America encountered cannibals in Peru who still communicated in verse, proving that Amerindians remained 'sauage and vnciuill'

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Hunt, 'Henrico and its College', p. 483.

¹³⁷ Philippe de Mornay, *A woorke concerning the trewenesse of the Christian religion* (London, 1587; STC 18149), sig. Hr. For contemporary attitudes towards the past, see Graham Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995). The 'primitive character of pre-Roman Britain was universally accepted' by antiquarians and historians who sought, in the Elizabethan and Jacobean period, to explore an emerging sense of Englishness based on an understanding of the past that aligned them with Roman greatness, p. 359.

¹³⁸ John Speed, *The theatre of the empire of Great Britaine* (London, 1612; STC 23041), sig. Rr3r. See also John Speed, *The history of Great Britaine under the conquests of the Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans* (London, 1611; STC 23045).

¹³⁹ Richard Whitbourne, *A discourse and discovery of New-found-land*, in *Newfoundland Discovered*, p. 125.

precisely because civility had not yet transformed the ‘barbarity’ apparent in their modes of communication.¹⁴⁰

Further, the promotion of civility was a project in which all citizens could collectively partake. The broadside *Londons lotterie*, printed in 1612 as the Virginia Company sought to sell more shares of its stock, gave the theme of cultural development a popular appeal:

Who knowes not *England* once was like
a Wildnesse and sauage place,
Till gouernment and vse of men,
that wildnesse did deface:
And so *Virginia* may in time,
be made like *England* now...¹⁴¹

This sentiment was visually and verbally expressed in another broadsheet printed in 1616. The woodcut included depictions of two named Indians, Eiakintomino and Matahan. The images collectively relayed a message of legitimacy, with the benign Amerindians, in their naturalised setting, pointing the viewer to the commodities available in Virginia and endorsed by the king. The subsequent verses again made reference to England’s distant past, this time from the natives’ perspective: ‘As *Wee*, were *Yee*; till *Others* Pittie/Sought, and brought You to *That Citie*’ [Jerusalem].¹⁴² Within the dual temporality of natives living both in a darkened past and in the present, the key lay in bringing them to a knowledge of law and God. This opened up a possibility for what *could* be, once their living conditions improved.

Violence and Planting

In 1624, Nicholas Ferrar recorded the heated speeches in parliament following Prince Charles’ controversial visit to Spain. His diary detailed James’ use of the language of cultivation to describe his method of care towards his subjects. The king proclaimed himself ‘not onely a good Husband butt a good Husbandman, who doth not onely plante good Plantes butt weede upp ye weedes

¹⁴⁰ Peacham, *Compleat gentleman*, sig. C4r.

¹⁴¹ Virginia Company, *Londons lotterie* (London, 1612; STC 16756.5).

¹⁴² Virginia Company, *A declaration for the certaine time of drawing the great standing lottery* (London, 1616; STC 24833.8).

that would else destroy the good Plantes'.¹⁴³ James' play on 'husband' and 'husbandman' emphasised the patriarchal framework through which order was achieved. James also made clear that, like a gardener who uprooted the weeds that threatened the health of a garden, 'hee did indeed thinke fit like a good horseman not allwaies to use the Spurr butt sometimes the brydle'.¹⁴⁴ Correction was seen a necessary component to good government.

The use of these metaphors in speeches, and Ferrar's act of inscribing them after they were uttered, indicate the ways in which figurative language helped articulate beliefs and justify action. 'Planting' became an effective civilising instrument because it espoused both ideas and action; it not only represented the ideal of perfect cultivation and the thrill of possibility, but it offered a means of enacting that through the plantation system. Rather than contrasting glory and profit against labour and husbandry, projects for colonisation were placed firmly within this context of cultivation. Colonists in Ulster, Virginia, and Bermuda frequently styled themselves as planters.

What is striking is the extent to which this language actually mirrored policies. Charters, grants, and proclamations under James were almost uniformly communicated in this way. By highlighting the need to subjugate the wild, planting promised permanence and stability. James' desire to bring draw unruly subjects to obedience by securing their submission to Crown authority involved rigorous campaigns against the peoples in Ireland and the Scottish highlands. Those who dwelled 'in our maine land, that are barbarous for the most part, and yet mixed with some shew of ciuilitie', James told his son in 1598, differed from those 'that dwelleth in the Iles...[and] are alluterly barbares, without any sort or shew of ciuilitie'.¹⁴⁵ It would be easy to subdue the former to obedience, James wrote, by targeting the nobility and securing their allegiance to him. For the Gaelic Scots, James believed that planting colonies offered the best solution, 'that within short time may reforme and ciuitalize the best inclined among them; rooting out and transporting the barbarous and stubborne sort, and planting ciuilitie in their rooms'.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴³ Nicholas Ferrar's Diary, 12 February – 8 March 1624, *Seventeenth-Century Political and Financial Papers: Camden Miscellany XXXIII*, ed. David R. Ransome (London: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society, 1996), p. 12.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁴⁵ James I, 'Basilikon Doron', in *Workes*, sig. O2r.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

James continued his policy of driving ‘a wedge within Gaeldom’ by actively seeking to “civilise” and to “close” the internal frontiers’ in Ireland, the Highlands and Scottish isles, and along the Borders after his accession to the English throne.¹⁴⁷ He dissolved the ‘overlapping nexus of greater and lesser clans, cemented by feudal and tenurial ties by bonds of kinship’ that ‘determined the social order’ by sending Scottish and English noblemen to plant colonies and establish English systems of law.¹⁴⁸ James endorsed the sorts of expeditions that colonisers equally promoted in Virginia, ones in which ‘sharp conflicts’ would ‘civilize and reform the savage and barbarous Lives, and corrupt Manners of such peoples’ in order to build ‘a solid and true foundation of Pietie... and wisdom, conjoined with fortitude and power’.¹⁴⁹ Between 1596 and 1608, the earls of Huntly, Errol, and Angus confiscated significant portions of lands belonging to clans like the MacLeods and MacDonnells that resisted Crown authority in attempts to instil ‘perfyte obedience and civilitie’.¹⁵⁰ Such plans involved undermining local traditions and attempting to ‘demilitarise’ the clans while Anglicising the lords who commanded large spheres of local influence.¹⁵¹

Initiatives in Munster and Ulster followed similar policies at the same time as plans for the colonisation of the Chesapeake were under way, and historians recognise that James’ initiatives, framed in the language of civility and improvement, were largely successful in achieving submission, if not in creating the fully-incorporated, Protestant communities originally intended.¹⁵² James proclaimed it a king’s duty to ‘foresee and prevent all dangers, that are likely to fall upon [his subjects], and to maintaine concord, wealth, and civilitie among them’, a sentiment mirrored in language adopted by colonial promoters.¹⁵³ By 1607, James could boast, however exaggeratedly, that ‘these confining places

¹⁴⁷ Jane H. Ohlmeyer, ‘Civilizing of the Rude Partes’: Colonization within Britain and Ireland, 1580s-1640s’, in *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Vol. 1*, ed. Nicholas Canny (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 127; Lord Sheffield to the King, 1605, Hatfield MS, CP 192/44.

¹⁴⁸ Ohlmeyer, ‘Civilizing of the Rude Partes’, p. 128.

¹⁴⁹ Sir Walter Raleigh, *Remains of Sir Walter Raleigh* (London, 1657; Wing R180), sigs. G10r, G12r.

¹⁵⁰ Ohlmeyer, ‘Civilizing of the Rude Partes’, p. 132.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 140, 144; Nicholas Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established* (Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1976); *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic and America, 1480 – 1650*, ed. K.R. Andrews, N.P. Canny, and P.E.H. Hair (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1978); Nicholas Canny, ‘The Ideology of English Colonisation: From Ireland to America’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 30:4 (1973), pp. 575-98.

¹⁵³ James I, ‘The trew law of free monarchies’, in *Workes*, sig. R2r.

which were the Borders of Two Kingdomes...[are now] planted and peopled with Ciuilitie...and where there was nothing before heard nor seene in those parts but bloodshed...they now liue euery man peaceably vnder his owne figgetree, and all their formers cryes and complaints turned onely into prayers to God and their king'.¹⁵⁴ The language of planting – and, by extension, projects for plantation – were ingrained in a collective language of conformity and obedience.

The idea of planting begins to reconcile what initially seems to be a contradiction between civilising and violence. Though the English styled themselves as benevolent ushers of order and improvement, the notion of cultivation contained ingrained theories about the need to restrain or remove harmful influences. Destruction was not antithetical but inherent to growth. 'As seeds and roots of noisome weeds', Robert Johnson wrote, English misbehaviour would 'soone spring vp to such corruption in all degrees as can neuer bee weeded out' if left unchecked.¹⁵⁵ The English believed they had a responsibility to redress savage behaviour and to 'manage [the Amerindians'] crooked nature to your forme of ciuilitie'.¹⁵⁶

Ethan Shagan's book on moderation argues that 'coercive moderation' dictated relationships within the hierarchical structures of English society in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, where to 'civilise' meant to 'subject to civil authority'.¹⁵⁷ Efforts at colonisation indicate that the same rules applied in the colonies. From a perceived lack of civility in America to a decline of civility in Ireland, it was necessary, 'by cutting vp all mischiefs by the rootes', to render 'the state of their common-weales' prosperous by forceful interference.¹⁵⁸ Behaviour, like young plants, must be twisted, however brutally, into shape:

For no doubt like as the wilde olive and figge tree, by the continuall addressing of a skilfull husbandman, is made at the last kindley, profitable, and fruitfull, and not inferior to the natural branches; so a common-wealth over-growne with a general corruption of manners, and thereby become savage, barbarous, and barren, like vnto the wilde olive and figge tree may by the continuall pruning and addressing of a skilfull magnistrate be made obedient, civill, and profitable unto that prince, whom God hath constituted to be the labourer in that vineyard.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁴ 'A Speech to Both the Houses of Paraliement' in James I, in *Workes*, sig. Xxr.

¹⁵⁵ Johnson, *Noua Britannia*, sig. E4r.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, sig. E4v.

¹⁵⁷ Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 182, 212.

¹⁵⁸ Richard Becon, *Solon his follie* (London, 1594; STC 1653), sig. Fv.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, sig. G3r.

In framing violence as a necessary correctional force, colonists did not advocate eliminating Amerindians as much as transforming them. ‘As for supplanting the Sauages, we haue no such intent’, Richard Becon wrote, since ‘[o]ur intrusion into their possessions shall tend to their great good, and no way to their hurt...to plant our selues in their Countrie yet not to supplant and roote them out’.¹⁶⁰ This treatment was exactly what authors advocated towards ‘idolaters’ and Catholics within England. If allowed to flourish, ‘they will euer bee plotting and conspiring, to roote you if they can’.¹⁶¹ The presence of dissenters within a state would twist the nature of obedient subjects, inducing cannibalistic behaviour. ‘Harbor not’, wrote Robert Johnson, ‘this viperous brood in the bosome, which wil eate out and consume the womb of their mother’.¹⁶² Those who forgot their allegiance to the king, whether Irish or English, were equally in need of correction.

This is further apparent in the letters of Englishmen who sought to establish stability in border regions, where the metaphor of stinging nettles took on special relevance to the situation at hand. Writing to Sir George Carew in 1600, Hugh Cuff described the ‘wilde mocion’ of the native Irish, who ‘in nature doe resemble the netle, w[hi]ch beinge softly handled and gentle touched, will stinge and pricke, but if hardly and roughly they neu[e]r hurte’.¹⁶³ This example came to pervade the view of policy-makers in the colonies. Sir Arthur Chichester, writing to the earl of Salisbury, believed the Irish to be ‘much of the qualytie of nettles [that] wyll stinge being tenderly toucht, but by hard gripinge them we shall tend less annoyance’.¹⁶⁴ Chichester believed previous tactics to be too lenient, where ‘the course hitherto hath been to dandle and please them in all thinges...wherby the kinge is yll serued’.¹⁶⁵ Henry Cary, first viscount Falkland and lord deputy of Ireland, expressed the opinion that those Irish lords who transgressed against the king’s ordinances were ‘like nettles that sting being gently handled, but sting not being crushed’.¹⁶⁶ The ‘rebels’ who navigated the shifting borders between Scotland and England were considered in similar

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, sig. Cv.

¹⁶¹ Johnson, *Noua Britannia*, sig. D2r.

¹⁶² Ibid., sig. Dv.

¹⁶³ Hugh Cuff to Sir George Carew, August 1600, TNA: PRO, SP 63/207/4, f. 308v.

¹⁶⁴ Sir Arthur Chichester to the Earl of Salisbury, 4 July 1606, TNA: PRO, SP 63/219, f. 3r.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Quoted in Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 261.

language. Sir William Bowes wrote a weary letter to Robert Cecil complaining of the slanders made against him as he sought to restore order to a violent region, but believed that ‘distempers may like nettles sting, if they be softlie touched, yet if they thoroughlie handed, a little paines tymelie taken for reformacion may exceedinglie benefit her Highnes service, and make this place an habitable for quiet and good men’.¹⁶⁷

Colonial governors, like patriarchal heads of estates and families, were expected to use force when necessary. Justifications for this came from the classical authors who featured widely on the humanist curricula in universities in the sixteenth century. Although historians have seen the tactics of men like the earl of Essex or John Smith as exercising ‘a Machiavellian critique of the prevailing Ciceronian model of colonisation’, Cicero had not hesitated to recommend violence as a principle instrument at the disposal of political actors.¹⁶⁸ Law separated ‘life thus refined and humanised, and that life of savagery’, Cicero wrote, but ‘if the choice is between the use of violence and the destruction of the state, then the lesser of the two evils must prevail’.¹⁶⁹ To Cicero, violence was justified when it came to combatting savagery, which imperilled the state. In such cases, violence might be legitimately used for the sake of common interest – a common theme in Elizabethan and Jacobean writings concerning the use of violence in expansion. Tactics of war carried out in the colonies further drew a connection between the land and subjugation. The ‘feedfights’, or burning of crops, that the English conducted in Ireland and Virginia – sometimes when in perilously short supply of food themselves – were similarly an assertion over the landscape that sought to subject local peoples to a recognition of English ascendancy. The Irish, wrote Sir Arthur Chichester in 1605, were ‘generally so...vncyvell...the best we can do is plant and countenance some Englyshe’, though such planting often required razing and clearing the soil first.¹⁷⁰

Although projects flourished in a time of relative peace, this should not distract historians from the fact that colonisation inherently involved conflict, for savagery lurked ever on the fringes of uncultivated territories. This allowed the

¹⁶⁷ Compare to Sir William Bowes to Cecil, 31 December 1600, TNA: PRO, SP 59/39, f. 306v.

¹⁶⁸ Fitzmaurice, *Humanism and America*, p. 168.

¹⁶⁹ Neal Wood, *Cicero's Social and Political Thought* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), pp. 186, 189.

¹⁷⁰ Chichester to Salisbury, 2 October 1605, TNA: PRO, SP 63/217, ff. 165r-v.

deployment of violence as a preventative cure for further ills: '[s]avage creatures will be smitten by their keepers, when they are ready to teare strangers in peeces', wrote the minister John Yates in 1622, '& shall I struggle with him that made and moderates the world, when he strikes me?'¹⁷¹ One aim of Protestantism, specified Thomas Gataker, was that 'through instruction and learning...we may not be like sauage people'.¹⁷² While historians largely agree that civility was promoted and sustained through displays of duty and deference, this was often articulated not through ideal behaviour but through the horrors of degeneration.¹⁷³ While plantation purported to solve conflicts within the realm – reducing overpopulation, financing the Crown, finding wealth to check Spanish power, or finding employment for idle men, for example – interest in America introduced new conflicts in the Crown's expanding territories. This will become especially apparent in chapters two and four, where ideas of savagery clashed with the reality of indigenous peoples.

Conclusion

The desire to make plantation the primary method to achieve colonisation naturally drew out horticultural metaphors, but it also signified how the widespread interest in colonisation was largely inseparable from a need to educate not only Amerindians but the English themselves, inspired by a process already underway in England and the British Isles. 'Euen as husbandmen to their grafts and plants ding in stakes and adioyne hedges for the safetie therof', wrote the tutor Edward Grant, 'scholemasters do instil and plant in the tender yong mind of their scholers, salubrious precepts...that they maye burgen, floure, and proceede...in good maners, virtue, and learning'.¹⁷⁴ Investors were frequently the same men who believed it their duty to impose order in their localities, and they framed this need for order in the language of planting, civility, and savagery. The interfering hand of the husbandman – a metaphor used by the king himself – justified direct and often forceful intrusion in the lives of his subjects.

¹⁷¹ Yates, *A modell of divinitie*, sig. Z3v.

¹⁷² Thomas Gataker, *Maskil le-David* (London, 1620; STC 11655), sig. D3r.

¹⁷³ Michael Braddick, *State formation in Early Modern England, 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 422.

¹⁷⁴ Edward Grant, *A president for parentes* (London, 1571; STC 20057.5), sigs. Bviv-Bviir.

What emerges is a concerted effort by Englishmen to employ such language to encourage conformity and tighten governmental control. Involvement in colonising projects allowed some measure of political engagement, widening the opportunities through which English subjects might contribute to an expanding society and allowing participants to engage in contemporary issues in ways that were both meaningful and profitable. This, however, this made savagery a label that automatically excluded those considered unfit for membership in a community. In the state-endorsed projects for plantations, a more general project emerged through which the language of cultivation and the promise of participation became a means of creating dutiful subjects, starting with cultivating the landscape and its ‘savage’ inhabitants. Colonisation thus helped define the bounds through which subjects could take part in the civil life of a growing state, especially land-owning gentlemen who sought a stake in political participation. There were acceptable avenues of involvement, such as buying shares in company lotteries, serving on trade committees in parliament, or donating money to Amerindian schools, but there were also clear social, religious, and political boundaries that could not be crossed, as subsequent chapters explore.

What this relationship between expansion and tightening control highlights is the shared attitudes towards authority in England and plantation settings at a time when these were governed by the same gentlemen. These gentlemen operated under the authority of a king who first tried to unite the realms of England and Scotland until a single vision of *imperium*. Framed as pious work that would bring ‘those poore and sauage, and to be pittied *Virginians*’ into the folds of English civility, as Richard Crakanthorpe preached at Paul’s Cross in 1608, the aim of plantation was to allow for ‘a new BRITAINE in another world...together with our English’.¹⁷⁵ The crossover between these domains of rule made colonisation and the emphasis on civility interrelated, rather than distinct, processes. As one author expressed – referring to Newfoundland, but relevant to any colony at this time – the merits of planting were twofold. Firstly, ‘[t]his cuntry, which hitherto hath onely served a den for wilde beasts, shal not only be repleat with Christian inhabitants, but the Sauages...may in time be

¹⁷⁵ Richard Crakanthorpe, *A sermon at the solemnizing of the happie inauguration* (London, 1609; STC 5979), sigs. D2r-D2v, D3v.

reduced to Civilitie'.¹⁷⁶ Further, such an act would cause 'an Iland every way as bigge and spacious as *Ireland*...to be brought to bow under the waight of his royall Scepter'.¹⁷⁷

The reduction of savagery and the growing power of the 'royall Scepter' were thus carefully, and deliberately, connected. English actions against colonised peoples, though often brutal, must be understood within this larger attempt by authorities to create and retain subjects to the Crown. As one scholar noted, attitudes to nature often indicated less about what actually occupied that space than about an individual's fears and reliance on culture.¹⁷⁸ Understanding English anxieties towards who inhabited the 'wilderness' helps explain attitudes towards native peoples, but it equally exposes anxieties over the consequences of neglecting cultivation for the survival of the civil state. This next chapter addresses this issue by exploring the cultivation of the physical body through clothing.

¹⁷⁶ T.C., *A short discourse of the New-found-land* (Dublin, 1623; STC 4311), sigs. A4r-v.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, sig. A4v.

¹⁷⁸ Bushnell, *Green Desire*, p. 5.

Chapter Three

Civilising the Body: The Rules of Apparel in Ireland and London

*A proude man clothed in sumptuous or costly arraye, it maketh him the more proud...a whore that is bedect in light and garish apparel, it maketh her in her mind to be the more whorish...[the Irish] be as confused as the rest: the men goe more beastly and sauage like then the people of America.*¹

Moving on from a more general overview of cultivation and savagery, this chapter examines and tests some of the claims made in Chapter Two. It does so by focusing on English attitudes towards the cultivation of the physical body through apparel, arguing that clothing comprised a significant aspect of English plans to achieve regional ascendancy in other territories. The previous chapter concluded with the author of *A short discourse of the New-found-Land* (1623) comparing Newfoundland to Ireland. In doing so, the extension of royal power into America was projected as an extension of civilising initiatives already apparent in Munster and Ulster. Since plantation initiatives in Ireland formed the only major English precedent to parallel American colonisation, a focus on English activities in Ireland offers a means of better understanding policies against ‘savagery’ in relation to westward colonisation more broadly.²

To colonial deputies and administrators, many of them connected to the English court and aware of the significance of dress in political spheres, the ability to regulate the appearance of Irish and American natives was considered an important part of the success, or failure, of English plantation schemes. ‘The wise man hath taught vs’, wrote the traveller Fynes Moryson, ‘that the apparel in some sort shewes the man’.³ This was especially true of Ireland, where previous attempts to colonise the island had crystallised assumptions that the Irish were ‘more vnciuill, more vncleanly, more barbarous, and more brutish’ than anywhere else.⁴ The first part of the chapter devotes significant attention to English attitudes and policies towards the Gaelic Irish in order to indicate how the English put the rhetoric of civilising others into practice.

¹ Barnabe Rich, *Allarme to England* (London, 1578; STC 20979), sigs. Cv-C2r.

² James Lyttleton, *The Jacobean Plantations of Seventeenth-Century Offaly: An Archaeology of a Changing World* (Portland: Four Courts Press, 2013), p. 270.

³ Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary* (London, 1625; STC 18205), sig. Ff4r.

⁴ Barnabe Rich, *A short suruey of Ireland* (London, 1609; STC 20992), sig. Bv.

The second part of the chapter focuses on the representations of the Irish and, to some extent, Amerindians in late Elizabethan and Jacobean London, in order to explore the prevailing tropes that came to bear on English articulations of conformity more generally. By emphasising the role of appearance in achieving and maintaining conformity, it argues that the civilising agenda imposed by the English involved a significant visual aspect, where regulating the body was seen to embody the transformation from a ‘savage’ to an obedient subject. It also raises some of the ways in which cultural interference failed, as attempts to establish appropriate modes of self-presentation invariably offered a means of resisting English authority beyond physical violence. The consequences of these can be seen in sartorial debates in London as well as Ireland.

Historiography

While sixteenth-century colonists and colonial promoters tended to contrast the civil English against the wild Gaelic in polarised terms, the reality was far more entangled, as Irish historians have demonstrated in recent decades.⁵ Interactions between sixteenth and seventeenth-century English colonists (the ‘New English’), members of the Gaelic nobility, Irish tenants, town-dwellers, and ‘Old’ English descendants of the twelfth-century Anglo-Norman invasion were characterised by coexistence as well as brutality, depending on the policies of individual governors and their relationship to surrounding localities.⁶ The aim of this chapter is not to undermine the historical complexities of Ireland at this time, but to explore how concepts of civility shaped descriptions of Gaelic and English inhabitants in Ireland, with a focus on the elements that figured most frequently in sartorial debate in London. As Nicholas Canny observed, the mostly Protestant colonists who highlighted Irish incivility did so largely out of the moral sense that informed their expansionist politics, where ‘the consequence of the fall of humanity from divine grace’ was ‘deeply ingrained in the imagination’, and these

⁵ Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580 – 1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); Steven G. Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447 – 1603: English Expansion and the End of Gaelic Rule* (London: Longman, 1998); *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland*, eds. Ciaran Brady and Jane Ohlmeyer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). These merely represent a few of the key authors in the contentious debates over Anglo-Irish history in the early modern period.

⁶ For an example of how the English might benefit from being more lenient towards local populations, see Canny, *Making Ireland British*, p. 79.

writings shaped the way they framed the reports, letters, and treatises they sent to London.⁷

The fear that the Irish would ally themselves with Spain or the papacy against the English emphasised the sense among the New English that they were a relatively isolated group in a largely Catholic society. This partly explains the tendency, in their writings, to group all Irish together in depictions of incivility.⁸ At the same time, Irish scholars have detected the successes of English state formation in Ireland in several key areas, through greater ‘centralisation, administrative uniformity, and cultural imperialism’.⁹ The focus here is on the latter, not least because Jacobean colonial promoters including Francis Bacon explicitly ‘portrayed colonisation as a classic civilising enterprise’.¹⁰ The state’s appeal to English Protestantism and civility played a key role in effecting the Londonderry plantation of 1610, to the extent that Gaelic authors writing during the atrocities of Cromwell’s campaign of subjugation in Ireland from 1649 to 1650 explicitly attributed the loss of land to James’ policies: ‘he [James] ordered their lands to be measured with ropes, he replaced the pure Irish with Saxons, and transplanted them all’.¹¹ The relationship between ‘the character of the people’ and reform through apparel becomes a means of accessing the cross-over between colonising initiatives through civility and the centralising and controlling concerns of the English state as they were manifested in both Ireland and London, though these tropes against Irish customs did not reflect the complex spectrum of hybridity or adaptation on the part of local populations.

Recent interest in patterns of consumption, and the evolution of London as a metropolis, has recognised the importance of clothing to sixteenth and seventeenth century individuals. In London between 1530 and 1609, around 19,000 people were apprenticed to the Clothworkers, Drapers, Haberdashers, and Merchant Taylors.¹² Clothing was the dominant industry in the burgeoning city,

⁷ Canny, *Making Ireland British*, p. 120. See his Chapter One, ‘Spenser Sets the Agenda’, for Canny’s discussion on how humanistic literature affected Elizabethan conceptions of colonisation.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁹ Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors*, p. 358.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 197-8. Bacon’s 1608 memoranda corroborate this, BL: Add MS 27278, f. 23v.

¹¹ Canny, *Making Ireland British*, pp. 214, 575.

¹² Peter Stallybrass, ‘Worn worlds: clothes and identity on the Renaissance stage’, *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture*, eds. Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 289.

constituting twenty-two per cent of all production; victualing came in second.¹³ Elizabeth and James released proclamations, with varying degrees of success, that tried to regulate production and consumption, and the Elizabethan sumptuary laws existed to dictate what various members of society could wear depending on their status.¹⁴ These initiatives usually denounced luxury and its affiliated sins of pride and idleness as the reasons for regulation, but, as Alan Hunt has pointed out, fears of dearth and economic depression were very real in pre-industrial societies.¹⁵ While sumptuary statutes had existed across Europe and the East for centuries, Hunt found that English sumptuary laws in the later sixteenth century ‘came closest to an attempt to impose a hierarchically organised dress code for the whole population’, one characterised by ‘increasing particularism’.¹⁶ Hunt further suggested that the lapse of sumptuary laws under James in 1604, often assumed to have been encouraged by a king who favoured upstarts and who had inflated honours to the point of making sumptuary laws untenable, did not represent a decline in attempts to impose sartorial control.¹⁷ Rather, various bills concerning apparel were discussed in most of James’ parliaments, but failed to pass because no agreement could be reached over the strategies and breadth of intervention.¹⁸

Current historiographical trends in the study of clothing stem largely from the turn, in the 1980s, towards cultural materialism and economic exchange.¹⁹ An interest in gloves, fabrics, jewellery and shoes as ‘agents of memory’ and commodities of desire were explored beyond the theatre, a space that has long been regarded as a place where clothing might impart subversive meanings and question gender boundaries as well as communicating status.²⁰ Most recently, studies by Isabelle Paresys, Peter Stallybrass, Anne Rosalind Jones, and Ulinka

¹³ *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis*, eds. A.L. Beier and Roger Finlay (London: Longman, 1986), p. 148.

¹⁴ Alan Hunt, *Governance of the Consuming Passions: A History of Sumptuary Law* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), p. 305.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 305.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 313.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 313, 322.

¹⁹ Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); Peter Stallybrass and Ann Rosalind Jones, ‘Fetishising the Glove in Renaissance Europe’, *Critical Inquiry*, 28:1 (2001), pp. 114-32; Michelle O’Malley, ‘A Pair of Little Gilded Shoes: Commission, Cost, and Meaning in Renaissance Footwear’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 63:1 (2010), pp. 45-83.

²⁰ Quote from O’Malley, ‘A Pair of Little Gilded Shoes’, p. 83. See also Laura Levine, *Men in Women’s Clothing: Anti-theatricality and Effeminisation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Jean Howard, *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1994), Chapter 5.

Rublack have emphasised the place of apparel in the day-to-day lives of sixteenth and seventeenth century men and women. These works explore how clothing was worn, both in elite and non-elite circles, in ways that might shape individuals ‘both physically and socially’, enabling them to navigate the complex social worlds they inhabited.²¹ Surviving inventories and deeds of sale show how much tailors and gentlemen paid for second-hand gowns, hose, doublets and jerkins, which they refashioned and resold. The detail and cost outlined in these lists also indicate how involved gentlemen were with the creation of their wardrobe.

The intimate relationship between wearers and their apparel, but also between those items and their social meanings, might be further explored in relation to English politics. The abuse of apparel, Elizabeth proclaimed, brought ‘the subuersion of all good order’, and did so with ‘impunitie’.²² Puritans yoked sartorial excess with sin and political instability. Excess of apparel not only debased English trade by prizing European markets, but it caused subjects to ‘consume themselues, their goodes, their landes’ with a destabilising tendency to luxury that prevented them from being ‘seruisable to their Countrey’.²³

Consequently, items of clothing often came under the attention of the state. The lieutenant of the Tower, Sir Wiliam Waad, found it necessary to inform state secretary Sir Robert Cecil in 1605 that the ‘scarf which Persy had...were well it were seen’, and ‘it were not amiss to learn of the embroiderers what scarves of such have been lately made, and for whom...Rucwood made also a very fair Hungarian horseman’s coat ...not fit for his degree’.²⁴ This was part of Waad’s interrogation of the anti-Protestant Gunpowder plotters, and provides but one example of how a choice of apparel was believed to contain implications for the conspirators’ political (and religious) sensibilities. On the night before their execution, these conspirators were depicted as awaiting their trial with little remorse. The fact that they were described as ‘richly apparelled’ even after their

²¹ Quote from Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 2. See also Ulinka Rublack, *Dressing Up: Cultural Identity in Renaissance Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Isabelle Paresys, ‘The Dressed Body: the moulding of identities in sixteenth-century France’, *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Herman Roodenburg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 227-57; *Clothing Culture, 1350-1650*, ed. Catherine Richardson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

²² *By the Queene. The Queenes Maiestie considering to what extremeties a great number of her subiectes are growen, by excesse in apparel...* (London, 1566; STC 7995).

²³ *By the Queene. The excess of apparel, and the superfluitie of unnecessary forreyne wares therto belongyng* (London, 1574; STC 8066).

²⁴ Sir William Waad, Lieutenant of the Tower, to the Earl of Salisbury [Thomas Wintor’s confession], 26 November 1605, Hatfield MS, CP 112/91r.

arraignment further linked indulgence with a loss of deference for the prescribed order of things.²⁵

The role of apparel in shaping subjects is especially relevant in light of the English civilising agenda, yet this remains a neglected aspect of scholarly study. As Michael Braddick has noted, ‘a desire to unlock a cultural history persistently pushes us towards the unspoken and explicit or the physically communicated’.²⁶ In the absence of a shared spoken language, clothing became an unspoken means of asserting authority in colonial settings, sometimes from competing groups. Although Braddick referred mostly to gesture, physical communication also manifested itself in what people put on. When George Percy, younger brother to the earl of Northumberland, prepared to travel to Virginia, he spent 7*l* – and another 9*l* nearer to the departure – on jerkin, hose, ‘silke pointes’, and gloves.²⁷ These were ‘concessions to style and fashion rather than imperatives for survival’, but Percy’s careful choice in apparel might also have provided some comfort in the uncertainties of a new environment, even as it emphasised his rank among the English.²⁸

Percy’s personal interest in garments, and his keen eye for craftsmanship and accessories, also enabled him to make perceptive remarks on Amerindians. Noting the role of appearance in the ceremonies of local chiefs, Percy detailed a werowance who wore a crown of deer’s hair dyed red, fashioned like a flower in his hair; he was painted crimson with beads around his neck, his face blue, and a bird claw in either ear. ‘He entertained us in so modest a proud fashion’, Percy marvelled, ‘as though he had beene a Prince of civill government’.²⁹ Clearly, clothing might impart important messages among the Algonquians as with the English. When the Powhatans returned a Mrs Boys, ‘chief of the prisoners’, to the English some weeks after the massacre of 1622, she came ‘appareled like one of

²⁵ T.W., *The arraignment and execution of the late traytors* (London, 1606; STC 24916), sig. B3r.

²⁶ Michael Braddick, ‘Introduction: the Politics of Gesture’, *Past and Present*, 203 (2009), pp. 9–35, p. 10.

²⁷ Mark Nicholls, ‘George Percy’s “Trew Relacyon”: A Primary Source for the Jamestown Settlement’, *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 113:3 (2005), pp. 212–75, p. 216.

²⁸ *Ibid.* Compare to Lord Mountjoy, who dressed lavishly when serving as lord deputy in Ireland, wearing white or black taffetas and satins, silk stockings, silk cloaks, ruffs, and taffeta waistcoats. See Mairead Dunlevy, *Dress in Ireland* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1989), p. 66.

²⁹ George Percy, ‘Observations gathered out of a discourse’ (1606), *Virtual Jamestown* <www.exttext.lib.virginia.edu> [accessed 2 July 2014].

theire Queens, w[hi]ch they desired wee should take notice of'.³⁰ The ability to dress the body of another was a signifier of power.

Despite the possibilities for subversion, clothing often did remain a prime indicator of hierarchy and status, however much this might be manipulated in certain contexts. Despite the lapse of sumptuary laws, James understood the value of clothing as visual statements. The sumptuousness fostered at his court celebrated styles that encouraged extravagant displays of wealth, seen, for example, in the long-tipped shoes that were considered wasteful of leather.³¹ James reminded members of the Scottish parliament in 1609 to dress according to their 'rank and estate, whereby they may be... more revered by the people subiect to their charge'.³² Ornament, emphasised the king, was 'a badge & mark for distinguishing them from the vulgare sorte', inducing 'in common people that reverence and regarde that is dew and proper'.³³ Clothing was less about representation than a visceral perception of how power operated socially. This was equally manifest in discourses against luxury, which served less as a means of criticising those who might conceivably afford greater fineries, than to condemn the aspirations of the poor: 'the attack upon luxury had served the interests of power and intellect, becoming the vital expression to [the elite's] impulse to order'.³⁴

Ornament might serve to reinforce hierarchy, but clothing was also a means of cultivating the body. As Isabella Paresys has argued, apparel 'had an essential function in identifying social, sexual, and national differences' alongside language and gesture, going so far as rearranging physical anatomy by 'concealing it, adjusting it, or overemphasising it' as well as hampering it.³⁵ The physical nature of clothing could be as useful as its symbolic functions, becoming effective tools in inducing self-restraint. When Fynes Moryson described the 'nastie filthinesse of the [Irish] nation in generall', he referred largely to

³⁰ Letter to the Virginia Company of London, 4 April 1623, in *VCR: IV*, p. 98.

³¹ Rumours circulated that James was considering re-instating the sumptuary statutes in 1616. Nathaniel Brent to Carleton, 29 November 1616, TNA: PRO, SP 14/89, f. 106r. This was perhaps a consequence of the scandal of the Overbury affair. See 'Yellow Starch: Fabrications of the Jacobean Court' in Jones and Stallybrass, *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*, pp. 59-86.

³² *Certaine acts particularlie recommended by our most gracious and sacred soveraine to the Estates of Parliament of the Kingdome of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1609; STC 21892.7), sig. C2v.

³³ *Ibid.*, sig. C2v.

³⁴ John Sekora, *Luxury: The Concept in Western Thought, Eden to Smollet* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), p. 284.

³⁵ Paresys, 'The Dressed Body', pp. 233, 240.

immoderate gestures – women revelling in alcoholic excess by ‘kneeling vpon the knee...[drinking] health after health with men’, or ‘young maides starke naked’ grinding corn so vehemently that ‘such reliques thereof stuck on their belly’.³⁶ Such behaviour might be immediately redressed through certain fashions. The abolition of mantles, colonists believed, might hinder the poorer members of Irish society from living nomadically, which they considered to be an evasion of authority. Conversely, encouraging the sons of Gaelic lords to develop a taste for English fashions might incite them towards English civility, setting an example for those serving in their households. Clothing contained the body in specific ways, directing how an individual might move and therefore behave, providing a way to redress the ‘looseness’ of manners which English observers described with such distaste.

States of Undress

What a body lacked was as insignificant as what adorned it, and the most obvious indicator of incivility was often the absence of clothes. It was nothing but sheer whimsicality for Thomas Dekker, in his mock conduct book of 1609, to encourage his gentleman readers to

strip thy selfe starke naked...Our first parents so long as they went naked, were suffered to dwell in paradice, but after they got coates to their backes, were turned out a doors: put on therefore no apparel at all...³⁷

The thought of dwelling in a society where individuals wore little or no apparel could be nothing but laughable to the gentlemen of London. It was a sin, insisted John Williams to the king in 1620, to turn ‘the *bread* of the poore to a plume of feathers’ by spending extravagantly on adornment, but such display also highlighted a sophistication and developed craftsmanship that indigenous peoples were not seen to possess.³⁸ When the English criticised Irish mantles – the loose woollen cloaks worn largely by the rural population – they tended to associate these coverings with the status of their wearers as vagrants or idle poor. The Irish were regularly deemed ‘naked and sauage men’, each term supplementing the other, their lack of proper apparel a large signifier of their inability to develop

³⁶ Moryson, *Itinerary*, sigs. Sss2r-v.

³⁷ Thomas Dekker, *The guls horne-booke* (London, 1609; STC 6500), sig. C2v.

³⁸ John Williams, *A sermon of apparell* (London, 1620; STC 25728.5), sig. Dv.

more sophisticated trade while providing the English with ideological justification for conquest.³⁹

Mantles came to symbolise the tendency towards resistance to English ways, but their provocation also had something to do with the revelation of the body that accompanied various states of undress. The Latin *nudere*, from which ‘nude’ derives, actually meant ‘to strip’, invoking the various states *between* being clothed and being naked. Though cloaks might loosely cover the body, they remained heavily suggestive in what they failed to cover. Satires in France and Italy attacked the fashion for low-neckline shirts that erotically brought the viewer’s gaze to rest on a gentleman’s revealed neck and chest, and doublet slashes allowed the intimacy of undergarments to spill from their slits.⁴⁰ In the cases of European dress, the intimacy and eroticism of low-cut undershirts hinged on subtle craftsmanship, on a careful counterpoise between intricate lace and the body bared underneath. This is evident in the painter Nicholas Hilliard’s portrait, ‘Man Among Flames’, where the privacy of a miniature allowed such an intimate revelation [Figure 3.1].

In the cultural hierarchies created by Englishmen, nakedness represented the basest levels of undeveloped society. This was sometimes construed as vulnerability or innocence, implying that natives were in a state of potential that might develop when introduced to civility. Art depicting early encounters in America often associated the naked body with the *terra incognita*, perhaps best embodied in Theodore Galle’s engraving, ‘Amerigo Vespucci Landing in America’, in which a fully-clothed, flag-bearing Vespucci made contact with the reclining, naked figure of America. Elizabethan and Jacobean propaganda often drew a connection between Virginia and a virgin land. Since ‘this land [is] a pure Virgine to Christ’, preached William Symonds, ‘we shall haue a Virgin or *Maiden Britaine*’.⁴¹ Colonists occasionally described the plight of the native Irish, clad in rags, with sympathy; more often, references to vulnerability were evoked by

³⁹ Captain Robert Ellyott to Sir Robert Cecil and the Lords of the Council, 13 January 1600, Hatfield MS, CP 67/9; Sir Francis Shane to Sir Robert Cecil, 22 February 1601, TNA: PRO, SP 63/208/1, f. 137v; Sir Arthur Chichester to Robert Cecil, 20 October 1601, TNA: PRO, SP 63/209/2, f. 85r. The association was also apparent in Virginia: [Meeting] at Whitehall, 29 July 1622, TNA: PRO, PC 2/31, f. 449v.

⁴⁰ Paresys, ‘The Dressed Body’, pp. 247.

⁴¹ William Symonds, *Virginia. A sermon preached at White-chappel* (London, 1609; STC 23594), sig. A3v.

captains who complained that their soldiers had not yet received their allocated apparel from England and were perishing from cold.⁴²



Figure 3.1. 'Man Among Flames', attributed to Nicholas Hilliard, 1588, V&A, P.5-1917.

Even a vulnerable nakedness, then, was hardly an enviable condition. The ripeness of America carried strong and explicit connotations of exploitation, often highlighted in colonial propaganda; potential necessitated interference. Walter Raleigh famously praised Guiana for having 'yet her Maydenhead, never sackt, turned, nor wrought'.⁴³ The fantasies of penetration were clear, climaxing into the triumph of imperialistic possession. Guiana's earth had 'not beene torne, nor the virtue...of the soyle spent...the mines not broken...neuer entred by an armie of strength...neuer conquered or possessed'.⁴⁴ Perhaps most explicitly of all, one Dublin official described Ireland as a 'nymph' that 'is at all points like a young wench that hath the green sicknes for want of occupying', who 'was drawn out of

⁴² Sir Thomas Norreys to the Privy Council, 9 December 1598, TNA: PRO, SP 63/202/4, f. 20r; Report by Henry Smyth on the present state of Munster, 1598, TNA: PRO, SP 63/202/3, f. 295v; St John, Viscount Grandison to the Privy Council, 9 April 1622, TNA: PRO, SP 63/236, f. 131r.

⁴³ Sir Walter Raleigh, *The discoverie of the large, rich, and bewtiful empire of Guiana* (London, 1596; STC 20634), sig. N4r.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

the womb of rebellion about sixteen years [ago]...and yet she wants a husband'.⁴⁵ In Samuel Purchas' 'Virginia's Verger', the Amerindians became the rapists, and the English those that would protect the land: 'like a modest Virgin she is now veiled with wild Couerts and shadie Woods, expecting rather rauishment then Mariage from her Natiue Sauages'.⁴⁶

Literature similarly linked the ease of possession with the submission of the unclothed. Decades before his more sober sermon to the Virginia Company, John Donne's interest in colonisation manifested itself in his manuscript poetry. The narrator of one sonnet slowly stripped his lover of each item of clothing – girdle, corset, gown, shoes – while paralleling this experience to the rapture of discovering the 'New' World, culminating in the climax of conquest: 'O my America! My new-found-land...my mine of precious stones, my emperie/How blest I am in discovering thee'.⁴⁷ Michael Drayton employed similar language in 'To a Virginian Voyage', endorsing the colony in 1606. The poem built up the image of a country ripe for picking – 'delicious', 'luscious', and 'subdued'.⁴⁸

Beyond the metaphorical, however, the prevailing association between the poorer Gaelic Irish and their nakedness, as with Amerindians, seemed to emphasise the reality of their 'savage' condition. The English, in changing their strategies from one of military conquest to colonisation according to Roman models, began to turn more rigorously to the means through which they would 'fashion' subjects by altering the manners of the Gaelic population in the later sixteenth century.⁴⁹ Excepting those who lived in walled downs, Andrew Trollope informed Francis Walsingham that the majority of Irish were 'heathen, or rather sauage, and brute bestes', indicated by barefoot men and women who 'goe commonly all naked, saveing onely a lose mantle hangeinge aboute them'.⁵⁰ The town-dwelling Irish were rarely commented on by English colonists, perhaps

⁴⁵ Luke Gernon, 'Discourse of Ireland (1620)', *CELT: Corpus of Electronic Texts*, Cork <www.ucc.ie/celt/published/E620001> [accessed 21 July 2014], pp. 349-50.

⁴⁶ Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimes* (London, 1625; STC 20509), sig. Mmmmmmm4v.

⁴⁷ John Donne, 'To His Mistress Going to Bed', in *The Major Works*, ed. John Carey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 12-13.

⁴⁸ Michael Drayton, 'Ode to the Virginian Voyage' (1606), in *The Works of Michael Drayton: Vol. II*, ed. William J Hebel (Oxford: Blackwell, 1932), pp. 363-4. It is interesting, though perhaps unintentional, that Drayton conjured a land full of laurel trees – in the Greek myth, Daphne asked to transform into a laurel tree to save herself from rape.

⁴⁹ Nicholas Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonisation: From Ireland to America', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 30:4 (1973), pp. 575-98; Canny, *Making Ireland British*, p. 52, also pp. 121-4.

⁵⁰ Andrew Trollope, *Reipublica benevolus*, to Walsyngham, 12 September 1581, TNA: PRO, SP 63/85, f. 97v.

because their urbanisation was seen as a positive step in achieving civility and Anglicisation. Initiatives by local lords allowed Munster to experience ‘an unprecedented level of commercial growth’ in the early seventeenth century, where trade networks in Europe and further east helped ‘lay the foundations for future mercantile links with the English Atlantic empire and reinforce imperial developments’.⁵¹ The English rarely distinguished between genuine poverty and active resistance, portraying the ‘mere’ Irish as similar to the vagrants seen to plague London and the English countryside. Arthur Chichester passed an act in 1611 against those who lived ‘loosely and freely’, descriptions that also labelled the problems with mantles.⁵²

The lack of shame associated with nakedness and incivility further emphasised that the Irish and Amerindians acted more like pagans than Christians. A lack of shame was unbiblical; Adam and Eve had immediately covered themselves after God expelled them from Eden. Christianity ‘had much to say on the topic of the unclothed body’, with shame, in a postlapsarian world, ‘a prerequisite for Christian salvation’, meaning that those who displayed no shame at being naked ‘were people whose souls were in danger’.⁵³ Conversely, observers praised those who seemed to show a sense of shame. ‘Being unwilling to be seene [in] their nakednesse [when changing mantles]’, wrote one New Englander, ‘they slip the one from under them in a decent manner...therin they seeme to have as much modesty as civilised people, and deserve to be applauded for it’.⁵⁴ People who did not feel shame were often assumed to lack self-awareness, rendering them mentally unstable. Sir Ralph Sadler, examining a man who had attempted to write to the Queen of Scots in 1584, reported to Francis Walsingham that the prisoner wore only a torn doublet and a pair of tattered orange hose.⁵⁵ Sadler eventually concluded that his detainee did not intend any harm to the state, but that his faculties had been marred by an unsound mind. His ‘gestures of body & other vnmann[er]ly behavyor...[and] wylde looks & meane apparel,’ Sadler

⁵¹ Jane Ohlmeyer, *Making Ireland English: The Irish Aristocracy in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), p. 381.

⁵² Quoted in Dunlevy, *Dress in Ireland*, p. 86.

⁵³ Philippa Levine, ‘States of Undress: Nakedness and the Colonial Imagination’, *Victorian Studies*, 50:2 (2008), pp. 189-219, p. 191.

⁵⁴ Thomas Morton, *New English Canaan* (London, 1637; STC 18203), sigs. D2v-D4r.

⁵⁵ Ralph Sadler to Francis Walsingham, 25 October 1584, TNA: PRO, SP 54/14, f. 16r.

concluded, were not fit for ‘a gentlemans eldist [son]’.⁵⁶ Unfitting behaviour manifested itself visually in disorderly and shoddy attire.

Such assumptions reflected views apparent in Erasmus’ *De civiltate morum puerilium* (1530), a key text used by Norbert Elias to highlight the shift towards civility in the sixteenth century.⁵⁷ Erasmus had outlined the proper conduct befitting a child reared in civil society, placing much emphasis on a child’s imitation of his betters. Subsequent conduct manuals highlighted this notion that education and decorum – or lack thereof – was demonstrated through one’s general demeanour, with the visual being a cue for forming impressions of others. Bodily carriage and dress became a manifestation of the inner man. In Sadler’s opinion, his prisoner’s mean attire and nonsensical babbling rendered him, if not treasonous, then mentally deficient, and English attempts to regulate Irish apparel demonstrated similar concerns in this regard. Though colonists might disagree on the best methods of achieving stability in a region, an adherence to English customs remained paramount.

‘Lett us converse with the people’, invited Luke Gernon in his manuscript account of Irish society in 1620, adding, teasingly: ‘Lord, what makes you so squeamish? – be not affrayd. The Irishman is no Caniball to eate you up’.⁵⁸ Gernon’s account, light-hearted and conversational, took his readers on a brief tour of the eastern coast. He described the town-dwelling Gaelic populations in careful detail, indicating the diversification of textiles in the taffeta, silk, velvet, and gold and silver thread and buttons worn by various members of society. He admitted that ‘in the country even among theyr Irish habitts they have sundry fashions’, and even described some of the styles particular to certain counties.⁵⁹ Yet Gernon’s descriptions still implied English superiority, with indigenous styles less refined than English ones. Brogues were ‘more rudely sewed than a shoo’, daggers made with ‘a rude wodden handle’.⁶⁰ ‘They are also wedded to theyr mantle’, he noted; ‘they plow, they ditch, they thressh with theyr mantles on’.⁶¹ The women were beautiful, but ‘drinke with you without controll’, wore

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ For a detailed exegesis of Erasmus’ text, see Norbert Elias, *The Civilising Process*, tr. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Blackwell, 1978), from p. 53.

⁵⁸ Gernon, ‘A discourse of Ireland’, p. 356.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 358.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 357.

⁶¹ Ibid.

crucifixes and bright mantles, and ornamented their hats with ‘precious stones...but most of them gawdy and made of paynted glasse’.⁶² ‘I would not have you suppose that all the Irish are thus strangely attyred’, Gernon qualified; ‘[t]he old women are loath to be shifted out of they auncient habitts’.⁶³ Such a remark hinted at the lingering memory of a society that had undergone profound change in the previous century.

By 1620, Gernon believed the English presence in Ireland to be well-established. The Irish were servile, crafty, and hungry for news, he callously wrote, because such were ‘the simptome of a conquered nation’.⁶⁴ Gernon’s remark supports Canny’s view that colonists in the early seventeenth century saw themselves as planters of civility in the aftermath of military conquest. The younger Gaelic generation, especially in the houses of the gentry and elite, were now ‘brought up to resemble the English, so that it is to be hoped, that the next age will wear out these disguyses’.⁶⁵ The word ‘disguyse’ is revealing. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a disguise could denote a bewildering fashion, or altered personal appearance to conceal a wearer’s identity.⁶⁶ Both senses of the word applied. English colonists often described Irish hairstyles and mantles as serving as disguises for rebels who sought to subvert English settlement, as will be discussed below. At the same time, in using the term ‘disguise’, traditional Irish apparel became the strange or incongruous fashion, even in its own realm; it was stripped of its cultural prominence and turned into a marginal, even counterfeit, style.

Praising the exploits of Sir Henry Sidney’s deputyship, John Derrick, present with Sidney on campaign, created an evocative image of the Irish kern, or foot soldier, based on how they chose to apparel themselves. Composed in verse, Derrick’s descriptions of Irish dress invited the audience to imagine savagery through appearance. Irish hairstyles, the rejection of hats, and shirts with trailing sleeves, all conjured a people whose backwardness encouraged rebellious behaviour:

With writhed glibbes like wicked Sprits [*sic*],
 With visage rough and stearne.
 With sculles vpon their poules,

⁶² Ibid., pp. 357-8.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 359.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 356.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 359.

⁶⁶ ‘Disguise, n.’, *Oxford English Dictionary Online* <www.oed.com> [accessed 22 July 2014].

In stead of ciuill Cappes...

Their shirtes be verie straunge,
Not reachyng past the thie;
With pleates on pleates thei pleated are,
As thicke as pleates maie lye.

Whose sleues hang trailing doune
Almost vnto the Shoe:
And with a Mantell commonlie,
The Irishe Karne doe goe...

Like as their weedes be straunge,
And monstrous to beholde:
So doe their maners far surpasse,
Them all a thousande folde...

In maners thei be rude,
And monstrous eke in fashion:
Their dealynges also do bewraie,
A crooked generation.⁶⁷

Beyond Derrick's moralistic commentary, the clothing he described may not have been too far exaggerated from actual styles, as the surviving fragment of pleated jacket, mantle, and pair of trousers found in a Kilcommon bog indicate.⁶⁸ To Derrick, these styles were part of a larger narrative of Irish savagery. They ate from wooden plates, sat on the ground eating with 'long stabbers...in steede of handsome kniues', and their raw meat appeared as 'gobbes of fleshe not boyld enough'.⁶⁹ Observers like Derrick, Edmund Spenser, Barnabe Rich, and Sir John Davies repeatedly commented on how the Irish manner of dressing, seen alternatively as simple or garish, became an outward show of their inner natures. 'There is not a little in the garment', noted Spenser, 'to the fashioning of the minde'.⁷⁰

Regulating Attire

Recent work on consumption in sixteenth-century Ireland demonstrates a diversification of product types and new goods.⁷¹ Excavations of dwellings in Dublin have revealed velvets, silks, reused garments, ribbons, lace, buttons, and

⁶⁷ John Derrick, *The image of Irelande* (London, 1581; STC 6734), sigs. B3r-B4r.

⁶⁸ See Audrey S. Henshall, Wildred A. Seaby *et al.*, 'The Dungen Costume', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology* 24/25 (1961/1962), pp. 119-42.

⁶⁹ Derrick, *The image of Ireland*, sigs. Fv-F2r.

⁷⁰ Edmund Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland*, ed. Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), p. 73.

⁷¹ Susan Flavin, 'Consumption and Material Culture in Sixteenth-Century Ireland', *Economic History Review* 64:4 (2011), pp. 1144-74.

other imports from European trading ports, suggesting that Irish consumer habits were already changing before English colonisation.⁷² London merchant companies, lured by the opportunities for trade, made up a significant percentage of the communities in towns and plantations in Munster and Londonderry, where haberdashers and clothworkers brought English styles to Irish towns.⁷³ It is not the purpose of this section to deny that the Irish trades were burgeoning and in some cases well-established, but to explore why certain Irish fashions caused such concern among New English colonists and privy councillors in London in lieu of their civilising projects.

While a small percentage of the population undoubtedly followed the latest fashions coming in from England or Spain – seen, for example, in the arrival of the ruff in elite portraits from the 1610s – the focus here is on the significance of certain styles that took on especially charged meanings in a colonial context.⁷⁴ Margaret Jaster’s essay begins to explore how ‘a sartorial message’ might ‘sabotage...verbal messages’, though her article focuses largely on sources from the medieval to the early Elizabethan period.⁷⁵ A focus on the politics of apparel moves away from the economics of trade and commodification, questioning instead why policy-makers and captains wrote about – and simplified – Irish dress in such detail.

The Irish, the English constantly iterated, insisted on wearing

Mantles and longe *Glibbes*, which is a thicke curled bush of haire, hanging downe over their eyes, and monstrously disguising them, which are both very bad and hurtfull.⁷⁶

The primary concern was not that these mantles looked unsophisticated, but that they allowed dangerous mobility. This was illustrated by Albrecht Dürer’s 1521 drawings of attendants to Irish mercenaries, which depicted the mantles and ‘glibs’ the English were so intent on eradicating [Figure 3.2]. Spenser believed mantles allowed the Irish to seek refuge in the woods, using their mantles as beds. This allowed individuals to remain ‘far from the danger of law’ by making ‘his

⁷² Ibid., pp. 1148, 1166.

⁷³ Nicholas Canny, *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560 – 1800* (Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1988), p. 82.

⁷⁴ Susan Flavin, ‘Consumption and Material Culture in Sixteenth-Century Ireland’ (University of Bristol, unpublished PhD thesis, 2011), p. 89.

⁷⁵ Margaret Rose Jaster, ‘“Out of all frame and good fashion”: Sartorial Resistance as Political Spectacle’, *The Irish Review* 34 (2006), pp. 44-57, p. 56.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 56. Mantles were a primary signifier of Irish customs in continental costume books and woodcuts by Albrecht Dürer, Lucas de Heere, John Derrick, and John Speed.

Mantle his house...[covering] himself from the wrath of Heaven...and from the sight of men.⁷⁷ In this way, the Irish were seen to operate within a built environment of their own making, one that became an alternative to civil living; they had turned cloth into a ‘house’ that existed outside the city or plantation. Derrick’s woodcuts, accompanying his aforementioned poem, reinforced this. Irish rebels were shown lurking in the woods, wrapped in their mantles, with wild animals for company.⁷⁸ Spenser also described mantles as makeshift tents, where the Irish could subvert English campaigns by becoming thieves, hiding weapons among their folds.



Figure 3.2. Detail from Albrecht Dürer drawing, ‘Irish Warriors and Peasants’ (1521), Jean Michel Massing, ‘Albrecht Dürer’s Irish Warriors and Peasants’, *Irish Arts Review Yearbook*, 10 (1994), pp. 223-6, p. 225.

For women, Spenser believed a mantle might hide their pregnancies and allow them to rear future rebels:

When she hath filled her vessell, under it she can hide bothe her burden, and her blame; and when her Bastard is borne, it serves instead of swadling cloutes.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Spenser, *View of the State of Ireland*, p. 57.

⁷⁸ The copy of Derrick’s *The image of Irelande* in the British Library does not contain woodcut plates. These images exist exclusively in the National Library of Edinburgh, De.3.76.

⁷⁹ Spenser, *View of the State of Ireland*, p. 58.

Though the army promised death to any soldier who forced themselves upon women while on campaign, Spenser's blame was not directed at the conduct of the soldiers but the willingness of Irish women to become pregnant. Illegitimacy subverted the correct distribution of lands and titles, already heavily criticised in the Gaelic practices of tanistry. John Davies similarly complained that 'even bastards' were considered legitimate and 'held themselves to be Gentlemen', disturbing the social order but also the politics of inheritance and land rights.⁸⁰ In order to achieve regional ascendancy, colonists suggested they 'forbid all mantles'.⁸¹

The Munster colonist Sir William Herbert compiled a list that detailed why mantles should be prohibited in 1589. The problem with mantles, Herbert wrote, was that these garments served

vnto the Irishe as to a hedghogge his skynne, or to a snaile her shell, for a garment by daie, and a house by night. It maketh them w[i]th the contynuall vse of it, more apt and able to liue out and lie out in boggs and woods...and therby [the Irish] are lesse addicted to a loyall dutifull and civill lieffe.⁸²

Despite the influence of his 'Croftus, sive de Hibernia Liber', written in the early 1590s, on the policies and works of Richard Becon and Edmund Spenser, Herbert made considerable effort to reform the Irish by non-violent means. This led to bitter disagreements with fellow colonists Sir Edward Denny and Sir Valentine Dale, who complained to Francis Walsingham about Herbert's tactics. 'If Sir Wiliam [is] to gayne him self...thankes among the Irish', Denny spat, let 'not vs suffer for his humor'.⁸³

Herbert's desire to reform Ireland by transforming its mores led him to translate the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments into Gaelic to inspire private prayer. It also induced him to seek to abolish Irish apparel as a key strategy in achieving political stability. Writing in the years before the outbreak of the Nine Years War in 1594, at a time when Hugh O'Neill began to reject English policies

⁸⁰ Sir John Davies, *A discourse of the true causes why Ireland was neuer entirely subdued* (London, 1612; STC 6348), sig. G2r.

⁸¹ Spenser, *View of the State of Ireland*, p. 58.

⁸² Sir William Herbert, 'A note of sutch reasons as mooued mea toe putt the statute in execution against Irish habites', 1589, TNA: PRO, SP 63/114, f. 186v.

⁸³ Sir Edward Denny to Francis Walsingham, 25 July 1589, TNA: PRO, SP 63/145, f. 178v. These disagreements led to an investigation by the privy council, though the churchmen and Gaelic noblemen who knew Herbert personally spoke highly of him. See Commission from Queen Elizabeth for hearing and ending of controversies between the undertakers, 26 April 1587, TNA: PRO, SP 63/129, f. 47; Sir William Herbert to Lord Burghley, 20 October 1588, TNA: PRO, SP 63/127, f. 140.

more openly and to put pressure on his Gaelic allies, Herbert recognised the importance of the visual in securing loyalty:

The com[m]on people and multitude beinge more led by the eie then by any other sorce, seeing vs in a strange attire from them and they from vs, haue thereby a contynuall testynonie in their eie that they are different people from vs and we from them, strangers and alienes: wh[i]ch breedeth & confirmeth in them a strangeness and alienac[i]on of myndes from vs, our lawes & gouernment.⁸⁴

The English seemed threatening, Herbert argued, because they looked, from an Irish perspective, like strangers. The Irish could not be amenable to accepting fundamental changes in their government if they did not accustom themselves to the English in their territories; a sense of difference would only continue to cause resentment, especially among the illiterate in society. To allow the Irish to persist in their ‘wearing of rude and barbarous attire’ would allow ‘rudeness and barbarisme’ to prevail, whereas ‘wearing ciuill handsom & clealie apparel receiveth a persuac[i]on and adoptac[i]on vnto handsomnes & cleanelynes and Ciuilitie’.⁸⁵ It would also, of course, begin to make Irish apparel appear foreign. Eliminating cultural difference would be the first step to dissolving that ‘alienac[i]on of myndes’ that accompanied this visual incongruence, for ‘[t]he vnitie of apparel and maner of cloathing’ was directly related to ‘the combinac[i]on of nations’.⁸⁶

‘Decorum’, Herbert concluded, ‘taketh roote in the hartes and myndes of men’ and ‘indureth them to all cyvill behavio[u]r, good demeanure and honestie’.⁸⁷ To allow mantles to be worn was to allow ‘habits’ – clothing – to dictate habit, leading men to ‘all disorder, dissoluteness and impuritie’.⁸⁸ Like so many travellers before him, Herbert was appalled by Irish hygiene, drawing a correlation between disorder and impurity. In a letter to Lord Burghley in 1587, he wrote that although the wealthier Gaelic lords were treacherous, the poor were ‘verie filthie’, and he wondered which would be easier to subdue.⁸⁹ To submit to English law without casting off the styles of the former regime, Barnabe Rich believed, would only breed contempt of law, inciting rebellion and ‘the vtter

⁸⁴ Sir William Herbert, ‘A note of sutch reasons as mooued mea toe putt the statute in execution against Irish habites’, 1589, TNA: PRO, SP 63/114, f. 186r.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Sir William Herbert to Lord Burghley, 30 April 1587, TNA: PRO, SP 63/129, f. 102r.

decay... of countries and kingdomes'.⁹⁰ A civil body required an outward display of conformity, but one made on purely English terms.

This called for a stricter implementation of laws which, as the council in Dublin stressed, had already been laid out in previous decades by former governors. Richard Bingham, governor of Connaught, wrote that the lord deputy, council members, and 'other officers of justice in the Sessions' were in favour of attendants wearing English apparel, with fines and imprisonment forced on any 'attired in mantles and rolls'.⁹¹ In 1625, the lords justices in Dublin published an ordinance that called for the justices of assize to abolish

the vse of Irish apparel, & the reducing of all men to vse a ciuill and comely attire, according to the Lawes and Statutes of this kingdome:...[and] to take away the barbarous custome of wearing Mantles, Trowses, Skeynes, and such like vniciuill and vncomedy apparell.⁹²

The statutes noted that James had often 'recommended the care of the redresse of the said barbarous custome to Us'.⁹³ Certainly Arthur Chichester had written to Robert Cecil in 1609 desiring the Irish who joined English armies to be given 'apparel after the English fashion', asking whether the king might cover the expenditure.⁹⁴

The document's reference to previous laws and statutes may have been similar to those issued by lord justice Sir William Drury in 1579. These ordered the 'forbiddinge and restrainingge of Irishe apparell, to be worne by her ma[ies]t[ies] subiectes w[i]thin this Realme'.⁹⁵ Drawing an explicit link between English apparel and dutiful English subjects immediately rendered Irish apparel subversive. Appalled by the gentlemen 'of no meane calling and estate' who continued in this 'vniciuill custome', Drury ordered that any man over the age of twenty who appeared in law courts of sessions, 'or any other publicke assembly of Iustice, in Irishe apparell' be fined, and forbidden from further attendance.⁹⁶

Governors like Bingham also specified that council members were to be prohibited from wearing glibs, a hair style (long in the front, shorter in the back)

⁹⁰ Rich, *A short suruey of Ireland*, sig. F4v.

⁹¹ A book of instructions touching the province of Connaught, 11 July 1588, TNA: PRO, SP 63/135, f. 221r.

⁹¹ *By the Lords Deputie and Councell whereas for preuention of such disorder, ryots, and rebellions within this realme* (Dublin, 1625; STC 14190.5) [single sheet].

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Sir Arthur Chichester to the ear of Salisbury, 16 August 1609, TNA: PRO, SP 63/227, f. 80r.

⁹⁵ Proclamation by the Lord Justice Drury, 19 March 1579, TNA: PRO, SP 63/66, f. 24r.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

that the English also found necessary to address. Like the mantle, colonists believed them to supplement the wearer's tendency towards subversion: 'the Irish glibbes, they are as fit maskes as a mantle is for a thiefe'.⁹⁷ When Irenius, in Spenser's dialogue, pointed out that the English, too, sometimes wore their hair long, Eudoxus noted that it was the reason behind the style that made it intolerable. 'For whensoever he hath run himselfe into that peril of law, that he will not be knowne, he either cutteth of his glibbe...or pulleth it so low downe over his eyes, that it is very hard to discern' his true countenance.⁹⁸ When the captain Barnabe Rich described the Irish in 1610, he noted that 'the vnciuill sort so disfigure themselues with their *Glybs*...and their mishapen attire', making them 'rude, vncleanlie, and unciuill...cruell, bloudie minded, [and] apt and ready to commit any kinde of mischiefe'.⁹⁹

If necessary, the New English would cut off glibs by force. To enforce civility, the Irish must be 'reclaimed...from their wilderness', an act that required drastic measures in which the language of 'cutting off' mirrored the notion of pruning or correcting discussed in Chapter Two.¹⁰⁰ The statutes from Dublin also demanded that any who wore mantles in public places were to have them forcibly removed. 'Such men as they shall finde wearing of Mantles or Trowses outside of their owne houses', the lords justices commanded, were to have these taken from them 'and before their faces to cut them into peeces, that they neuer be worse againe'.¹⁰¹ Fears that Irish hairstyles altered appearance was a recurring theme in reports sent back to London. 'Such as doo come in to vs', Ralph Rokeby wrote to William Cecil from Connaught, 'we cause to cut ther glybbez w[hi]c[h] we doo thynke the first token of obedyence'.¹⁰² John Perrot boasted that he had caused the Irish to forgo this hairstyle within his jurisdiction, and the earl of Tyrone, when making his submission to Elizabeth, was required to

⁹⁷ Spenser, *View of the State of Ireland*, p. 59.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ Barnabe Rich, *A new description of Ireland* (London, 1610; STC 20992), sig. D4r.

¹⁰⁰ Davies, *A discoverie of the true causes*, sig. Mm2r. 'Like as the corrupt braunches and unwholesome boughs are first to bee pruned, and the foule mosse cleansed and scraped away', Spenser, *View of the State of Ireland*, p. 93.

¹⁰¹ *By the Lords Deputie and Councill whereas for preuention of such disorder, ryots, and rebellions within this realme* [single sheet].

¹⁰² Master Ralph Rokeby to Cecil, 4 January 1570, TNA: PRO, SP 63/30, f. 8v; [Meeting] At Greenwich, 17 July 1590, TNA: PRO, PC 2/17, f. 754r.

promise the privy council that he would make his subjects wear English apparel and cut their hair.¹⁰³

Rules against the public wearing of mantles and Irish trousers targeted all members of society, including gentlemen and members of the elite. John Speed's images of the Irish in 1612 depicted mantles as universally worn among the Irish, though embellished differently. Herbert noted that the 'richer sort' were already more civil than the poorer members of society, and that clothing might be one means of drawing them to admire English customs.¹⁰⁴ It was possible to appeal to their desire for refinement by gifting them with English fashions. James promised '[p]arcells of Clothing' to the earl of Desmond on the condition that he 'disuse the Irish habit'.¹⁰⁵ An Irishman in Virginia recognised the tactic: the 'natives of the land...go clothed in well-dressed deer-skins', yet 'the English sent the Emperor a crown of polished copper...and silk robes for himself, his wives and his children'.¹⁰⁶ While he praised the Algonquian skins for their impressive craftsmanship, the observer equally recognised the English desire to supplant native attire.

The Irish who did adopt English dress were praised for their shows of civility and conformity. Anthony Bacon wrote to the earl of Essex in 1600, recommending an Irishman for employment and noting that he had 'put himself into English attire...the day of his arrival', gaining him access at court.¹⁰⁷ John Long, archbishop of Armagh, wrote to Sir Francis Walsingham commending Sir John Perrot's efforts in Ireland, noting that the lords from Ulster had arrived at Dublin Castle apparelled in English styles.¹⁰⁸ They were beginning, Long maintained, 'to acknowledge their olde follye', and this had manifested itself in the way they had appeared 'stripped of their Irishe weades, and apparelled w[i]th Englishe attire, craving the winge of...Government'.¹⁰⁹ Local captains and

¹⁰³ Lord President Perrot to Burghley, 18 June 1573, TNA: PRO, SP 63/41, f. 121r.

¹⁰⁴ Sir William Herbert to Lord Burghley, 30 April 1587, TNA: PRO, SP 63/129, f. 102r; [Meeting] at Greenwich, 17 June 1590, TNA: PRO, PC 2/17, f. 755r.

¹⁰⁵ 'Parcells of Clothing, &c. to be delivered to the said Bisshop', in *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts: With Indexes of Persons, Places, and Matters: Vol. I*, ed. Robert Nares et al. (London: Record Commission, 1808), p. 308.

¹⁰⁶ 'Francis Mangel's relation and the beginnings of the Jamestown Colony', July 1610, in *The Jamestown Voyages Under the First Charter, 1606 – 1609, Volume I*, ed. Philip L. Barbour (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 154. The fabrics, it turned out, were not silk, but low-quality wool.

¹⁰⁷ Anthony Bacon to Lord Essex, 19 September 1600, Hatfield MS, CP 81/77r.

¹⁰⁸ Doctor John Long, Archbishop of Armagh, to Walsynham, 4 June 1585, TNA: PRO, SP 63/117, f. 29r.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

governors reported in letters and depositions when, in the midst of regional conflict, certain Gaelic gentlemen accepted to attire themselves according to English fashions, seeing it as an inclination to accept reform. ‘Besides the rude people of this cuntrey [Wexford] did show their inclination to ciuility’, Davies recounted in 1606, ‘the principall gentlemen freeholders act of appearing publicly in English attire became an act of submission. Similarly, Arthur Chichester reported that the gentlemen in the counties of Tyrone, Armagh, and Colerain had ‘reformed themselues in their habyte...beyond others’, with the majority having ‘putt on English apparel...[promising] to lyve in townreeds’.¹¹⁰

Conversely, the Gaelic lords who continued to appear in their native dress were a subject of derision. Andrew Trollope wrote that the ‘Erle of Clancar & the Lo[rd] Morrrys’ presented themselves to the lord deputy in their ‘best robe, or garm[en]t’, but that was a ‘russett irishe mantle not worth about a crowne a peece’.¹¹¹ This recalls the similar dismissal of native customs in America, such as Sir Walter Cope’s letter to Robert Cecil in 1607. ‘Pohatan, an other of the kinges, came stately marchinge w[i]th a great payre of buckes hornes fastened to his forehead’, Sir Walter Cope described, adding wryly, ‘not knowinge what esteeme we make of men so marked’.¹¹² Powhatan’s regal status did not exempt him from being seen as a ridiculous figure – a cuckold. John Smith, reporting on the tribes he encountered in Virginia, likened the Amerindians’ simple styles with their tendency to violence. Describing the Susquehannocks, an Iroquois people whose lands bordered the Chesapeake, Smith described one man who wore ‘the head of a Woolfe hanging in a chaine for a Iewell’.¹¹³ This man also had a ‘[t]obacco pipe 3 quarters of a yard long, prettily carued with a Bird...or some such devise...sufficient to beat out the braines of a man’.¹¹⁴ This tribe, wrote another observer, ‘with a great painted beares skin...covered our Captine [Smith]’ and showed the English ‘18 mantles made of divers sorts of skinnes...with many other toys’.¹¹⁵ The careful displays of power expressed by indigenous societies through

¹¹⁰ Sir Arthur Chichester to Salisbury, 27 September 1610, TNA: PRO, SP 63/229, f. 133v.

¹¹¹ Andrew Trollope, Reipublicus benevolus, to Walsyngham, 12 September 1581, TNA: PRO, SP 63.85, f. 97v.

¹¹² Sir Walter Cope to Lord Salisbury, August 1607, Hatfield MS, CP 124/18r.

¹¹³ John Smith, *A map of Virginia* (Oxford, 1612; STC 22791), sig. A4v.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ ‘The proceedings of the English colonie in Virginia’ (1612), in *The Jamestown Voyages Under the First Charter, 1606 – 1609: Vol. II*, ed. Philip L. Barbour (London: Hakluyt Society, 1969), p. 408.

their choice in attire became, to English colonists, mere a further mark of their lack of sophistication.

In order to encourage conformity, the English targeted younger members of Irish society. Wards, Spenser believed, should be raised in civil places, lest they be ‘brought up lewdly, and Irish-like, but also for ever after so bound to [the rebels’] services’.¹¹⁶ Sending the sons of Irish noblemen to Oxford and Cambridge removed them from political access in Ireland while indoctrinating them in Protestantism and English manners. Maurice O’Brien professed his allegiance to Elizabeth because she had sent him to Oxford and Cambridge, of which he remained grateful.¹¹⁷ In 1602, Sir George Carew reported that Cormack McDermond’s son at Oxford must be carefully observed, for there were ‘great expectations’ for him on his return.¹¹⁸ In 1607, with a more aggressive colonisation campaign in Ulster under James, the English found themselves in an especially strong position to dictate who filled the vacuums of power caused by the ‘flight’ of the earls. The earl of Thomond wrote to Robert Cecil requesting that his son return to Ireland so that he might be instructed in running his estate.¹¹⁹ He felt especially compelled to do so after hearing there were plans to marry his son without his consent – another tactic employed by the English to prevent the consolidation of dynastic houses in Ireland.

Clothing as Resistance

How efficient were English laws against Irish apparel, and what can be inferred about the choice of individuals to retain local styles of dress even when instructed not to? After being introduced to English civility, whether in plantations or in courts of law, the Irish could no longer claim ignorance of ‘proper’ comportment, and the English often considered the Irish adherence to their fashions as a symbol of active resistance, tied to their broader refusal to accept the laws and customs of the English, including Protestantism. Criticising fellow planter William Herbert, Edward Denny complained that Herbert ‘hath geven it out in Inghland that all hear go in Inghlish apparel’.¹²⁰ This, however, was ‘vntru for the most part, and those that ar as [he] tearmed them in Inghlish apparel

¹¹⁶ Spenser, *View of the State of Ireland*, p. 96.

¹¹⁷ Maurice O’Brien to Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam, 22 December 1573, TNA: PRO, SP 63/44, f. 9r. See also Charles Duinny to Lord Cecil, August 1604, Hatfield MS, CP Petitions 721.

¹¹⁸ Sir George Carew to Secretary Cecil, 20 August 1602, TNA: PRO, SP 63/212, f. 50r.

¹¹⁹ Earl of Thomond to Salisbury, 11 December 1607, TNA: PRO, SP 63/222, ff. 285r-v.

¹²⁰ Sir Edward Denny to Walsingham, 25 July 1589, TNA: PRO, SP 63/145, ff. 178r-v.

are must thus clad, for example, I send you a clok[e]'.¹²¹ Sending a mantle to court was clearly meant to reinforce the fact that attempts to instil civility had been unsuccessful. Targeting clothing may be a strategic plan, Denny maintained, but it had failed to reform the province of Munster. In reality, most garments beyond simple English-made cloaks were 'all Irish, or the men naked with such a clok[e]'.¹²² Appeals to civility were the refuge of those 'devoyd of experiens of this people': 'justice without mercie must first tame and com[m]and them', Denny advised the council in London, or the Irish would 'neuer be drawn to god or civil good'.¹²³

Denny accused the Irish of refusing English attire not out of ignorance of proper attire but out of choice. As one observer in a parliament in 1585 noted, the Irish 'disdain to sort themselves in fashion unto us, which in their opinion would more plainly manifest our Conquest over them'.¹²⁴ 'Macswyny Fanaght sat w[i]th vs as a Justice of peace', wrote Sir Robert Jacob, solicitor-general of Ireland, to the earl of Salisbury in 1609, but nonetheless 'came in an vncivill manner in his mantle'.¹²⁵ In 1602, Lord Mountjoy complained that the Gaelic in the localities chose to wear their mantles not for lack of other options, but because 'the barbarous Customes in habits of apparell in their poets or herauldes' served to 'inchant' them 'in sauage manners and sundry other such dregges of barbarism and Rebellion... already forbidden'.¹²⁶ Such 'inchantments' reinforced the interplay between clothing and language, where the appearance of heralds in local courts, presumably sharing stories and news in the Gaelic tongue, were presenting the 'dregs of barbarism' both through language and their attire.

Luke Gernon similarly reported, some twenty years later, than gentlemen had failed to abandon their traditional dress. 'The better sorte are apparelled at all poynts like the English', Gernon wrote, 'onely they retayne theyr mantle'.¹²⁷ The style itself did not present problems, and Gernon pointed out that mantles were similar to long cloaks. The issue was instead that the Gaelic lords knew these styles were forbidden, yet wore them anyway. 'Because they are commanded at

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Quoted in Jaster, "'Out of all frame and good fashion": Sartorial Resistance as Political Spectacle', p. 55.

¹²⁵ Sir Robert Jacob to the earl of Salisbury, 15 April 109, TNA: PRO, SP 63/226, f. 188v.

¹²⁶ Suggestions by Lord Mountjoy for the Government of Ireland, 1602, Hatfield MS, CP 139/138r.

¹²⁷ Gernon, 'A discourse of Ireland', p. 356.

publicke assemblyes to come in English habit, they have a tricke...to take off the fringe, and to putt on a cape'.¹²⁸ When the assemblies ended, they 'resume it agayne', so that those who 'aske an Irishman for his cloke, he will tell you it is in his pocket and show you his cape'.¹²⁹ Gernon's remarks reflect his awareness of the laws against apparel, and that there were efforts to make Irish gentlemen adhere to them in public assemblies. They also highlight the ways in which the Irish learned to adapt to such laws, inventing a means of appearing in expected attire – and therefore continuing to involve themselves in policy-making in Dublin – while refusing to allow such apparel to be a fixed mark of their allegiances.

This fluidity of allegiances, despite shows of cultivating English civility, can be seen in Sir John Harrington's encounter with the earl of Tyrone's two sons in 1599. Hugh and Henry were well-learned and charming, Harrington observed, and could recite from his English translation of Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*. Their demeanours were refined, and they 'dressed in English clothes, with velvet jerkins and gold lace'.¹³⁰ Yet Tyrone's sons were also tutored by Aodh Mac Aingil, a counter-Reformation priest affiliated with the Jesuit college at Louvain who supported Tyrone's pro-Spanish policies.¹³¹ The velvet and gilt embroideries were indicative of changing tastes among the nobility, but a broader accessibility to materials were not necessarily based on trade with English ports (notably Bristol), but also with Spain and France. While gentleman may have seemed amenable to English civility, an engagement with European culture allowed them to seek allies elsewhere, as Tyrone had been doing for decades.

The 1625 statutes also indicated that the numerous laws against apparel from the previous decades had not been properly adhered to, despite efforts by men like Gernon. Behind the promises made by colonists to the council in London that the situation was improving, hints of failure were apparent. The lords justices of Dublin complained that although they had instructed the assizes to bar the Gaelic from wearing mantles, the use of them 'rather increased then any ways reformed or abated, euen to this day, to the great contempt of autoritie, and the disgrace of this kingdome among other ciuill nations'.¹³² The justices called for

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Quoted in Nicholas Canny, 'O'Neill, Hugh, second earl of Tyrone (1550-1616)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <www.oxforddnb.com> [accessed 21 July 2014].

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² *By the Lords Deputie and Councill whereas for preuention of such disorder, ryots, and rebellions within this realme.*

policy-makers in Ireland to ‘inflict the vtmost penaltie of law vpon such as from and after the time hereby prescribed shall resume eyther to weare the said barbarous attire, or to suffer any within their family or rule to weare and vse the same’.¹³³ The justices praised the subjects who attired themselves according to the laws, but in doing so were forced to admit that a lack of English apparel sprang less from unavailability than personal choice.

It is possible to infer this contempt of English interference in the repeated laws issued by Elizabeth and James’ governors, but there are also instances in which apparel reflected political contempt in a more obvious way. When Shane O’Neill visited Elizabeth’s court in 1562, he surrounded himself with soldiers ‘who had their heads naked, and curled haire hanging on their shoulders’, with ‘yellow shirts, as if they had been died with Saffron...and rough hairy Clokes’.¹³⁴ Elizabeth accepted O’Neill’s public submission, but O’Neill’s choice in retinue displayed a conscious desire to retain the customs of his country even in the face of outward surrender. 1573, Gerald Fitzgerald, earl of Desmond, returned to Ireland after years of imprisonment in London. When he arrived home, he immediately ‘put on Irish raieiment and made proclamation that no deputie nor...sheriff should practice office in his countreye’.¹³⁵ Here, the choice to cast off his English attire was a powerful act that rejected English rule, and indeed Desmond continued to do so until he died in 1583. The persistence of Irish styles of dress and headwear in tomb effigies also indicated an adherence to old styles of dress, where ‘an eclectic but distinct style... persisted despite the political and cultural pressure to conform’.¹³⁶

The wearing, or absence, of hats was also significant. In many reports, removing a hat reflected public submission to English authority. The lord deputy Arthur Grey, describing the capitulation of Turlough Lynagh, noted that it was only after the ‘passions and alteracions’ were ‘tempered...to any conformity’ that the man was able ‘with humility, to...put of [*sic*] his hatte’.¹³⁷ The earl of Ormond wrote to Elizabeth in 1597, describing the earl of Tyrone’s desire to submit

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Quoted in Jaster, “‘Out of all frame and good fashion’: Sartorial Resistance as Political Spectacle”, p. 51.

¹³⁵ Elizabeth Wincott Heckett, ‘Tomb Effigies and Archaic Dress in Sixteenth-Century Ireland’, *Clothing Culture, 1350 – 1650*, ed. Catherine Richardson (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 63-75.

¹³⁶ Flavin, ‘Consumption and Material Culture in Sixteenth-Century Ireland’, p. 1171; Heckett, ‘Tomb Effigies and Archaic Dress in Sixteenth-Century Ireland’, p. 70.

¹³⁷ Lord Deputy Grey to the Privy Council, 12 August 1581, TNA: PRO, SP 63/85, f. 30v.

himself to the queen. ‘He came to me...[with] moste reuerent and humble speches’, Ormond wrote, ‘w[i]th his hatt in his hande’.¹³⁸ When the earl of Ormond himself was taken prisoner in 1600, the English took his sword, dagger, and hat, implying that such an object served an important symbolic function when taking political prisoners.¹³⁹ In other instances, the presence of hats were seen as specifically associated with Englishness. Fynes Moryson noted that the Irish rebels, because of their long hair, ‘have no use of cap or hat’.¹⁴⁰ It was therefore significant that the earl of Tyrone reportedly expressed admiration for his sometime-ally Maguire, lord of Fermanagh, because he would not ‘suffer a man to passe...that weares a hatt on his head, or a clok on his back, or that speakes a worde of Englishe, withoute taking his head from his shoulders’.¹⁴¹

In America, the use of apparel to resist English cultural impositions was perhaps most blatantly evidenced in the figure of Nemattanew, a close advisor of Powhatan’s militant brother. ‘A small company goeing by the water’, George Percy described in a letter to his brother, they were ‘dyv[e]rs tymes assawlted and encowntered by the salvages beinge sentt from Powhatan, haveinge for their Leader one...Comonly called amongste us Jacke of the feathers’.¹⁴² This evocative name was adopted ‘[b]y Reason thatt he used to come into the felde all Covered over w[i]th feathers and Swans wings fastened unto his showlders as thowghe he meant to flye’.¹⁴³ The derisive name of Jack-of-the-feathers imposed by the English served to belittle his power, but it also testifies to the vibrancy of Nemattanew’s constructed image. The Powhatan, Smith reported, believed Namattanew to be immune to English firepower, and his battle attire served as a vivid focus for the resistance of others.

English commentators found Nemattanew’s clothing to be one of the most significant aspects of his resistance, but bodily markers and hairstyles also testify to the continuing traditions that persisted throughout the colonial period. Bodily paint and tattoos were an assertion of difference, one that remained engrained in

¹³⁸ The earl of Ormonde to the Privy Council, 10 December 1597, TNA: PRO, SP 63/201, f. 240r. See also Stephen Duff, Mayor of Drogheda, to the Lord Deputy and Council, 13 April 1603, TNA: PRO, SP 63/215, f. 66r.

¹³⁹ Extract out of the Lord President of Munster’s letters concerning the Earl of Ormonde’s taking prisoner, 12 April 1600, TNA: PRO, SP 63/207/2, f. 252r.

¹⁴⁰ Quoted in Henshall, ‘The Dungiven Costume’, p. 131.

¹⁴¹ Declaration of Darby Newman of speeches used by the earl of Tyrone, 19 February 1594, TNA: PRO, SP 63/173, f. 173r.

¹⁴² Nicholls, ‘George Percy’s “Trew Relacyon”: A Primary Source for the Jamestown Settlement’, p. 216.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

the skin even if certain items of clothing, like linen shirts, were sometimes adopted. John White's Roanoke watercolours, later adapted by Theodore de Bry, displayed the various markings that dotted and embellished the skin. One New England observer noted that these were 'not a superficial painting, but a certain incision...by a small sharpe instrument, under which they conveigh a certain kind of black unchangeable inke'.¹⁴⁴ This permanence, to English observers, indicated a stubborn pride in local culture. One chief 'will not stick to say, hee is all one with King *Charles*. He thinkes hee can...conquer kingdomes with his conceit', an attitude not unrelated to the insistence on retaining native fashions and the refusal to 'conforme to our *English* apparell'.¹⁴⁵

Degeneration and Anti-Savagery

Irish and Amerindian customs only reinforced, to English observers, the belief that these peoples were not unlike the ancient Picts and Britons, the 'savage Nations' that had once peopled England. They, too, 'by the meanes of artificiall incisions of sundry forms' had created 'markes deeply imprinted within their bodies', and it was believed the trait of underdeveloped societies to esteem 'durable skars' that 'cause their limbs to drinke in much painting and colour'.¹⁴⁶ A better knowledge of their own past, aided by the works of emerging antiquarians like William Camden, Sir Robert Cotton, and Sir Henry Spelman, reminded the English of their own past incivility. Underneath their insistence on their own cultural superiority, English fears of degeneration remained paramount. Tacitus, often quoted in Jacobean discourse, had warned of the dangers of degeneration in the context of expansion, and the English Pale offered colonists a pertinent contemporary example, not least because of their continued adherence to Catholicism.¹⁴⁷ Like many before him, George Carew noted in 1611 that 'the best part of the realme (the Englishe pale) is now the most obstinent'.¹⁴⁸ The Old English, he complained, were religiously superstitious and political unreliable,

¹⁴⁴ William Wood, *New Englands prospect* (London, 1634; STC 25957), sig. Kv.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, sigs. Kr-v.

¹⁴⁶ William Camden, *Britain*, tr. Philemon Holland (London, 1637; STC 4510.8), sig. C4r. Numerous editions of Camden's *Britannia* circulated in Latin from 1586 before the publication of this English translation.

¹⁴⁷ J.H.M. Salmon, 'Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England', in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 169-190; Graham Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English antiquarians of the seventeenth century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 359; Andrew Fitzmaurice, *Humanism and America: an Intellectual History of English Colonisation, 1500 – 1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

¹⁴⁸ Lord Carew to the Earl of Salisbury, 28 July 1611, Hatfield MS, CP 196/47v.

and the relative success in planting Ulster made the Catholic Old English families, settled in Ireland since the twelfth century, the bigger threat.

As explored in Chapter Two, wildness became a trait not only of uncultivated spaces, but of human individuals. Davies attributed this to the ‘degenerate and metamorphosed’ condition that inevitably followed the rejection of English customs, giving the disobedient Old English ‘the heart of a beast’.¹⁴⁹ In adopting Irish practices including intermarriage, wearing mantles, and allowing their children to be nursed by Irish-speaking women, they relished ‘their beastly manner of life, as they would not returne to their shape of men again’, rendering the Old English almost indistinguishable from the native Irish.¹⁵⁰ ‘The very English of birth’, chronicled Holinshed, ‘conuersant with the sauage sort...become degenerate...[and] are quite altered’.¹⁵¹ ‘The neglect of the Lawe’, wrote Davies, ‘made the English degenerate, and become Irish’.¹⁵² This mirrored Spenser’s belief that the Old English should be ‘more sharpely to be chastised and reformed then the rude Irish, which, being very wilde at the first, are now become more civill’, whereas ‘these, from civility, are growne to be wilde and meere Irish’.¹⁵³ Men like Richard Stanihurst, Dublin-born, Oxford-educated, and sometime resident of London, embodied the difficult predicaments that the Old English found themselves in, torn between two cultures and their actions often earning them both disfavour at court and alienation from the Gaelic nobility.¹⁵⁴ The thorny variables of loyalties and local ties were hardly sympathised with, and New English colonists frequently commented on the unwillingness of the Old English to help intervene in local politics. A summary report made in 1597 stated that ‘in the English Pale many are suspecting of unsoundness’, and are ‘far more backward than good subjects ought to be’.¹⁵⁵ It was this fear that English settlers would prefer a ‘foreign’ society to their own that led to accusation that they were

¹⁴⁹ Davis, *A discoverie of the true causes*, sig. Aa2v.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Raphael Holinshed, *The firste volume of the chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande* (London, 1577; STC 13568b), sig. D4v.

¹⁵² Davies, *The situation in Ireland*, sig. Mm2v.

¹⁵³ Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland*, p. 143.

¹⁵⁴ Colm Lennon, ‘Stanihurst, Richard (1547 – 1618)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<http://oxforddnb.com/view/article/26294>> [accessed 8 November 2012].

¹⁵⁵ A summary report made of the estate of the realm of Ireland, 5 November 1597, *Calendar of Carew Papers in the Lambeth Library, 1598 – 1600, Vol. 3*, ed. J.S. Brewer and William Bullen (London: Kraus, 1974), p. 273.

‘forgetting their owne Countrey’ and, by extension, forgoing their loyalty to the English Crown.¹⁵⁶

The transforming power of clothes played a significant part of this potential for degeneration:

Iren. But they thinke this precisenes in reformation of apparell not to be so materiall, or greatly pertinent.

Eudox. Yes surely but it is: for mens apparell is commonly made according to their conditions, and their conditions are oftentimes governed by their garments: for the person that is governed, is by his gowne put in minde of gravitie, and also restrained from lightnes, by the very unaptnesse of his weed.¹⁵⁷

Herbert voiced similarly when he wrote that God had forbidden the Israelites to wear Canaanite clothing ‘least they should becom[e] one nacon w[i]th them’, since ‘the contynuall gesture and wearing of rude and barbarous attire receaveth an impression of rudeness’.¹⁵⁸ In 1598, numerous captains wrote to the privy council in London requesting that soldiers, many of whom were daily deserting from cold and starvation, be furnished with Irish brogues, stockings, and mantles, which might also be used as beds while on campaign, a request the council remained divided over.¹⁵⁹

Fears of savagery, however, were not confined to the colonies alone. Instead, these encounters made ideas of degeneration and disobedience within England all the more pertinent, as they offered contemporary examples of how quickly political stability might disintegrate through corruption and overindulgence. In London, the presence of Irish and Amerindians – actual visitors, and representation of them – either underwent transformations of their own, or were turned into curiosities that were stripped of their political threat. Although, as mentioned earlier, Shane O’Neill chose to present himself to the English court with his galloglasses, or mercenaries, dressed in traditional garb, there is no evidence to suggest O’Neill himself had not worn something deemed more appropriate. Further, as William Camden observed, the court hardly seemed to take this retinue seriously. Observers were as fascinated by the tartan-clad

¹⁵⁶ Moryson, *Itinerary*, sig. Ttt5v.

¹⁵⁷ Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland*, pp. 72-3.

¹⁵⁸ Herbert, ‘A note of sutch reasons as mooued mea toe putt the statute in execution against Irish habites’, f. 186v.

¹⁵⁹ The humble requests of the Captains of Ireland to the Privy Council, 18 May 1598, TNA: PRO, SP 63/202/2, f. 146r.

visitors as they would be ‘to see those of *China*, or *America*’.¹⁶⁰ One might marvel at the outlandish, but it was hardly threatening in the carefully-regulated world of the court. This might also explain what Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass argue was ‘the migration of the mantle’ to the wardrobes of fashionable Londoners in the 1610s and 1620s.¹⁶¹ These were sumptuous appropriations made with velvet and satin, indicated in the portrait of Richard Sackville, earl of Dorset, in 1613.¹⁶² It can be argued that these were intended to show a triumph or superiority over newly-acquired territories by domesticating the foreign, where indigenous styles were adapted and refined to display more sophisticated craftsmanship. ‘Tho perhaps neuer past the English shore’, satirised one author in 1598, the adoption of foreign fashions showed a willingness to ‘be a Conquerour’.¹⁶³

The appearance of peoples from Ireland and America, then, served largely to reinforce a new sense of English superiority. Just as courtiers had been disdainfully curious of the Irish at court, Londoners were intrigued by the Inuit from Baffin Island whom Elizabethan allowed to canoe down the Thames in London in 1576, and by the Algonquian arriving from Virginia in 1616. Such Amerindians, wrote one English merchant, were ‘such a wonder onto the whole city [of London] and to the rest of the realm that heard of yt’, a sentiment that is redolent of Shakespeare’s oft-quoted line, that citizens would do nothing to relieve a lame beggar, but would pay tenfold to see ‘a dead *Indian*’.¹⁶⁴ In such instances, individuals were stripped of political importance and observed as curiosities. The presence of Amerindians in native dress also allowed Londoners to visualise the peoples they read about in colonial reports and print. A broadside printed by the Virginia Company in 1616 included images of two Algonquians, Eiakintomino and Matahan, when promoting their lottery.¹⁶⁵ Though portrayed in a highly-stylised manner, Eiakintomino seems to have been physically present in

¹⁶⁰ Quoted in Jaster, “‘Out of all frame and good fashion’”: Sartorial Resistance as Political Spectacle’, p. 51.

¹⁶¹ Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, “‘Rugges of London and the Diuell’s Band’”: Irish Mantles and Yellow Starch as Hybrid London Fashion’, *Material London, c. 1600*, ed. Lena Cowen Orlin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 128-49, p. 133.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 135, 144. Some of the examples provided are not entirely convincing, and appear little different than cloaks or capes, which the English long recognised were similar to mantles.

¹⁶³ Joseph Hall, *Virgidemiarum* (London, 1598; STC 12717), sig. E4v.

¹⁶⁴ Quoted in William Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters: American Indians in Britain, 1500 – 1776* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 1; William Shakespeare, *Comedies, histories, & tragedies* (London, 1623; STC 22273), sig. A5r.

¹⁶⁵ Virginia Company, *A declaration for the certaine time of drawing the great standing lottery* (London, 1616; STC 24833.8).

London, when a Flemish visitor, Michael van Meer, included an almost identical figure around 1614 in his *album amicorum*, describing the ‘young man from the virginias’ walking through St James’ Park [Figure 3.3].¹⁶⁶ The figures were highly-stylised and near mirror-images of each other, but the nature of the *album amicorum* as a collection of notable sights on a traveller’s stay abroad suggests that, though derived from pre-existing images, Meer very may well have seen Eiakintomino himself and commissioned the watercolour from a local workshop.



Figure 3.3. Detail from Virginia Company broadside, *A declaration for the certaine time of drawing the great standing lottery* (London, 1616; STC 24833.8), and Michael van Meer, *Album amicorum*, 1614-1615, Edinburgh University Library, MS.La.III.283, f. 254v.

To hold any political weight, Irish and Amerindians would need to undergo transformations to civility, including the constraint of their bodies within civil bounds by dressing them in English fashions. This was apparent in court performances. In 1595, the earl of Essex provided an entertainment for the queen, centring around two Amazonian natives who arrived at court to attest whether Elizabeth was the fulfilment of a long-held prophesy among their tribe. A squire

¹⁶⁶ Michael van Meer, *Album amicorum*, 1615-1616, Edinburgh University Library, MS.La.III.283, f. 254v.

began the performance with a caveat. Although the exotic visitors would generally be in their ‘ordinary habett, an Indian naked, or attired w[i]th fethers’, they were, ‘for comelynes, clad’.¹⁶⁷ Performed within weeks of a sulking Raleigh’s empty-handed return from the Orinoco, tales and news of South America must have been particularly salient. Increasingly, ‘savages’ were not depicted as apolitical creatures living outside history and relinquished to fables; colonisation had made them dangerously real, as Essex himself expressed when he failed to subjugate Ulster in 1599.¹⁶⁸ Court masques, too, represented Amerindian figures, including George Chapman and Inigo Jones’ *The Memorable Masque* (1613), *The Masque of Flowers* (1614), and Ben Jonson and Jones’ *News from the New World* (1620), as did civil pageants such as Thomas Middleton’s *The Tryumphs of Honor and Industry* (1617) and *The Triumphs of Honor and Vertue* (1622).¹⁶⁹ Amerindians figured largely in the anti-masques, signalling raucous disorder before the restoration of harmony.

In Ben Jonson’s popular ‘Irish Masque’, performed in 1613 and again in early 1614, four Irishmen came to London for the wedding of Robert Carr, earl of Somerset, and Francis Howard.¹⁷⁰ They entered the room speaking in heavily-accented English, asking, ‘phair ish te king?...show me te shweet faish’.¹⁷¹ The Irish were, they promised, ‘very good shubschechts’, and proceeded to perform a dance ‘to the bagpipe and other rude music’ (lines 55, 138). It was only after the visitors were taught civility by an English gentleman that they abandoned their ‘coarser manners’ and offered obeisance to the king (lines 144, 152-3). Flinging their mantles aside, they revealed the apparel of English gentlemen underneath, singing their fealty and professing to be ‘new-born creatures all’ (line 184). As

¹⁶⁷ A devise by the Earl of Essex for the Queen’s entertainment, 17 November 1595, TNA: PRO, SP 12/254, f. 139v.

¹⁶⁸ ‘How unequal a wager’, Essex lamented, ‘to adventure the lyves of noblemen...against rogues & naked beggars’, Earl of Essex to the Privy Council, 20 May 1599, TNA: PRO, SP 63/205, f. 92r. See also ff. 1, 19, 23, 39, 46, 58, 81.

¹⁶⁹ Gavin Hollis, “‘He would not goe naked like the *Indians*, but cloathed just like our selves’”: Disguise and “the Naked Indian” in Massinger’s *The City Madam*, *Renaissance Drama*, 39 (2011), pp. 129-62, p. 130.

¹⁷⁰ For a detailed account of the masque, see Margaret Rose Jaster, ‘Staging a Stereotype in Gaelic Garb: Ben Jonson’s “Irish Masque”, 1613’, *New Hibernia Review*, 2:4 (1998), pp. 86-98; Lauren Shohet, ‘Interpreting “The Irish Masque at Court and in Print”’, *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, 1:2 (2001), pp. 42-65; James Smith, ‘Effaced History: Facing the Colonial Contexts of Ben Jonson’s “Irish Masque at Court”’, *English Literary History*, 65:2 (1998), pp. 297-321.

¹⁷¹ Ben Jonson, ‘Irish Masque at Court’, in *Masques of Difference: Four Court Masques by Ben Jonson*, ed. Kristen McDermott (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), lines 6-7. It is possible that Jonson was also attacking James’ Scottish accent and the number of Scots present at court – this, however, only reinforced the English mistrust of Gaelic ‘otherness’.

‘naked trees’ get ‘coloured coats’, so the Irish, having been brought to civility through clothing and public submission, found harmony in the unifying presence of the king (lines 193-4). In these performances, the incivility of the Irish and Amerindians were closely entwined with their failure to acknowledge the monarch’s sovereignty; only after accepting English clothing, and swearing allegiance to James, were they welcomed into society. This concern was especially relevant to London in a time when new trade routes, in the Atlantic and the east, changed the nature of goods and consumption that rendered conformity all the more important.

This was enacted in a real-life scenario with the arrival of Pocahontas, Wahunsunacock’s daughter, to London in 1616. As with the masques at court, the Algonquian princess required an act of transformation. As a girl, William Strachey had described her as mischievous and free-spirited, scantily-clad and playing with the boys of her tribe around the fort at Jamestown, risking her father’s displeasure by helping the English on numerous occasions.¹⁷² A different young woman presented herself to James and Anne at Whitehall nearly ten years later. She had converted to Christianity and went by the name Rebecca. An engraving by Simon van de Passe depicted her in current Jacobean fashion, including pearl earrings, a feathered fan, embroidered jacket, and starched lace ruff [Figure 3.4]. Having been made, as John Smith boasted, ‘civill after our *English* manner’, Powhatan’s ‘dearest iewell’ had become dazzling propaganda for English expansion and the triumph over savagery.¹⁷³ Many ‘*English Ladies*’ were ‘worse fauoured, proportioned and behauioered...[and] it pleased both the King and Queenes Maiestie honourably to esteeme her’.¹⁷⁴ Yet the acceptance of Pocahontas at court was largely, Smith admitted in his letter to Queen Anne, so that ‘this Kingdome may rightly haue a Kingdome by her meanes’.¹⁷⁵

The Irish in Jonson’s masque, like Pocahontas herself, catalogued acts of transformation with a clear message. Savagery, unless removed from the wilderness and made harmless, had no place in the realm, and certainly not in the same halls where policies were created and carried out. Nor would wild behaviour allow access to the sovereign; banishment from court for misbehaviour or unbecoming conduct reinforced this. Court performances and printed works, in

¹⁷² Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters*, pp. 78-80.

¹⁷³ John Smith, *The general historie of Virginia* (London, 1624; STC 22790), sigs. Rr, L3r.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. Rv.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

perpetuating common stereotypes about ‘savages’, served to reinforce the validity of English customs, and to exclude those who did not live by them – whether Irish, Amerindian, or English. While scholars often highlight the implications of negative descriptions of ‘others’ in the colonies, it is equally necessary to think about how these projections and stereotypes reinforced values that the English themselves were increasingly expected to adhere to. The need to regulate and enforce conformity therefore drew on, and adapted, experiences in Ireland and America. Performances at court collectively involved viewers and participants in condoning savagery and encouraging civility in the specific context of westward expansion.



Figure 3.4. Simon van de Passe engraving of Matoaka (Pocahontas), 1616, BM 1863,0509.625.

Polemics against cross-dressing and ostentatious sartorial display from the 1590s onwards further expressed this concern by yoking savage behaviour with political ambiguity. The early seventeenth century saw a dramatic change in dress styles, and writings clearly recognised the way in which new goods and commodities, accessible to a wider range of the population, forced the elite to change their fashions frequently to distinguish themselves from others.¹⁷⁶ What was at stake, then, was just as much about the hierarchical order, and ensuing stability, than what colours and cuts were prevailing at any given time. James had advised his son to ‘eschew to be effeminate in your clothes’ and to make ‘a foole of your selfe in disguising or wearing long haire or nailes, which are but excrements of nature’ and which would undermine his status as a serious ruler.¹⁷⁷ James’ advice about moderation in apparel were not unlike Puritan tracks like William Prynne’s *The vnloneliness of loue-lockes*, which condemned long hair in a prolific rant that equated the styles that ‘euery Sorded, Base, Deboist, and Rascall person wears’ to those of ‘unchristian’ Irishmen, Amerindians, and Ottomans.¹⁷⁸ The deliberate adoption of transgressive styles was visually rendered – though more ambiguously – on the stage in the character of Mary Frith, a cross-dressing woman who fought duels and engaged in all the boisterous behaviour associated with roaring boys, in Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton’s *The roaring girle* (1611). Alongside her sword, one of Moll’s defining characteristics was the pipe in her mouth [Figure 3.5].

To moralists like Prynne, the issue was not the incivility of indigenous practices so much as the enthusiasm with which civil subjects adopted them. The incivility of ‘naked’ and ‘wild’ beings found their way into Jacobean discourse as explicit examples of the incompatibility between stable societies and uncivil apparel. If women wearing men’s clothing ‘bee not barbarous’, one author asked, then why not make ‘the naked *Indian*, or the wild *Irish*, lords and rulers of well-gouerned cities’.¹⁷⁹ The implication was striking: it was the height of exaggeration, in this rhetorical appeal, to believe a ‘naked Indian’ could be capable of good government. At the same time, the comparison lent itself to equating sartorially-transgressive Englishmen and women with Amerindians. The link between ‘deformities of your apparell’ and ‘wilde Sauages’ was also apparent

¹⁷⁶ Dunlevy, *Dress in Ireland*, p. 67.

¹⁷⁷ From ‘Basilikon Doron’ in James I, in *Workes* (London, 1616; STC 14344), sig. Q2r.

¹⁷⁸ William Prynne, *The vnloneliness, of loue-lockes* (London, 1628; STC 20477), sig. Gr.

¹⁷⁹ *Hic mulier: or, the man-woman* (London, 1620; STC 13375.5), sig. Bv.

in Philip Massinger's play *The City Madam* (1632), in which Virginian Indians stood 'in relief to the sartorial excesses of their English counterparts'.¹⁸⁰ At the same time, the play concluded with the necessary removal of the Amerindian threat from the English household in order to restore order. It has been argued that this was a consequence of the anxieties caused by the 1622 massacre, in which Powhatan warriors killed the English in their own households.¹⁸¹ In Massinger's play, as in printed polemic, physical modification of the body reflected inner pretensions that stood in the way of social stability.



Figure 3.5. Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton, *The roaring girle* (London, 1611; STC 17908), frontispiece.

¹⁸⁰ *Haec-Vir: or, the womanish-man* (London, 1620; STC 12599), sigs. A4v, B4v; Hollis, "He would not goe naked like the *Indians*...", p. 137.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 153.

Conclusion

In exploring the political potential contained in sartorial choice, especially prominent in societies fighting the domination of another culture, this chapter has investigated the cultivation or colonisation of the physical body through an interest in regulating style. Notions of the body in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries focused on ‘managing and disciplining’, with refinement often articulated through its distance from savagery.¹⁸² Conduct manuals depicted gracefulness as the ability to harness or control one’s freedom to move, condemning those who moved in ways that displayed a lack of ‘the ideal outline of the body, the border separating it from the world’.¹⁸³ Fynes Moryson’s repulsed description of Irish women churning butter, or George Percy’s account of Algonquian dances, indicates this mistrust towards bodies that did not exercise control. These examples were visually reimaged and projected in new ways when applied to subjects within England itself.

A concern with apparel highlights the significance of appearance and status as a mode of expression, one that became increasingly nuanced as both Ireland and England saw a rise in available commodities. Believed to have a transformative, but also a containing, quality, the English saw ‘habit’ as both clothing and an indication of character. Herbert was confident that just as ‘som worthy Jentlemen in tymes past mayd penbrooke shire a litle england beyond wales, so shall I mak kery and desmond a litle england beyond ireland’.¹⁸⁴ This aim, he recognised, required an eradication of native apparel, a belief held by policy-makers in Dublin and London. Descriptions of apparel often crystallised into polarisations, whereby mantles and nakedness were the contrasts through which the manners of the Protestant New English were highlighted. This dichotomy hardly offers a true picture of the vibrancy and complexity of developing Irish society, but it does contribute to several related aspects of sixteenth and seventeenth-century English history. Firstly, it allows historians to understand English attitudes towards apparel more widely, and the ways through which authorities sought to regulate it. Secondly, it indicates the influence of attitudes towards apparel and the body on how the English both framed their perceptions of others, and attempted to impose civility on those they colonised.

¹⁸² Wayne A. Rebhorn, ‘Baldezar Castiglione, Thomas Wilson, and the Courtly Body in Renaissance Rhetoric’, *A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 11:3 (1993), pp. 241-74, p. 242.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 248.

¹⁸⁴ Sir William Herbert to Lord Burghley, 9 January 1589, TNA: PRO, SP 63/140, f. 43r.

Finally, the use of clothing as a means of resisting civility demonstrates how this ultimately deepened polarisations, and lent themselves to discourses on savagery in London.

On a physical level, garments – resting on, moulding, and restraining the body – were intimate objects that nonetheless served to reinforce the need to control the body, mediating the space between a person’s bareness and the wider world around them. To be naked, or scantily clad, was to appear ‘untouched by progress’, an idea that allowed the English to justify interference while reinforcing the savagery of those who resisted Crown control.¹⁸⁵ The way in which clothes were literally worn – what they concealed, what they exposed, what they prevented people from doing – carried potent messages about a wearer’s status, but also their, and the viewer’s, beliefs and presumptions. In England, masques, performances, and conduct manuals reiterated this belief, accentuating that ‘civility was to be worn as well as learned’.¹⁸⁶

Particular styles also articulated a certain resistance to boundaries. Thomas Wilson compared a convincing speech to the physical body, each to be cultivated carefully, avoiding monstrosity in order to achieve perfection.¹⁸⁷ As a non-verbal speech, however, the body could also make statements *against* certain values or impositions. Putting on a mantle, or refusing to cut one’s hair, might become an unspoken act of defiance. At the very least, as in Gaelic gentlemen creating removable collars for their mantles, it provided a defiant way of appearing in public places without abandoning old traditions. This is not to say that all those who wore Irish dress sought to oppose the English, but that evidence indicates particular instances when the Irish knowingly wore attire in ways that might challenge English impositions of civility. They made use, in other words, of English polarisations to their own advantage. Clothing became a physical means of offering resistance beyond the violence of actual bloodshed, reinforcing the archaeologist Audrey Horning’s view that objects highlight ‘the centrality...of material evidence in eliciting understandings of the complexity of colonial relations’.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁵ Levine, ‘States of Undress: Nakedness and the Colonial Imagination’, p. 195.

¹⁸⁶ Hollis, “‘He would not goe naked like the *Indians*...”, p. 146.

¹⁸⁷ Rebhorn, ‘Baldesar Castiglione, Thomas Wilson, and the Courtly Body in Renaissance Rhetoric’, p. 251. Rhetoric, wrote Wilson, is ‘an apt ordering...[of] the whole body’, p. 263.

¹⁸⁸ Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea*, p. 8.

Irish scholars are paying increasing attention to the role of clothing in English attempts to establish regional ascendancy, but it is equally worth asking what concerns with apparel signified for Jacobean colonisation. The experience in Ireland from the 1560s would influence later encounters with indigenous tribes in North America, for example. By the time colonists went to Virginia, they were long aware that cultural difference could hamper the aims of colonisation by keeping alive local traditions, thereby fostering resentment towards newcomers. In Virginia, John Smith observed that ‘the better sort vse large mantles of deare skins not much differing in fashion from the Irish mantels’.¹⁸⁹ The mantles crafted by Algonquian tribes might be made of turkey feathers rather than wool, but the comparison to Irish styles would instantly have conjured an image of shared incivility.

The attention that policy-makers and colonists devoted to clothing also indicates the breadth of control exhibited by an increasingly centralising state. Hiram Morgan found that where Gaelic lords once frequently appealed to their ancient liberties in their negotiations with the Crown, the ‘policy of centralisation’ endangered those liberties in increasingly invasive ways.¹⁹⁰ A more aggressive concept of sovereignty demanded the absolute loyalty of the subject, and Gaelic lords were less able to offer the Crown allegiance while retaining jurisdiction over their own territories.¹⁹¹ In arguing that the conflict in Ireland mirrored the contemporary situation between Spain and the Netherlands, Morgan placed the struggles in Ireland within contemporary European politics. However, the ‘integrative and penetrative’ sovereignty that Elizabeth and James pursued in Ireland must also be seen as an extension of a more pervasive desire to create obedient subjects within England.¹⁹² Steven Ellis, assessing frontiers within the British Isles in the sixteenth century, noted that ‘official perceptions of the differences between civility and savagery came to exercise a more general influence on the government’s strategy in dealing with the problem of the borders’.¹⁹³

¹⁸⁹ Smith, *A map of Virginia*, sig. C2v.

¹⁹⁰ Hiram Morgan, *Tyrone’s Rebellion: The Outbreak of the Nine Years War in Tudor Ireland* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993), p. 219.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁹² *Ibid.*

¹⁹³ Steven G. Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power: The Making of the English State* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), p. 76.

However misconstrued or simplistic, then, English encounters in frontier areas like Ireland and then Virginia nonetheless influenced state policy. The Crown demanded conformity, and it is striking that clothing was understood to be one arena over which it could extend its sovereignty. When James outlined the proper attire befitting those at court, he also sought to regulate the weapons people wore, thereby curbing the violence committed by his subjects. To wear weapons at court, James wrote, was as uncivil as wearing effeminate apparel, for the hot-headedness that prompted touchy young gentlemen to initiate violence in a civil court also governed their tendency towards flamboyant dress.¹⁹⁴

English clothing was in many ways the visual manifestation of both civility and conformity, for it involved a knowledge of decency and a willingness to wear what society prescribed. This is not to say that contrary fashions did not develop – complaints about the Hispanicisation of court attire were rife in England at this time – but that, significantly, aspects of apparel figured large in political debate, perhaps most famously during the trial of Anne Turner in 1615 and the controversies over yellow starched ruffs.¹⁹⁵ There is also, of course, a difference between passing fads and the more lasting styles associated with transcultural difference. Individuals who did not wear what they were supposed to were often mistrusted, mocked, or humiliated. When Nicholas Saunders, a country gentleman, noticed a pedlar wearing ‘an Indian hatt’ with a ‘Jewell fittar for a greater parsonage then that party of now hath it’, he immediately wrote to Robert Cecil to explain what he had seen.¹⁹⁶ Saunders described the hat with intricate detail, relating its ‘beaten plates of gould’ intermingled with pearls and unbefitting a man who ‘caryed a pack at his back about the countrey’.¹⁹⁷ Here was a rare American accessory that had fallen in the wrong hands:

I thought it my duety to let your Honour vnderstand of it, for only saving that it is somewhat weighty it is surely a rare and riche thing, it was a kings or viceroyes in the Indies, and brought hither now by some of Sir Franceys Drakes fleete.¹⁹⁸

This curious story raises questions about the acquisition and distribution of American objects among more rural areas of England. It also shows the extent to

¹⁹⁴ James I, ‘Basilikon Doron’, in *Workes*, sig. Q2r.

¹⁹⁵ Alastair Bellany, ‘Mistress Turner’s Deadly Sins: Sartorial Transgression, Court Scandal, and Politics in Early Stuart England’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 58:2 (1995), pp. 179-210.

¹⁹⁶ Nicholas Saunders to Sir Robert Cecil, 30 June 1596, Hatfield MS, CP 41/97r.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

which policy-makers and local authorities believed they had the authority to regulate what people owned and wore. The concern with presenting oneself in 'proper' clothing, and its relationship to behaviour and deference, in many ways provided a visual marker of the success, or failure, of achieving obedience. It is therefore commonplace to find sources deeming the Amerindians or Irish uncivil 'savages' in their choices of apparel, but far more striking to discover that, following the first English colonial enterprises, Englishmen and women were accused of becoming like the 'naked Indian' or 'wild Irish' when they failed to prescribe to established norms. State-formation, both in England and in the colonies, required a more detailed articulation of cultural control, a belief the English articulated all the more strongly as exotic objects permeated the realm from new areas of the globe. One way to achieve stability was to 'fashion' subjects, in every sense of the word.

Chapter Four

Amerindians and Lawyers: Concepts of Savagery at the Inns of Court

On the night of 15 February 1613, an ensemble of Virginians danced through the king's palace at Whitehall, moving through the galleries and circling an extra lap around the tilting yard so the king could take pleasure in their progression. Their faces, approaching and retreating from the illuminated spaces made by rows of fiery torch-bearers, were 'of oliue colour', their hair 'black and lardge, wauing down to their shoulders', and they moved in an incandescent swirl of sun-embroidered cloth and 'high sprig'd feathers'.¹

The performers – over 50 of them, many on horseback – were not native Americans but students at the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn. Chapter Two located a vogue for planting in Jacobean London, and Chapter Three examined how attempts to civilise others was put into practice in Ireland, where colonial experiences – and failures – then influenced perceptions of sartorial transgression within the metropolis. This chapter focuses on the interest in North and South American colonisation fostered at the Inns of Court from the 1580s to the 1620s, where the particular milieu of the Inns provided an ideal locus for making colonisation fashionable.

The gentlemen in the Virginia masque performed before 'the King, Bride [Elizabeth Stuart], and Bridegroom [Frederick V], with all the Lords of the most honord priuy Councell, and our chiefe Nobility'.² Their costumes and gestures allowed the students a disinhibition released through extravagant charade, until the performance concluded with an enactment of wilful submission that made obedience to English royal authority seem self-evident. The exuberant masque that dazzled even the usually-critical gossip John Chamberlain exposes the close relationship shared between members of the Inns of Court and the royal court. Though sometimes termed England's 'third university', the Inns were part of 'a larger metropolitan complex', and its members displayed 'behaviour and life styles [that] were moulded largely by the outside world', as the *Memorable*

¹ George Chapman, *The memorable masque of the two honourable Houses or Innes of Court* (London, 1614; STC 4982), sigs. Br-v. For an idea of the immense cost undertaken by the Inns, and the difficulties in repaying these debts, see the taxation records in *The Middle Temple Documents Relating to George Chapman's Memorable Masque*, ed. Tucker Orbison (Oxford: Malone Society, 1983).

² Chapman, *The memorable masque*, sig. B3v.

masque indicated.³ The chief masquers were accomplished members – the ‘gentlemen [of] best choise out of both houses’ – and their ‘gallant and glorious shew’ so impressed James that he allowed them to kiss his hand afterwards.⁴

The masque also highlights the influence that colonial promoters had on the life of the Inns. The king commended Sir Edward Phelips and Richard Martin – both shareholders of the Virginia Company – for being the ‘chiefe doers and vndertakers’ of the spectacle, and members of the Inns showed considerable interest in colonising projects in America.⁵ This chapter contends that the particular milieu of the Inns, which encouraged a certain creative license through which to explore ideas of government and civility in various forms of representation and discourse, was crucial to the engagement with Amerindian savagery and exoticism that proliferated in political contexts. The networks of colonial interests among barristers and courtiers who were also involved in other affairs of the realm, alongside changing modes of conduct and sociability, allowed ideas of savagery to move beyond justifying colonisation to serving a more inward-looking function. The fashion for smoking, the representation of tobacco and native Americans in performances, and reactions to news from America all contributed to a particular development in ideas of civility in Jacobean London.

Historiography

The seventeenth century saw the development of a London ‘season’ caused by two major factors: firstly, the development of London-based political, legal, and administrative institutions, and secondly, the city’s rise in trade and a global economy that made London the centre of commercialised leisure.⁶ The Inns of Court were affected by both; admissions rose steeply in this period, with sons of the gentry increasingly desirous to complete their education by experiencing London culture in a way that partly served as both ‘finishing school’ and a place to establish political connections essential to establishing a career in government.⁷ The training in law, whether or not members of the Inns were ever called to the

³ Wilfred R. Prest, *The Inns of Court Under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590 – 1640* (London: Longman, 1972), p. 111.

⁴ John Chamberlain to Alice Carleton, 18 February 1613, TNA: PRO, SP 14/17, f. 47r.

⁵ Ibid. See also Sir Edward Phelips to Dudley Carleton, 25 February 1613, TNA: PRO, SP 14/72, f. 73r.

⁶ Ian Warren, ‘The English Landed Elite and the Social Environment of London, 1580 -1700: the Cradle of an Aristocratic Culture?’, *English Historical Review*, 126: 518 (2011), pp. 44-74, p. 44.

⁷ David Lemmings, *Gentlemen and Barristers: The Inns of Court and the English Bar, 1680 – 1730* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), p. 5.

bar – many were not – endowed members with the ‘smattering of the law’ that humanist statesmen like Sir Thomas Elyot had advocated since the fifteenth century for those ‘destined to become governors of the realm’.⁸ As Ian Warren notes, the ‘cultural impact of this environment upon an elite previously defined largely by the provincial basis of its power and prestige’ was substantial, and manifested itself partly through changing codes of behaviour.⁹ A London education also influenced the status of members of the lesser gentry or merchant families in the localities, especially those Christopher Brooks labelled the ‘lower branch’ of the legal profession, usually trained at one of the eight Inns of Chancery and destined to become justices of peace, sheriffs, and clerks.¹⁰

Since Wilfrid R. Prest’s *The Inns of Court Under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590 – 1640*, scholars have increasingly studied the Inns not only in terms of their legal history, but their role in this ‘civilising’ milieu. Inventories show that gentlemen who left Oxford and Cambridge often brought books and apparel with them, including the cosmographies that were increasingly being incorporated into the curriculum at university [Figure 4.1]. As early as the fifteenth century, chief justice Sir John Foreshue stressed that the education received at the Inns went beyond the study of law, and were ‘nurseries’ where the courtly arts and government patronage might be obtained.¹¹ This implies a self-consciousness among members of the Inns in being part of an influential centre of civility and urbanity. In their pursuit of civility, members in the early Stuart period increasingly began to disparage the lower branches at the Inns of Chancery, not because of their lack of learning, but because of the nature of their education as a form of apprenticeship.¹²

Attuned to the contemporary emphasis on the Inns as a centre of civility in London, scholars have shifted their attention to the dramatic and literary environment through which gentlemen explored ideas of government, law, and self-expression.¹³ As Paul Raffield pointed out, entertainments, spectacles, and

⁸ Christopher W. Brooks, *Pettyfoggers and Vipers of the Commonwealth: The ‘Lower Branch’ of the Legal Profession in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 161.

⁹ Warren, ‘The English Landed Elite and the Social Environment of London’, p. 45.

¹⁰ Brooks, *Pettyfoggers and Vipers of the Commonwealth*, p. 2.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 181.

¹³ Prest, *The Inns of Court Under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts*; Paul Raffield, *Images and Cultures of Law in Early Modern England: Justice and Political Power, 1558 – 1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); *Inns of Court*, ed. Alan H. Nelson and John R. Elliott (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010); *The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court*, ed. Jayne Elisabeth Archer *et al.* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011); Brian

literary output were a mandatory feature of formal education, where gentlemen constantly enacted debates over political authority in representative forms.¹⁴ Most recently, *The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court* recreates the experience of young gentlemen at the Inns by focusing on the social influences and networks of people that shaped their lives, careers, and mentalities. Contemporaries themselves were often the ones to note the influences of the Inns beyond the education of law. ‘Initiated in a Tauerne’, members soon learned what was truly important in university and in the city: velvets, tennis, books about honour tied with silk strings, and wit ‘which may doe him Knights seruice in the Country hereafter’.¹⁵




Figure 4.1. Inventory of M[aste]r Smith's apparel and books at Cambridge and Gray's Inn [1603], TNA: PRO, SP 12/288, f. 52r.

P. Levack, *The Civil Lawyers of England, 1603 – 1641: A Political Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973).

¹⁴ Raffield, *Images and Cultures of Law in Early Modern England*, p. 87.

¹⁵ John Earle, *Micro-cosmographie* (London, 1628; STC 7440.2), sigs. E8r-E9r.

Though Inns gentlemen were frequently satirised in Jacobean discourse, the critiques of ostentation hardly seem exaggerated. Sir Matthew Carew, a civil lawyer trained on the Continent who received an honorary admission to Gray's Inn, complained to Dudley Carleton in 1613 that one of his sons cared only for 'houndes and hawkes', while his other 'is of the Midle [*sic*] Temple, where he hath a chamber and studye, but I heare studieth the law very litle'.¹⁶ This was the poet Thomas Carew, eighteen at the time and seemingly inclined to use his education for somewhat less principled reasons than serving the commonwealth. On the other hand, scholarship has also recognised that the sometimes unruly behaviour at the Inns signified less a rejection of discipline than an attempt to preserve and define it in other spheres. Members styled themselves as active proponents of a "civilising" agency' in English society and promoted an ethos of responsibility towards government and the law, all in a sophisticated milieu through which good manners were cultivated.¹⁷ What was law, the Gray's Inn lawyer Sir Henry Finch wrote, but the 'Art of wel ordering a Ciuil Societie'.¹⁸ Portraits commissioned by students often portrayed them with formal demeanours that appear to reflect their attempts to separate themselves from those who practised law at the Inns of Chancery. Nicholas Hilliard's portrait of Francis Bacon is one example, painted in 1578 when Bacon resumed his studies at Gray's Inn following his tour of the Continent [Figure 4.2].

It is within this atmosphere that Jacobean 'wits' cultivated 'a fashionable, urbane reputation' tied to the rise of concepts of sociability that accompanied the London season.¹⁹ The social and intellectual networks created at universities and the Inns of Court 'were intended to facilitate social exchanges among the elite and affirm social identity, designating the participants as cultivated and learned men fit to participate in the structures of governance'.²⁰ Sociability in the early seventeenth century did not just imply the meeting between friends, but networks of associations, both professional and informal, that contained specific codes of behaviour and might lead to charged moments of social interaction and political debate.²¹ The term 'company' or 'fraternity' suggested 'a politics (in the broad

¹⁶ Sir Matthew Carey to Carleton, 25 February 1613, TNA: PRO, SP 14/72, f. 71r.

¹⁷ Michelle O'Callaghan, *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 13.

¹⁸ Henry Finch, *Law, or a discourse thereof* (London, 1627; STC 10871), sig. Br.

¹⁹ O'Callaghan, *The English Wits*, p. 3.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 2, 5.

²¹ Phil Withington, 'Company and Sociability in Early Modern England', *Social History*, 32: 3 (2007), pp. 291-307.

sense of the term) of social participation involving inclusions, exclusions and the construction of boundaries', and the concerns over civil behaviour propagated at this time should be understood partly as a response to these developments.²² At the same time, rites of masculinity were framed by a set of societal expectations that involved civic responsibility and an ability to practice self-regulation beyond the spaces of conviviality.²³



Figure 4.2. Portrait of Francis Bacon by Nicholas Hilliard in 1578, at the age of 18, NPG 6761.

In their self-aware pursuit of civility, gentlemen at the Inns were prime proponents for projects of expansion that purported to 'civilise' others. Michelle O'Callaghan's *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* has been the first work to emphasise that the rise of concepts of sociability were closely allied to members' associations with corporations like the Virginia Company, especially at the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn.²⁴ Lawyers including Robert Phelps, John Hoskyns, John Donne, Francis Bacon, Christopher Brooke, and Middle Temple's darling and 'Prince d'Amour', Richard Martin, served the company in various legal capacities and 'clearly had their own

²² Ibid., p. 302.

²³ See Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

²⁴ O'Callaghan, *The English Wits*, p. 4.

investment in Virginia', likely encouraged by patrons like Sir Robert Cecil or Sir Lionel Cranfield, who also had connections with merchants in the City.²⁵ This interest in colonisation did not only manifest itself in their speeches in parliament but also in their poems, sermons, and plays. Chapman's *Memorable masque*, O'Callaghan argues, allowed Richard Martin and other investors to employ the politically-charged symbolism of the performance to present a utopian vision of the colony at an uncertain moment in the company's future, enabling affiliates of the company to make pointed political comments to the audience at Whitehall.

The fashion for colonisation brought with it real questions of governance through the question of confronting 'savages'. Cosmographies denoting the lives of those in the 'fourth part of the world' included Sebastian Münster's *Cosmographia* (1544, first translated into English by Richard Eden in 1572), Abraham Ortelius' *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (1570), André Thevet's *Cosmographie universelle* (1571), the archbishop of Canterbury George Abbot's *A briefe description of the whole world* (1599), and Robert Stafforde's *Geographicall and Anthologicall descriptions of all the empires and kingdoms* (1607), and began to appear in library and university inventories.²⁶ Henry Peacham advised his gentleman readers to study history and geography for its political value, for without a knowledge of the world, 'we know not how the most memorable enterprises of the world haue bin caryed and performed; we are ignorant of the growth, flourish, and fall of the first Monarchies'.²⁷ In short, 'we conceiue nothing of the gouernment, and commodities of other nations, we cannot judge the strength of our enemies'.²⁸ The study of geography, encouraged in most conduct manuals of the time, ultimately provided men with the means to understand and assess the contemporary world order, and to engage in the question of the most successful forms of government and rule. The role of geography in conceiving and articulating savagery is not usually considered alongside changing modes of political participation in England. Accounts of 'savage' cannibals 'euen at this day' and 'the wilde and sauage people themselues newly discouered' imbued classical notions of civility as the practice of the rule of

²⁵ Ibid., p. 16.

²⁶ Ibid., pp.143-4; Robert Stafforde, *Geographicall and Anthologicall descriptions of all the empire and kingdoms* (London, 1607; STC 23135).

²⁷ Henry Peacham, *The compleat gentleman* (London, 1622; STC 19502), sig.I2v. See also Edward Grimstone's translation of Pierre d'Avity's *The estates, empires, & principalities of the world* (London, 1615; STC 988) and Arthur Golding's translation of Jaques Hurault's *Politicke, moral, and martial discourses* (London, 1595; STC 14000).

²⁸ Peacham, *The compleat gentleman*, sig. I2v.

law and justice with contemporary significance.²⁹ Anna Bryson, in *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*, remarks that John Dickenson's translation of Aristotle's *Politics* (1598) included mention of the uncivil 'savages' of America, but does not elaborate on the consequences of this, noting only that dichotomies of civility and savagery must have been 'elaborated partly through the discovery of the New World'.³⁰

Though Bryson hints at the crucial role that an engagement with Ireland and America had on English concepts of civility and government, her book leaves this specific relationship unexplored. While much recent scholarship remains attuned to the way that manners created 'modes of urbanity' through which politics were discussed and accessed, then, curiously little has been made of the ways in which involvement with America affected these changing modes, especially on a demographic of impressionable young men.³¹ Something is missing, between O'Callaghan's stress on London sociability and Bryson's cursory recognition of the influence of American savagery on changing concepts of civility in England. This chapter suggests that the link between the two can be found in the Inns of Court and the engagement members had with colonisation.

The Taste for Expansion

Richard Hakluyt, in his dedicatory epistle to Sir Francis Walsingham in the first edition of his *Principal nauigations* (1589), pinpointed the precise moment when his interests in English colonisation were first ignited. His own revelation, he wrote, came as a boy in his cousin's chambers in the Middle Temple, where the lawyer showed him a cosmography and explained to him the opportunities that lay in the uncharted territories beyond England. Hakluyt's epiphany, and his subsequent career, was made possible largely through the connections he made at university and the Middle Temple. The interest in colonisation at the Inns from the 1580s, from individuals like Hakluyt and his cousin, were crucial to the more creative appropriations of America that became characteristic of the 1610s and 1620s, and arose largely from earlier interests in Irish colonisation by influential courtiers like Walsingham, William Cecil and his son Robert, and Elizabeth's keeper of the privy seal, Thomas Smith.

²⁹ John Dickenson, *Aristotles politiques* (London, 1598; STC 760), sigs. F6v, D3v.

³⁰ Anna Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 51-2.

³¹ Warren, 'The English Landed Elite and the Social Environment of London', p. 46.

The Irish colonisation projects from the mid-sixteenth century were largely effected by these men, all of them educated at Cambridge or Oxford and heavily influenced by their humanist education in Greek and Roman histories, which advocated expansion within a strong strain of civic responsibility.³² William Cecil and Walsingham were both members of Gray's Inn, as Robert Cecil would become by 1580. The interest of such men were key; Henry Wriothesley, who became treasurer of the Virginia Company, was a ward of William Cecil's, and became a member of Gray's Inn himself in 1589.

As David Quinn argued, it was only in the 1570s, largely through this coterie of men, that the language of planting took hold, and the connections between them reinforce the large extent to which early colonisation projects were made possible through patronage and family ties.³³ Sir Humphrey Gilbert, a member of New Inn, had fought in Ireland with the lord deputy and friend of Cecil, Henry Sidney, and future Virginia colonist Thomas Harriot entered Walter Raleigh's employment in the early 1580s.³⁴ The debate over planting at this time was propagated by the elder Richard Hakluyt at the Middle Temple as well as the younger Hakluyt's 'Discourse on Western Planting', presented to Elizabeth in 1584.³⁵ Though Elizabeth may never have read the document, the text, like others at the time, created 'social blueprints' for colonies that indelibly influenced the language and rhetoric of future projects.³⁶ Events in Ireland, including the Irish uprisings in Munster in 1598, led to more stringent policies against native peoples, and treatises by William Herbert, one of Dee's assistants and a colonist in Ireland, and especially Richard Beacon of Gray's Inn, argued that the colonies had hitherto failed precisely because colonists were accepting and even imitating the inferior morals of native peoples.³⁷ This was the humanist culture of colonisation that gentlemen at the Inns inherited as they began to look further westward.

Though Ireland provided the context and experience for much of the interest in American colonisation, print culture also disseminated ideas. Interests in other cultures were rife in cosmographies and histories translated from

³² D.B. Quinn, 'Renaissance Influences in English Colonization: The Prothero Lecture', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 26 (1976), pp. 73-93, p. 73.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

³⁴ Rory Rapple, 'Gilbert, Sir Humphrey (1537-1583)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10690> [accessed 11 March 2015]; J.J. Roche, 'Harriot, Thomas (1560-1621)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12379?docPos=1> [accessed 11 March 2015].

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Quinn, 'Renaissance Influences of English Colonization', p. 83.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

continental sources and read at university. Hakluyt's *Principal nauagations*, printed in Oxford and London in 1589 and expanded in 1599, was a testament to the number of English merchants, investors, explorers, and patrons who were involved in the process of expanding the realm through trade and the acquisition of new territories. Trade companies were crucial to dictating interest in the east and west at various points. Just as the rise in literature about Ottomans peaked in the 1580s and 1590s, in the aftermath of the founding of the Levant Company in 1581, so elite interests in westward projects from 1600 were partly the product of the establishment of new trading companies. The Muscovy Company (1555), Levant Company (1581), and East India Company (1600) were established under Elizabeth, whereas English involvement with America experienced a pitch of fervour in the 1610s and 1620s with the establishment of new joint-stock companies. The Virginia Company and Plymouth Company (1606), Newfoundland Company (1610), Somers Islands/Bermuda Company (1612), and the Amazon Company (1619) were Jacobean innovations, and became the more accessible cultural referents through which savagery was engaged with. The rise of tobacco-smoking and the formation of these companies, along with James' peace treaty with Spain in 1604, the end of the Ottoman-Hapsburg wars in 1606, and the growing diplomatic relations between England and the East, saw a temporary dip in anti-Ottoman rhetoric at this time.

Hakluyt's description of colonial interest at the Inns offers a glimpse into the way aspiring statesmen applied ideas of civic humanism in their study of geography and in their plans for expansion. Sir Edward Hoby, himself a member of the Middle Temple and a respected courtier at James' court, kept a commonplace book that exhibited an active interest in English affairs in America. Hoby included numerous copies and transcriptions of news from North and South America, including a tract by George Popham, future leader of the short-lived Sagadahoc colony in Maine, that Popham had written promoting English affairs in South America. Hoby's commonplace book also included his correspondence with his good friend George Carew, who advanced colonisation in Ireland and eventually Virginia, and copies of specific instructions for discovering and cataloguing areas of North America.³⁸ This would partly be achieved through discovering the 'statutes conditions apparell and manners of foode, w[hi]ch of

³⁸ Sir Edward Hoby's commonplace book, 1582-1596, BL: Add MS 38823, ff. 1r-5v; also ff. 5v-8r, 93r-94v.

them be men eaters...what manner they arme and order them selves in warres and who oure friendes or enemies [are] to each other of them'.³⁹ Hoby's commonplace book, which included copies of manuscripts that circulated at court, shows an overlap between interests at the Inns and the royal court. The letters Hoby copied about colonisation were not just attentive to acquiring new territories, but in the customs of native peoples, their political systems, and how best to govern them.

Commonplace books like Hoby's may offer some clue as to how appropriations of native behaviour came to be used to explore English behavioural norms. Hoby's reports on colonisation were interspersed amongst his musings about friendship and philosophy. 'There be fowre thinges in the world most needfull,' Hoby wrote, 'and the same ofte most hurtfull. witt, and wordes; drinck, and Company'.⁴⁰ The reflections on sociability, along with Hoby's interest in America, all framed a gentleman's way of thinking about himself in relation to the rest of the world. One day Hoby thought about his own moral self, and the next, about the right of the English to claim unconquered territories. In thinking about the manners and apparel of native tribes, Hoby's humanist training may also have prompted him to think about his own habits in relation to these. Commonplace books compiled seemingly disparate material and encouraged comparison or contrast by nature of those inclusions in one bound entity. The further study of Jacobean commonplace books, and the engagement with expansion within them, might begin to explain why so many references to Amerindians appeared in relation to conduct.

Copies of Walter Raleigh's accounts of his Guiana voyages, and notes derived and 'selected out of S[i]r Walter Raleighs first booke of his discoverie of Guyana', indicate that individuals sought to keep themselves informed on Raleigh's attempts at colonisation in South America the way Hoby did with Popham's account.⁴¹ One anonymous transcriber chose to make note of the customs of the natives, who 'are wont to make war vpon all Nations, and especially w[i]th the Caniballs'.⁴² These tribes separated the skin from the bones of their dead, taking the former to 'hang it in the Casiq[ue]s howse that died, and deck his scull w[i]th feathers of all colours, & hang all his goldeplates about the

³⁹ Ibid., ff. 1r-v.

⁴⁰ Ibid., f. 26r.

⁴¹ Raleigh's Guiana Voyages, 1618, BL: Sloane MS B 3272; An abstract of diuerse memorable thinges, worth the noting, selected out of S[i]r Walter Raleighs first booke of his discoverie of Guyana [after 1595], BL: Sloane MS B 3272; Miscellaneous letters from Sir Walter Rawleighe (1611-1618), BL: Add MS 29598.

⁴² An abstract of diuerse memorable thinges, f. 7r.

boanes of his armes, thighs, and legges'.⁴³ These reports correlated with what anthropologists now acknowledge was a real practice among certain tribes in Greater Amazonia.⁴⁴

In 1582, around the same time as Hoby collected information on these voyages, Richard Madox, an Oxford fellow at All Souls, embarked on a voyage overseen by Sir Martin Frobisher and Sir Francis Drake, to establish spice trades in a route that eventually took Madox to Sierra Leone and Brazil. Madox's journal, as with the diary of John Walker, evoked an uncertain world where prevailing views of native peoples, both Brazilian and African, were held even by travellers to the regions themselves. The Spanish friar whom the crew proposed to maroon, for example, 'wept bitterly alledging they *wolde* be eaten of the Indyes'.⁴⁵ Madox's diary seemed to have been intended for readership, probably by the courtiers who invested in the voyage, including Francis Walsingham, Lord Burghley, and the earl of Warwick, all of whom were members of Gray's Inn.

With its Latin and Greek references, veiled allusions and pseudonyms, and recordings of seditious behaviour, Madox's diary was both as private record and government report, and offers one example of the way university-educated gentlemen involved themselves in projects for expansion in America beyond collecting second-hand information.⁴⁶ Accounts written into the 1630s, including that of Sir Henry Colt from Barbados in 1631, are in many ways the results of the vogue for planting apparent at the Inns in the 1580s and 1590s. Colt had been admitted to Lincoln's Inn in 1596 and, before the systems of slavery irrevocably changed plantations systems, colonisation was still largely in the hands of those Colt considered 'gentlemen of note' – 'younge men, & [of] good desert' who must find ways to reign in the 'quarrelsome conditions of your fiery spiritts' through a duty to the commonwealth.⁴⁷

Ties that were formed at the Inns through patronage and court connections were crucial to advancing activities in the colonies, but it is with the establishment

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ James B. Peterson and John G. Crock, "'Handsome Death': The Taking, Veneration, and Consumption of Human Remains in the Insular Caribbean and Greater Amazonia", in *The Taking and Displaying of Human Body Parts as Trophies by Amerindians*, ed. Richard J. Chacon and David H. Dye (New York: Springer, 2007), pp. 547-574.

⁴⁵ 'The Diary of John Walker', 7 December 1582, in *An Elizabethan in 1582: The Diary of Richard Madox, Fellow of All Souls*, ed. Elizabeth Story Donno (London: Hakluyt Society, 1976), p. 326.

⁴⁶ *An Elizabethan in 1582*, pp. 21, 59.

⁴⁷ 'The Voyage of Sir Henry Colt knight to the islands of the Antilleas', in *Colonising Expeditions to the West Indies and Guiana, 1623 – 1667*, ed. V.T. Harlow (London: Hakluyt Society, 1925), p. 65.

of the Virginia Company that the links between the Inns of Court and westward enterprises manifest themselves most obviously. Those involved with drafting and signing the charters issued in 1606, 1609, and 1612 included a substantial number of men affiliated with the Inns. Members showed their commitment by investing in the voyages, while select others, after the founding of James Fort, travelled to the colonies themselves. This included, but was not limited to, Gabriel Archer of Gray's Inn, one of the initial colonists in Jamestown who died during the Starving Time; Christopher Brooke of Lincoln's Inn, a friend of John Donne's (also of Lincoln's Inn) and author of the poem recounting the Virginia massacre; Henry Wriothesley of Lincoln's Inn, patron of artists and poets, and treasurer of the Virginia Company; Francis Wyatt of Gray's Inn, royal governor of Virginia under James and Charles; Nathaniel Rich of Gray's Inn, heavily involved in the administration of the Virginia and Bermuda companies; George Calvert of Lincoln's Inn, who owned land in Newfoundland and served on the Council for New England; William Strachey of Gray's Inn, treasurer in Jamestown.⁴⁸ The courtier Henry Cary, later lord deputy of Ireland and colonial promoter for Newfoundland, belonged to Gray's Inn. The Middle Temple, a particularly strong locus for colonising projects, accommodated numerous affiliates including George Sandys, colonist in Virginia and brother to Sir Edwin Sandys, the Virginian councillor George Percy, younger brother to Raleigh's friend the imprisoned earl of Northumberland, and George Thorpe, who advocated Algonquian education and conversion until his death in 1622. Richard Martin, who so angered the earl of Southampton and Lord De La Warre by berating the House of Commons in 1614 in his capacity of councillor for the Virginia Company, was a reader at the Middle Temple, and William Crashaw served as preacher to the Inner and Middle Temples from 1605, where he invested in the Virginia Company and advocated the colonisation of Virginia and Bermuda from the pulpit.

Other colonising projects also bore the mark of the Inns of Court. Of the thirteen original adventurers of the Amazon Company (1619), for example, four

⁴⁸ The information is heretofore derived from the indexes of former Inns members, now available electronically. See *A Calendar of the Inner Temple Records* <www.innertemple.org.uk/downloads/archivesdept/Vol2> [accessed 8 November 2014]; *Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521 – 1889* <<https://archive.org/details/registerofadmiss00gray>> [accessed 8 November 2014]; *Register of Admissions for the Middle Temple* <<https://www.middletemple.org.uk/library-and-archive/archive-information-and-contacts/register-of-admissions>> [accessed 8 November 2014]; *The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn: The Black Books, Volumes I and II* <<https://archive.org/details/blackbookrecord01lincuoft>> [accessed 11 November 2014].

members (or a third) had been trained at either Gray's Inn, Lincoln's Inn, or the Inner Temple. James knighted three of these members at some point in their careers, and they contributed 500*l* to the original 2,500*l* collected for the company's first voyage.⁴⁹ This investment in the Amazon Company further indicates the ties between the Inns and royal court, where disenchanted courtiers, aggravated by the Spanish ambassador Gondomar's proximity to James and the duke of Buckingham's pro-Spanish policies, supported expansion to Guiana partly to challenge Catholic ascendancy. George Calvert, who fought in Ireland and strove to establish a colony in Newfoundland, studied at Lincoln's Inn and eventually became secretary of state in 1619.

The interest in colonisation was also fuelled by the formal socialising that burgeoned in the West End during the London 'season', which offered the chance for gentlemen to discuss expansion and civility alongside other news. As Michelle O'Callaghan has pointed out, involvement with the Virginia Company and the developing Jacobean 'wit' culture of sociability were closely entwined.⁵⁰ Men who might spend much of the year in the localities came to London on business and to sit in parliament, meeting in taverns and public houses to discuss current events in a convivial atmosphere in which literature and politics easily and often converged [Figure 4.3]. The coterie of 'sireniacal gentlemen' who met at the Mermaid tavern on Bread Street in the early 1600s included lawyers, courtiers and business associates who encouraged colonisation, notably Samuel Calvert, Sir Robert Phelips, Richard Martin, and Christopher Brooke. Bread Street's proximity to the printers around St Paul's made the Mermaid, and other taverns in the City, ideal places to discuss the latest publications on colonisation. English encounters with Caribs on the island of Santa Lucia, Virginia Company records about Jamestown, and eyewitness accounts of shipwrecks on Bermuda informed the discussions and attitudes that London gentlemen developed towards Amerindian peoples. Ben Jonson, Francis Beaumont, and John Fletcher were a few of the playwrights who met at these taverns, and who eventually brought America, Amerindians, and tobacco-smoking to the popular stage. These men also worked closely on court masques and city pageants, suggesting a cross-over between ideas

⁴⁹ 'The preamble for subscription to the Amazon company, with the signatures of the original thirteen adventurers', 6 April 1619, in *English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon, 1550 – 1646*, ed. Joyce Lorimer (London: Hakluyt Society, 1989), pp. 194-5. The affiliated members were Sir John Danvers (Lincoln's Inn), Sir Robert Rich (Inner Temple), Sir Edward Cecil (Gray's Inn), and Sir Nathaniel Rich (Gray's Inn).

⁵⁰ O'Callaghan, *The English Wits*, pp. 5, 16.

of native peoples as they were depicted in various spaces, and to different audiences.



Figure 4.3. Blasius Multibibus [Richard Brathwaite], *The lawes of drinking* (London, 1617; EEBO supplement guide, Harl.5987).

This engagement with news from America was also the result of connections between London gentlemen and court patrons such as lord treasurer Sir Lionel Cranfield, who also frequented the Mermaid, and who offered major financial support for the Virginia expeditions. The poems and epigrams about America by men like George Chapman, John Donne, and Michael Drayton – some of them perhaps shared over dinners in venues like the Mermaid – indicate that the rituals of friendship that involved codes of civility and urbanity were informed by purported facts as much as fantasy. ‘*America, A merry K, Peru.*’, wrote John Taylor to his friend, the gentleman traveller and ‘sireniacal’ Thomas Coryate, ‘*Virginia of thy worth doth onely heare,/And longs the weight of thy foot-steps to beare:/Returne thee, O returne thee quickly than,/And see the mighty Court of Powhatan*’.⁵¹

Underneath the teasing humour and the gibes at Coryate’s penchant for wordiness, lays evidence of a growing familiarity with America – a Virginia that

⁵¹ John Taylor, *All the workes of Iohn Taylor the water-poet* (London, 1630; STC 23725), sig. Gg6r.

was not merely filled with the fawning Indians described in sixteenth-century cosmographies, but a specific geographical region inhabited by an Algonquian chief named Powhatan. Michael Drayton's 'To a Virginian Voyage', or George Chapman's 'De Guiana', must be situated within this milieu. Chapman's 'De Guiana', often read out of context, was his contribution to Lawrence Kemys' 1596 *A relation to the second voyage to Guiana, a voyage 'performed' under the direction of courtier Sir Walter Raleigh*.⁵² Under the rhetoric of easy imperialism, Chapman and his readers were aware of the more complex process of colonisation that included interactions with local Arawaks. While the land itself, to Chapman, offered itself willingly to the English, the English must actively, through the loyal support for their monarch, bring 'what heretofore savage corruption held/in barbarous *Chaos*'.⁵³

Degrees of Savagery

Jews, Ottomans, individuals from various European countries (including France, Spain, and Italy), as well as subgroups within England – most notably Catholics – were all invoked as foils to the English in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Michael Braddick observes that Elizabethan depictions of Irishmen were similar to Stuart descriptions of Virginian Indians or Scottish Highlanders.⁵⁴ This is certainly true in the encompassing sense held by the English, that savagery characterised any who lived beyond the reach of the English state, and emphasises that projects to colonise America were extensions of the state's desire to strengthen its authority within the British Isles. At the same time, this should not be taken to mean that a homogeneity of 'otherness' existed. Although an awareness of uncivil behaviour was by no means relegated to native Americans alone, certain domestic and international factors contributed to the Jacobean association between incivility and American savagery. This section offers an overview of gentlemanly engagement with ideas of savagery and barbarity, in order to argue that the term 'savage' had a very precise influence on concepts of civil behaviour at this time.

⁵² Lawrence Kemys, *A relation of the second voyage to Guiana* (London, 1596; STC 14947), frontispiece.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, sig. Av.

⁵⁴ Michael Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England, 1550 – 1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 422.

New markets would incorporate Ottomans and Africans into concerns over the potential for societal corruption through sugar, coffee, tea, and chocolate, but this was not apparent in the London of 1620. Barbados – the island that would, by the 1670s, produce sixty five per cent of all sugar consumed in England – had yet to produce any sugar as late as 1637.⁵⁵ The first Africans in English North America arrived in Jamestown in 1619, and worked alongside indentured white servants; coffeehouses did not appear in Oxford and London until the late 1650s. For this reason, Amerindian savagery was the principle referent in Jacobean discourses about smoking. This would alter completely after slavery became a defining characteristic of English projects in the Atlantic, when fundamental differences came to be characterised by defective natures, rather than the degenerated civility that lent itself to intercultural comparison.⁵⁶ What Raleigh wrote in 1614 would have seemed untenable a generation or two later: ‘if colour...made a difference of species, then were the *Negros*, which wee call the Blacke-mores, *non animalia rationalia*, not men, but some kinde of strange beastes’.⁵⁷

English assumptions of inferiority and cultural difference among other countries or ethnicities were more nuanced than ideas of ‘otherness’ initially suggest, and the presence of certain groups within discourse therefore contained specific comments about behaviour and government. In the spectrum of cultural underdevelopment, ‘savages’ occupied a very different contextual framework than other groups that were considered uncivil. A survey of the use of the word ‘barbarous’ and ‘savage’ in published books in the *Short Title Catalogue*, as well as letters and reports by policy-makers and colonists in the State Papers and Cecil Papers, indicate that the description of ‘barbarous’ was most commonly associated with the Spanish and Ottoman empires. Stories of captured and enslaved English adventurers at the hands of pirates often appeared in popular works, where audacious merchants plotted to slay their ‘*Turkish iaylor*’ and

⁵⁵ Kathleen Donegan, *Seasons of Misery: Catastrophe and Colonial Settlement in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), p. 168. For the relative absence of Africans in England before the mid-seventeenth century, see Peter Fryer, *Staying Power: the History of Black People in Britain* (London: Pluto, 1984); Rozann Wheeler, *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000).

⁵⁶ For ‘blacks’ as both native Americans and Africans into the eighteenth century, see Catherine Molineux, ‘Pleasures of the Smoke: “Black Virginians” in Georgian London’s Tobacco Shops’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 64:2 (2007), pp. 327-76.

⁵⁷ Walter Raleigh, *The history of the world* (London, 1614; STC 20637), sig. L2r.

escape ‘so barbarous a thraldome’ as Ottoman rule.⁵⁸ In the European imagination, slavery was a fate that awaited Christians in the hands of ‘barbarians’ and their sprawling kingdoms, an idea that was reinforced by descriptions of janissaries as being enslaved Christians, indoctrinated in Islam from an early age and encouraged to rise in the sultan’s military ranks. Catholic Spain was often described in the language that mirrored anxieties over Ottoman repression, a comparison James himself made in 1604.⁵⁹ This reached a peak in the rhetoric of the early 1620s during the Spanish Match controversy, where John Reynolds penned virulent polemic against Spain, imagining, as Thomas Scott had in *Vox populi* (1620) and *The second part of vox populi* (1624), a world where ‘our Nobilitie and Gentry, dye vpon the swords of those barbarous *Castilians*, and those who escape and suruiue their fury, shall bee fettered and led Captiuies and Slaues’.⁶⁰

Though perceived as inferior or doctrinally flawed, ‘barbarous’ peoples, unlike ‘savages’, were nonetheless seen to operate in recognised polities. On the stage, savagery might best be embodied by Shakespeare’s Caliban in the *Tempest*, performed at Whitehall in 1611 – a half-human, treacherous, shifty presence – but the Ottoman threat was the title character of Marlowe’s thundering *Tamburlaine* (1587). As English writers and courtiers pandered to James’ idea of an imperial monarchy, depicting globes and new lands on processional arches and in masques and books, military men and chroniclers recognised that ‘their Monarchies [Ottoman and Persian] extend much further than all Christendome doth beside’.⁶¹ Richard Hawkins complained to Queen Elizabeth in 1598 that the ‘myseries of greuous calamities endured in thys my longe imprisonment amongst turkes and mores’ only emphasised that they were a ‘mercyles, faithless, filthy, and most barbarous nacion’, prideful and ‘the common enemye of all Christendom and the most tyrannous people that ever hath been known’.⁶²

Hawkins’ description of the Ottomans as ‘tyrannous people’ in an oppressive regime was nonetheless a recognised political category, though more analogous to the master-slave relationship that subdued the populace through

⁵⁸ Anthony Munday, *The admirable deliuerance of 266. Christians by Iohn Raynard Englishman from the captiuitie of the Turkes* (London, 1608; STC 18258), sig.C3v. See also Ellen G. Friedman, ‘Christian Captives at “Hard Labor” in Algiers, 16th – 18th Centuries’, *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 13:4 (1980), pp. 616-632; Linda Colley, *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600 – 1850* (London: Pimlico, 2003).

⁵⁹ James I, *A counterblaste to tobacco* (London, 1604; STC 14363), sig. Bv.

⁶⁰ John Reynolds, *Vox Coeli* (London, 1624; STC 20946.8), sig. Ir.

⁶¹ Barnabe Barnes, *Foure bookes of offices* (London, 1606; STC 1468), sig. G4r.

⁶² Richard Hawkins to Queen Elizabeth, 12 June 1598, Hatfield MS, CP 177/36r.

terror and the perversion of the law, than the paternal vision of European kingship as working for the good of the people.⁶³ Fears of savage behaviour were, on the whole, less fears of tyrannical behaviour than with anarchy – the ushering of chaos through the absence of government. Savagery was a different sort of ‘extreme ferocity’, wrote Barnabe Barnes, not coupled with the ruthless organisation of Roman or Ottoman armies but ‘void of all skillfull discipline’.⁶⁴ There were ‘those who are not possessed either of order, discipline, or authority; of that kinde are those Indians at this day’.⁶⁵ ‘Even the barbarourest people’ had laws; ‘savages’, it seemed to most writers, behaved as if they had none.⁶⁶

Contemporaries, then, saw a clear difference between threats of savagery and the threat offered by uncivil or ‘barbaric’ systems in the east. Ottomans and Spanish Catholics seemed natural points of comparison, partly due to the enduring crusading ideology rooted in shared interaction in the medieval past, and a long European history of involvement with the Holy Land through pilgrimage and trade.⁶⁷ The English awe of these empires and the extent of their dominions were most commonly seen as threats to their Protestant religion, dating back to Reformation debate where Martin Luther and other religious authors had seen Ottomans as the *flagellum dei*, the scourge of God, and the association between erroneous faith and violations of human dignity through tyranny remained closely allied.⁶⁸

The native inhabitants to the west of England offered very different elements of contrast to the English understanding of the world, and this was acknowledged in the writings of Inns members. In their translation of Philip de Mornay’s *A woorke concerning the trewenesse of the Christian religion* (1587), Philip Sidney of Gray’s Inn, and Arthur Golding of the Inner Temple, wrote that ‘[o]ur poore *Americans*’ were ‘the sauagest people of the world’.⁶⁹ Those ‘whome wee at this day call Sauages’ were the most ‘beastly people of the World’, especially the ‘*Caribies* and *Cannibals*’, who were considered less culturally developed than the ‘*Turkes*, *Arabians*, or *Persians*’, who at least possessed a

⁶³ Anders Ingram, ‘English Literature on the Ottoman Turks in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’ (University of Durham, unpublished PhD thesis, 2009), pp. 155-7.

⁶⁴ Barnes, *Four booke of offices*, sig. Bb4r.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Philippe de Mornay, *A woorke concerning the trewenesse of the Christian religion* (London, 1587; STC 18149), sig. G7r.

⁶⁷ Ingram, ‘English Literature on the Ottoman Turks’, p. 326.

⁶⁸ Quote by Kenneth Setton in Ingram, ‘English Literature on the Ottoman Turks’, p. 75.

⁶⁹ Mornay, *A woorke concerning the trewenesse of the Christian religion*, sig. G6r.

written culture through which to preserve their holy book.⁷⁰ The possessive ‘our’ in references to ‘savages’ would be an impossible pronoun to apply to eastern cultures, and reinforced the implicit view that attitudes towards native Americans represented a threat that did not spring from awe as much as derision. George Wyatt’s letter to his son Francis, the governor of Virginia, voiced similarly: ‘you shalbe superior easily to your Savages’.⁷¹ Sir Ferdinando Gorges reported the news that Captain Thomas Dermer had given him news that ‘one of my Savages’ had been found in Newfoundland – this was the Patuxet Tisquantum, on whom William Bradford and the colonists at Plymouth would rely on so heavily for their survival, and who had lived in Gorges’ household in England with several other captives after 1605.⁷²

The belief that Amerindians were mobile and landless, thereby living outside strict codes of societal expectations, made them obvious points of contrast in discussions of incivility. The overwhelming tendency to use the term ‘savages’ to categorise Amerindians yoked them to a particular set of meanings and values that authors would have understood when they employed such terms, and the fact that most gentlemen referred to them as such reflect their overall willingness to subscribe to the attitudes expressed by the governing regime. Letters from merchants, colonists, and council members of the Virginia Company consistently referred to natives as ‘savages’, and the employment of the word in James’ writings and proclamations reinforced the state’s acceptance of the term as a category that best described peoples who were seen to live outside any sort of legitimate government. The Virginia Council in London issued warrants for trade with the ‘savages of those parts’, and the king issued a proclamation in 1622 reprimanding those who ‘trafficked with the savages’ without permission.⁷³

Letters from members of the privy council referring to the natives as ‘savages’ far outweighed terms like ‘naturalls’, ‘Indians’, or even ‘heathens’, though the biblical associations with heathens as idolaters made the term more pervasive in New England than the Chesapeake. The king and privy council gave permission to Esmé Stuart, duke of Lennox, Thomas Howard, earl of Arundell,

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, sigs. G8r, S2r.

⁷¹ ‘A Letter of Advice to the Governor of Virginia, 1624’, ed. J. Frederick Fausz and John Kukla, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 34:1 (1977), pp. 104-29, p. 124.

⁷² ‘A Briefe Narration of the Originall Undertakings of the Advancement of Plantations into the Parts of America’, in *Sir Ferdinando Gorges and His Province of Maine*, ed. James Phinney Baxter (Boston: Prince Society, 1890), p. 26.

⁷³ Warrant by Lord Zouch for John Fenner, 15 February 1619, in *Calendar of State Papers: Colonial, Vol. 1, 1574 – 1660*, ed. W. Noel Sainsbury (London: Stationary Office, 1860), p. 21.

and the soldier Roger North to travel to South America with the Amazon Company in 1619 because the region was ‘inhabited with heathen and savage people, that have no knowledg of any Christian religion...[and] are not under the government of any Christian prince or state’.⁷⁴ The casual callousness of these references nevertheless made a powerful claim over the status of the peoples that colonists encountered, who were not to be diplomatic partners but recipients of English civility.

The interest in colonising projects fostered at the Inns of Court must be understood within this framework. The terms and ideas that were used were not arbitrary but informed by a complex way of considering the world and in its inhabitants. In recognising the choice of words employed by members, one can see the influences of the prevalent discourse of the royal court, as of colonists themselves. The very presence of the word ‘savage’ in Inns members’ diaries, commonplace books, poems, and performances were an adherence to a specific expansionist agenda playing itself out at that moment in America. At the same time, the use of these terms was fluid enough to be adapted for domestic use. Subjects were encouraged to think of themselves in terms of the behaviour of others.

To James, it was not enough to encourage his people to be civil; it was also necessary to highlight that his subjects’ rejection of his authority made them savage. A ‘Sauage custome’ was the trait of ‘Sauage men’, not to be mimicked.⁷⁵ When, in September 1618, a group of apprentices accosted the house of the Spanish ambassador, James was horrified that the City of London, ‘where all things should passe in quiet, and with obedience and order, should turne like the wilde Borders...subject to uprores’.⁷⁶ These perpetrators, the ‘scumme of the Suburbes’, were ‘betrayers of the government and peace of Our Kingdome’.⁷⁷ In seeking to establish order, James wanted nothing to do with ‘vnciuill violence’.⁷⁸ To writers who invoked concepts of savagery, a lack of manners rendered an individual, or group of people, perilously uncontrollable. ‘We maruell much at the rude and ignorant *Indians*’, wrote John Moore in 1617, ‘...but wee neuer thinke of

⁷⁴ ‘A letter to Sir Thomas Coventree, knight, from his Majesty’s Sollicitor Generall’, 18 April 1619, TNA: PRO, PC 2/30, f. 159r.

⁷⁵ James, *A counterblaste to tobacco*, sig. B2r.

⁷⁶ ‘By the King. A Proclamation at the sollicitation [*sic*] of the King of Spaines Agent for pardon of such persons as were convicted, for making of a seditious assault upon the house of the Spanish Ambassadour in Barbican’, 10 September 1618, in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol. I*, ed. James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973), p. 403.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 404.

⁷⁸ James I, *An apologie for the oath of allegiance* (London, 1609; STC 14401.5), sig. B3r.

our owne folly'.⁷⁹ In the lives of the sinful, wrote John Hagthorpe in 1623, '*Art and Nature* seeme to vie' for ascendancy, but he hardly needed to ask whether 'it were better to be gouerned by Art & Discipline, or the liue as some of the West Indian sauages do, only by the rule of Nature'.⁸⁰

Tropes depicting Amerindians indicated an interest in outward-looking civilising initiatives, but they also indicated the priorities of those who thought it so important to promote civility in the first place. To gentlemen who framed themselves as urbane promoters of a well-governed civil society, the reality of American 'savages' not only made colonisation seem imperative, but fed into a sense of superiority towards their own knowledge and abilities in assisting with affairs of the realm. There was a reason that native American 'savages' became appropriated in such a range of discourses in the way they did, and these appropriations often had little to do with America itself. After all, the derision for English degenerative behaviour in the colonies suggest that the overseas enterprises were, from the start, less concerned with governing new peoples than with governing the Englishmen in those territories, in which case comparisons between Amerindians and Englishmen were first and foremost about English conduct.⁸¹

The Sociability of Smoking

Though members of the Inns advocated colonisation and used the term 'savage' to denote the indigenous peoples of America, the bounds of savagery were sorely tested by the introduction of an exotic practice within the city itself. It was one thing to condemn the behaviour of Amerindians, but an engagement with a commodity like tobacco was more complicated than pitting a 'savage' habit against English manners. Surviving works suggest that tobacco-smoking was becoming, at this time, part of the demographic of London itself:

As I walked betweene
Westminster Hall
And the Church of St *Paul*,
And so thorow the Citie,
Where I saw and did pittie,
My Countrymens cases,
With fiery-smoke faces,

⁷⁹ John Moore, *A mappe of mans mortalitie* (London, 1617; STC 18057), sig. O3v.

⁸⁰ John Hagthorpe, *Visiones rerum* (London, 1623; STC 12604), sig. A3r.

⁸¹ Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion, and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 189.

Sucking and drinking
A fylthie Weede stinking.⁸²

The physical space of the city had become a conduit to a social practice that threatened the integrity of the realm as a whole, and nowhere did this seem more apparent than among the city's gentlemen. Henry Parrot, government informer and prolific writer of epigrams, included vivid pictures of the idle, arrogant lives of the young and moneyed:

Focus growne fat, liues like an Epicure,
And studies daily how he shall be fed,
That can no more your walkes in Powles indure,
But takes *Tobacco* as he lies in's bed:
Where belching (like a Boare) he cal's for Sack
And only keeps a Whore to scratch his back.⁸³

The stereotypes of the Inns man in the early seventeenth century was closely connected to the 'Indian weed': 'His Recreations...are his only studies (as Plaies, Dancing, Fencing, Tauerns, and Tobacco)'.⁸⁴ Tobacco was widely smoked, and records of the Inns show that councillors sought to curb the boys' smoking in public places like the dining hall, where the fashion for long hair also came under attack.⁸⁵ John Donne's 'Satire I' featured an encounter on the streets of London with a gentleman who 'did excel/Th'Indians, in drinking his Tobacco well', a largely ridiculous figure who acted in overly effeminate ways, caring more for lace and social status than personal integrity.⁸⁶ There were complaints that gentlemen were sometimes so uncivil that it seemed 'their Progenitors had beene some Cumanian Indians', and it was wished they would 'resume spirits truly English' to avoid becoming a 'degenerating posteritie'.⁸⁷

Satirists like the Gray's Inn member Henry Hutton criticised the behaviour of his peers, who seemed especially partial to smoking and theatre-going: 'The Globe to morrow acts a pleasant play...Goe take a Pipe of To[bacco]... Roarers respect, and value these too much'.⁸⁸ Other epigrams included languid figures

⁸² The new prologue was added to John Skelton, *Elynour Rummin, the famous ale-wife of England* (London, 1624; STC 22614), sig. A2v.

⁸³ Henry Parrot, *Laquei ridiculosi: or Springes for woodcocks Caueat emptor* (London, 1613; STC 19332), sig. D7v.

⁸⁴ From Francis Lenton's *Characterismi* (1631), quoted in *Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court*, p. 90.

⁸⁵ Prest, *The Inns of Court Under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts*, p. 93.

⁸⁶ John Donne, *Poems, by J.D. With elegies on the authors death* (London, 1633; STC 7045), sig. Tt4v.

⁸⁷ Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimes* (London, 1613; STC 20505), sig. Ooo4r.

⁸⁸ Henry Hutton, *Follie's anatomie* (London, 1619; STC 14028), sig. B2v.

with sharp wits, ruffled denizens in velvet breeches who expressed themselves through oaths and spent more time in tobacco houses and taverns than anywhere productive. Still in his teens, the budding poet John Beaumont, a member of Inner Temple alongside his young playwright brother Francis, published an ode to tobacco called *The metamorphosis of Tabacco*, where he praised ‘this precious herbe, Tabacco most diuine’.⁸⁹ Beaumont rejected the filthy tobacco hastily imbibed by London gulls and called instead for an enjoyment of ‘thou great God of Indian melodie’, invoking the golden-hued, heady, sacred plant of the exotic Americas.⁹⁰

The contentious but evident fashion for tobacco at the Inns indicates that gentlemanly attitudes towards civility and savagery were more complex than merely adopting the rhetoric found in travel books and cosmographies. Those who subscribed to classical and Christian notions of morality and self-control nonetheless ‘fetishized the dangers...and transcendent power of excessive consumption’, and tobacco became part of that expression.⁹¹ At the same time, though scholars tend to dwell on this latter aspect, the reverse is also true. Though exoticism seemed to indulge, rather than reject, what authorities perceived to be uncivil behaviour, smoking, like other ‘savage’ associations, became part of the maturing process of a masculinity that nonetheless sought to conform to prescribed rules and codes of behaviour. Civil behaviour did not always entail fully eschewing incivility, but it did hinge upon a mastery of savagery that ultimately prized moderation over anarchic excess.

To members of a peer group who sought to entrench themselves in the political life of the realm, debates over the effects of tobacco-smoking were made all the more relevant by the struggles in Jamestown and the decisions made by the privy council and parliament to award the Virginia Company a monopoly of tobacco production. Smoking might, to some, appear to be an exotic danger whose excessive use promoted disorder rather than order, but it might also serve as an indicator of social status – a public statement of political awareness by those who endorsed and subscribed to the colonisation of America. Further, tobacco became increasingly domesticated into the 1630s. In *Wine, Beere, Ale, and Tobacco*, Tobacco was portrayed not as a native but a swaggering gallant who

⁸⁹ John Beaumont, *The metamorphosis of tabacco* (London, 1602; STC 1695), sig. A3r.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, sig. Bv.

⁹¹ Phil Withington, ‘Introduction: Cultures of Intoxication’, *Past and Present: Supplement 9* (2014), pp. 9-33, p. 29.

pandered to others to advance his reputation.⁹² Although his fellows feared he would usher ‘pretty treasons’, Tobacco was ultimately accepted, and it is noteworthy that all exoticism had been removed from the representation of him. This contrasted to the *Maske of flowers* performed at court in 1613 and 1614, where ‘Kawasha’ arrived on stage dressed in swaying brown leaves and carrying a bow and arrow.⁹³

Even humorous works like *A solemne ioviall disputation*, written by the Gray’s Inn member Richard Brathwaite in 1617, showed a familiarity with expected conduct underneath the mocking prose. Though the hyperbole of ‘The Smoaking Age’ achieved its comic effect by mimicking the dominant rhetoric against smoking, denouncing it as a political evil, the humour was effective precisely because the gentlemen in the audience did not actually believe such chaos would be possible under stable government. The fictional Boraccio Fumiganto conversed with an acquaintance who decided that the best way to govern and ‘worke wonders among the wilde *Irish*’ was to reduce ‘all those bogs, and marshes, to plots of *Tobacco*’, a ludicrous project that jabbed at the Jacobean enthusiasm for schemes that purported to benefit both state and private purse.⁹⁴ Brathwaite included a lengthy lament by Father Time that neatly echoed anti-tobacco polemic, asking why men now preferred ‘an herbes vapour’ to seeking ‘their countries rewowne[,] Commonweales success; or publike managements of state’.⁹⁵ Having worked himself into a passionate frenzy, Father Time cried:

Now doe I behold the misery of the world; the corrupter of Cities; the depraver of Youth; the dotage of Age; the dissolution of all! And this griefe is no lesse than any other to me: when I see Pipes made occasions of a discourse, where nothing rellisheth, nothing delighteth without them: O, how Idlenesse hath erected a throne for her to sit in...!⁹⁶

Here, Brathwaite returned to the fears, so often voiced, of tobacco as dangerously sovereign, usurping the role of king or God: ‘O, baine of youth, why darest thou usurp the authoritie of a soveraigne...[becoming] a dissolver of states...?’⁹⁷ He derided tobacco’s anarchical qualities, yet the very act of cataloguing tobacco’s ills indicated an awareness of the contrast between such behaviour and civil

⁹² Gallobelgicus, *Wine, beere, ale, and tobacco. Contending for superiority* (London, 1630; STC 11542).

⁹³ *Wine, beere, ale, and tobacco*, sig. D2v; John Coperario, *The maske of flowers* (London, 1614; STC 17625), sig. B3r.

⁹⁴ Richard Brathwaite, *A solemne ioviall disputation* (London, 1617; STC 3585), sig. G5v.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. M6v.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, sig. M8v.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, sig. Or.

behaviour. Like John Beaumont's *Metamorphosis of tabacco*, the satiric jabs at anti-tobacco literature were nonetheless informed by recent discoveries, with mentions of Virginia and its tribes. Beaumont eventually gained royal patronage through his elegant verses on religion and religious policies, where fears of savagery were quelled through linguistic sophistication and a moderate worldview, even as he seemed to celebrate the fanciful disorder intoxicants might provide.

Chapman, who may have been connected to the Inns of Court, and who collaborated closely with students of the Middle Temple like John Marston, also lampooned the mediocrity of tobacco-smokers, even as his inclusion of the trend only emphasised its popularity. In 1606, the year after his imprisonment for mocking the Scottish at court and the Virginia enterprises in *Eastward Ho!*, he played on James' dislike of tobacco in the comedy *Monsieur D'Olive*. D'Olive, though ostensibly French, was the archetypal English gull, a vain and social-climbing gentleman with an extraordinary ego. He was also a stereotypically insufferable wit, forever wanting to meet with friends in his chambers to 'drinke Sacke, and talke Satyre...it shall be a second *Sorbonne*'.⁹⁸ The meeting to drink, smoke, and discuss politics must have evoked the fashions current at the Inns.

D'Olive, tricked into thinking he had been invited to take part in an important embassy for a French duke, embarrassed himself at court by philosophising at length about tobacco. Though humorous, Chapman's description of a Catholic deriding a Protestant for his opposition to tobacco evoked the fears of numerous English writers about the association between smoke, vanity, and uncivil behaviour, which contained obvious political implications. Upstart, a weaver, hated tobacco:

Purblind he was
 With the GENEVA print, and wore one eare
 Shorter...hotly he envaid
 Against Tobacco...
 Said 'twas a pagan plant, a prophane weede
 And a most sinful smoke...
 Invented sure by Sathan
 In these our latter dayes, to cast a mist
 Before mens eyes, that they might not behold
 The groseness of olde superstition
 Which is as t'were deriu'd into the church
 From the fowle stinke of Romish popery...

⁹⁸ George Chapman, *Monsieur D'Olive* (London, 1606; STC 4983), sig. B2v.

That the svbstantiall commodities,
 And mighty blessings of this Realme of France[,]
 Bells, Rattles...and such like
 Which had brought so much wealth into the Land
 Should now be changd into this smoke of vanitie
 The smoke of superstition.⁹⁹

Yet D'Olive's own affection for tobacco, matched only by his prodigious self-love, contributed to his utter inability to serve the duke in any useful capacity. In his discourse praising tobacco, D'Olive resorted to the vaulting stereotypes about tobacco's excellence that fell more hollowly than his mocking description of the Protestant weaver. 'What varietie of discourse it begets?' the hopelessly unwitty D'Olive asked his disdainful court audience: 'What sparkes of wit it yeelds...'¹⁰⁰

The place of colonisation in the Jacobean culture of sociability therefore involved frivolity, but only in certain contexts. John Donne may have eroticised the American landscape in his sonnets and reduced Irish colonisation to a playful metaphor in privately-circulated manuscripts – likely read to the Virginia Company member and lawyer Christopher Brooke at Lincoln's Inn, where the two shared lodgings – but he also sought the position of treasurer for the Virginia Company.¹⁰¹ This post demanded conformity to the dominating Protestant attitude that sought to convert natives, but also to civilise them according to English customs, a stance Donne publicly promoted as dean of St Paul's in his sermon to the Virginia Company in 1622. Men who scribbled odes to tobacco at tavern dinners were also faced with the task, in parliament, of finding the best policies to benefit the realm without letting the Virginia Company flounder. Even a praise of tobacco involved the need to condemn indigenous savagery: 'In the farre countries, where *Tabacco* growes', the English must assert their presence 'ouer *Virginia* and the *New-found-land*' to '[tame] the sauage nations of the West'.¹⁰² John Beaumont's injunction was not an abstract need informed purely by vague hearsay, but seemed informed by Thomas Hariot's treatise on Virginia, which also cited 'the valleys of *Wingandekoe*', that 'country in the North part of America' colonised by Elizabeth.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Ibid., sig. D3r.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., sig. D4r.

¹⁰¹ Michelle O'Callaghan, 'Brooke, Christopher (1570-1628)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3538?docPos=1> [accessed 11 March 2015]. Brooke and Donne were briefly imprisoned in the scandal following Donne's secret marriage to seventeen-year old Ann More.

¹⁰² Beaumont, *The metamorphosis of tabacco*, sig. E3v.

¹⁰³ Ibid., sig. Cr.

Enacting Savagery

Flirting with the bounds of civility did not only find expression in the act of smoking, but in the manifestation of certain tropes and types in performances. Plays like Thomas Tomkins' *Lingua: or, The combat of the tongue*, first printed in 1607, saw at least three further editions before James' death. Written by a fellow at Cambridge, the play proved far more popular than Barten Holyday's *Technogamia: or, The marriages of the arts* acted in Oxford at Shrovetide for the unimpressed king in 1621. These plays, both acted by students, show the way in which they engaged with the trend for smoking in ways that were both celebratory and, like Chapman's work, ultimately moderate. In the fourth act of *Lingua*, a student embodying Tobacco entered the stage, 'apparelled in a taffeta mantle, his armes browne and naked...his face browne painted with blew stripes, in his nose swines teeth'.¹⁰⁴ He wore 'a painted wicker crowne, with Tobacco pipes set in it, plumes of Tobacco leaves, lead by two Indian boyes naked, with tapers in their hands'.¹⁰⁵ Olefactus, hoping to prove his superiority over other senses, paraded Tobacco around the stage, praising the 'Emperour Tobacco' that 'conquered all Europe'.¹⁰⁶ In Holyday's play, 'Phlegmatico' arrived on stage 'in a pale russet Suite...his Hat beset round about with Tobacco pipes', where other characters derided the way he dragged himself across stage, smoking and drunkenly hurling himself across the stage, insisting on indulging in some 'pure *Indian*' for love of 'Metropolitane Tobacco'.¹⁰⁷ Though readily identified as swaggering gentlemen, especially those found in fashionable London, tobacco-smokers were a type that were heavily criticised, representing those who tried too hard to adopt the rules of civility while failing to understand its ethos. Like D'Olive's praise of tobacco, the songs and ditties performed by tobacco characters in university plays were explicitly ridiculous.

In *The Sea Voyage* (1622), John Fletcher, also a frequenter of the Mermaid, and Philip Massinger inverted expected tropes of Amerindian savagery by exploring the relationships between incivility and European political degeneration. The 'commonwealth' of fierce Amazonian women turned out to be

¹⁰⁴ Thomas Tomkins, *Lingua: or, The combat of the tongue* (London, 1607; STC 24104), sig. H4r.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, sig. H4v.

¹⁰⁷ Barten Holyday, *Technogamia: or The marriages of the arts* (London, 1618; STC 13617), sig. D3r.

long-lost Europeans who had degenerated into violence, and the only individuals willing to act on their impulses to eat human flesh were the ‘shallow-brain’d’ gentlemen, removed from all constraints of civil society.¹⁰⁸ Though a comedy, the play contained a disquieting scene in which a merchant and two gentlemen contemplated eating a sleeping woman. The language closely mirrored that of travel accounts of starvation, but also inverted the imagery of abundance evoked in Shakespeare’s *Tempest*. Here, wild animals lurked in the alien terrain, and the desperation of hunger made humans demonic. Here, there were no sprites and magical transformations; unmasked, everything was terrifyingly mundane.

Often overlooked in discussions about colonisation, *The Sea Voyage* plainly intended to comment on English behaviour despite the French and Portuguese characters. The degenerate gentlemen, so quick to respond to their instincts rather than to piety or self-restraint, may have been a pointed critique of the failures of the Virginia Company to govern the colony according to English law. Perhaps more straightforwardly, the figure of disgraceful gentlemen, rejecting civil behaviour, used the microcosm of the island to highlight the dangers of denying societal constraints. The recourse to cannibalism, and consequently dishonourable behaviour, were linked to the instabilities that came from rejecting civility and the failure to be governed – Franville, Morillat, and Lamure had arrogantly sought to operate outside the specific orders given them by their superior, Albert. The association between gallants and self-seeking or cannibal behaviour also found expression in the Cambridge fellow Edward Sutton’s treatise, *Anthropophagus* (1623), where hypocrisy transformed English gentlemen into destroyers of the commonweal – a message Sutton found ‘very necessarie for these times’.¹⁰⁹

Ten years after the *Sea Voyage*, Massinger would write *The City Madam* (1632), a play that featured a native American in London who, it turned out, was not a devil-worshipping Virginian at all, but a merchant who had adopted the disguise in order to re-establish order to his private home life. Though the play falls outside the main focus of this chapter (though Massinger did have connections with the Inner Temple through his coterie of friends), it is worth noting that scholars have suggested a connection between the play’s themes of the ‘reformation and restoration’ of the English household and the Virginia massacre

¹⁰⁸ *The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, Vol. IX*, ed. A. R. Waller (New York: Octagon Books, 1969), p. 32.

¹⁰⁹ Edward Sutton, *Anthropophagus: the man-eater* (London, 1624; STC 23496), frontispiece.

of 1622, which was so brilliantly executed partly because the Powhatan used the English willingness to allow them into their homes to their advantage.¹¹⁰ When Sir John revealed himself to be an Englishman in *The City Madam*, he announces that '[t]his wash'd off', whereby harmony and hierarchical deference ultimately depended on rejecting manifestations of 'savagery'.¹¹¹

Though *Memorable masque* dealt most explicitly with Amerindian peoples, *The maske of flowers*, also performed at Whitehall, featured the presence of 'Kawasha' – the name of the 'chiefe' Virginian god, reported by John Smith to be the 'one aboue all the rest' and depicted pictorially in the woodcuts by Theodore de Bry included in Hariot's *Briefe and true report*.¹¹² Presented by the gentlemen of Gray's Inn during the Twelfth Night celebrations of 1614, the performance was part of the revels that accompanied the wedding of the king's favourite, Robert Carr, to Lady Francis Howard. Francis Bacon, also a member of Gray's Inn, had commissioned the masque at great personal expense, filling the hall with 'beautiful youths' who turned into flowers with the onset of spring.¹¹³ On either side of the banqueting house stood the temples set up by Silenus (Wine), and Kawasha (Tobacco), where the two would contend for superiority in the anti-masque, attended by roaring boys and chimney sweepers. Kawasha appeared 'borne vpon two Indians shoulders', 'his body and legges of Oliue colour stuffe, made close like the skinne, bases of Tobacco-colour stuffee cut like Tobacco leaues' and holding a tobacco pipe the ludicrous size of a harquebus.¹¹⁴ The association between tobacco and its sovereignty was expressed in a song: 'Kawasha comes in maiestie/Was neuer such a God as he', where the mysteries of smoking understood by natives were 'holy rites'.¹¹⁵

As expected, however, the masquers ultimately expelled the mischievous perils of the anti-masque and turned to the true sovereign to praise 'Britain' and her monarchy. The performers 'vncouered their faces, and came vp to the State, and kissed the King'.¹¹⁶ Like the Virginian masque, *The masque of flowers*

¹¹⁰ Gavin Hollis, "He would not goe naked like the *Indians*, but clothed just like our selves": Disguise and "the Naked Indian" in Massinger's *The City Madam*, *Renaissance Drama*, 39 (2011), pp. 129-62, p. 153.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

¹¹² John Smith, *The general historie of Virginia* (London, 1624; STC 22790), sig. Hh4v; Thomas Hariot, *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia* (London, 1590; STC 12786), sig. D2r.

¹¹³ Coperario, *The maske of flowers*, sig. A4v.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. B3r.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. B4r.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, sig. C4r.

allowed members to perform a social contract between themselves and James. It is no coincidence that the barristers cast Eunomia as the figure who urged the ‘Virginian Princes’ to ‘renounce/Your superstitious worship of these Sunnes...[and turn] to this our Britain *Phoebus*’, for ‘eunomia’ was Greek for good governance through the law.¹¹⁷

The plays and performance penned by Inns members and affiliates indicate that their engagement with savagery were part of a complex understanding of civility that occasionally allowed for unruly behaviour within specific contexts. The presence of tobacco and native Americans in masques and plays invited young gentlemen to satirise uncivil behaviour through temporarily acting in the very manners conduct books advised them to reject. Wearing a mask, or donning costumes ‘also makes one self-conscious of a real “me” underneath’, and might have been a form catharsis like other forms of drama.¹¹⁸ The interactive nature of masque performances, and of university plays and even stage plays, were part of the humanistic trend that saw a moral didacticism in literature as capable of affecting the inner self and promote virtuous behaviour. Like anti-masques, the literature of convivial societies were part of the expectation that entering prescribed social contracts created ‘a safe place for play and performance’ which ‘were intended to facilitate social exchanges among the elite and affirm social identity, designating the participants as cultivated and learned men fit to participate in the structures of governance’.¹¹⁹ These performances were enacted in specific spaces and contexts; Edward Phelips was not amused when he received a petition by benchers of the Middle Temple, complaining that one gentleman refused to return his costume from the Virginian masque [Figure 4.4].¹²⁰ ‘Lett m[aste]r peters presently come vnto me,’ Phelips scrawled underneath the complaint, ‘for I hold his deniall very strange’.¹²¹ Forms of creative expression, including masques, have been described as a ‘paradox of state’ whereby ‘license and lawlessness’ was ultimately ‘interpreted as submission to authority’, which

¹¹⁷ Chapman, *The memorable masque*, sig. Fv.

¹¹⁸ Hollis, “‘He would not goe naked like the *Indians*, but cloathed just like our selves””, p. 135. This was all the more true considering the wearing of shell necklaces with teeth or claws allowed an individual to acquire spirit-helpers to navigate their dreams and visions. In some way, the performances by English subjects and native Americans were both about coming of age – but the English did so by removing what members of tribal communities put on.

¹¹⁹ O’Callaghan, *The English Wits*, p. 5.

¹²⁰ Petition by the benchers of the Middle Temple to Sir Edward Phelips, 1614, MT.7/MAA36r.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

might also be said of the dinners held by members of the fraternities that included members of the king's privy council as well as lawyers of the King's Bench.¹²²




Figure 4.4. Petition by the Benchers of the Middle Temple to Sir Edward Phelips [1614], Middle Temple Archives, MT.7/MAA/36r.

In creating a space for unmannerly behaviour, civility might be better promoted in everyday exchange. It was one thing to laugh at uncivil behaviour, which bolstered self-confidence and self-awareness, but quite another to be laughed *at* for behaving in the same way in public places. The presence of ‘savages’, of members of the universities and the Inns dressing up and embodying native Americans, by dressing (or undressing) as well as through gesture and accessories like bones and body paint, therefore served to raise awareness of the

¹²² Hugh Craig, ‘Jonson, the Antimasque and the “Rules of Flattery”’, in *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, ed. David Bevington and Peter Holybrook (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 176-96, p. 179.

importance of civil bonds in professional spheres while simultaneously validating the need for political control in new territories. It allowed members to define themselves against the behaviour they saw in those who lived outside acceptable social worlds, and perhaps even to grapple with their own private concerns with salvation through their ultimate identification with conformity to the Church of England. As Alec Ryrie noted, Protestant subjects saw their lives as a series of struggles – ‘with sin and the Devil, with the world and their own nation’, and ‘this valorisation of struggle and labour focused attention onto the opposing vice: idleness’.¹²³ This may help explain the enthusiasm for colonisation fuelled by an emphasis on ‘idle’ and pagan inhabitants in Virginia and Ireland. However paradoxically, the presence of ‘savages’ in the masques performed at James’ court ultimately indulged in exoticism in order to affirm a world where savagery had no place.

Incivility in Political Discourse

Such behaviour reinforced that incivility – and political engagement – was not passive but inherently performative. Ideas of savagery often entered political discourse precisely because it entailed a wilful act of doing, making it an especially useful concept for conceptualising disobedient behaviour. Since successful government depended on the participation of elites, and on the subscription of shared societal values, incivility became a point of reference that allowed groups and individuals to reject unsanctioned behaviour or slander others. Gentlemen were themselves part of this process of defining behaviour and, consequently, negotiating their reputation in society based on their habits. The exchanges between Sir Edward Hoby and the Jesuit John Floyd provides one example. Between 1612 and 1615, Hoby and Floyd engaged in a small pamphlet war after Floyd’s attack on William Crashaw’s *The Iesuites gospel* of 1610. Enraged at what he saw as gross inconsistencies in Crashaw’s attack on Jesuits, Floyd’s response not only sought to dismantle Crashaw’s credibility but the entire Protestant establishment that allowed Crashaw’s sermon to be preached and printed, and tobacco played a role in articulating this.

Since Crashaw was preacher of the Inner and Middle Temples, Floyd’s 1612 *The ouerthrow of the Protestant pulpit babels* included a lengthy appeal to

¹²³ Ryrie, Alec, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 4.

students at the Inns to display their equity in assessing the truth, cleverly appealing to the students' pride in good sense and virtue. Floyd's tract also included personal barbs towards Hoby, a member of the Middle Temple, parliament, and James' privy council, which prompted Hoby's 1613 rebuttal in *A counter-snarle for Ishamel Rabshecheh*. Floyd had dismissed Hoby's opinions under the presence that 'there is no story, nor miracle in the holy Bible, which some will not deride, when they bibble, or take *Tobacco*...as *Syr Edward* doth seeme to doe...Sir Edward Hoby must be called into question' for his 'vile fiction'.¹²⁴

'I am sure [smoking] is no mortal sin,' Hoby countered, 'though if it were, I haue litle reason to trauel to the Popes toe for a Pardon'.¹²⁵ He continued,

Shall I be so bold as to make you my confessors? Then I confesse in my time I haue not beene an enemy to that *Indian* weede, and perhaps haue spent somewhat that way, which had bin better giuen to the poore. Yet my tennants cannot say, but my chimneys did euer smoak more then my nose. As for these late yeares, I doe not remember, that I had a pipe in my hand twice.¹²⁶

Floyd's attempts to discredit Hoby's learning by condemning this particular personal habit hit a sore point, as Hoby's lengthy need to defend himself indicated. Here, accusations of incivility were explicitly used to attack an opponent's credibility and political leanings. Floyd rejected the validity of Hoby's Protestant views by implying they were conjured in a semi-intoxicated state brought on by the '*Indian weed*'. Floyd had also targeted the entire Virginian enterprise, calling the earliest colonists 'for the most part Atheists, and prophane fellowes' and mocking the fledgling attempts to create an English polity that had dissolved into disarray.¹²⁷ Floyd criticised the Protestant evangelical mission to America that had not led to the virtuous foundations of an English polity, but to a society modelled on the most dissolute members of society, men who were little different than the beings they proposed to convert. Like Protestant accusations of cannibal behaviour among Catholics, accusations of incivility piqued at gentlemanly honour-culture in ways that provoked dispute.

The particular milieu of the Inns, with its encouragement of creative engagement with literary forms, was conducive to the way that tropes of

¹²⁴ Original quote in John Floyd, *The ouerthrow of the Protestants pulpit-Babels* (St-Omer, 1612; STC 11111), sig. R4r; re-quoted in Edward Hoby, *A counter-snarle for Ishmael Rabshacheh* (London, 1613; STC 13539), sigs. F3r-F4r.

¹²⁵ Hoby, *A counter-snarle for Ishmael Rabshacheh*, sig. F4r.

¹²⁶ *Ibid*, sig. F4v.

¹²⁷ Floyd, *The ouerthrow of the Protestants pulpit-Babels*, sig. C4r.

Amerindian incivility were refracted to comment on specifically English behaviour outside tobacco-smoking. The savage behaviour invoked in Chapman's 'De Guiana', for example, belonged both to that 'world of Savadges' in South America, but also to disloyal or disinterested subjects: 'How easie t'is to be an Infidell'.¹²⁸ This was further reinforced by the connection between incivility and cannibalism, discussed in Chapter Seven, where the graphic imagery of people pulling apart the entrails of their own neighbours appeared in everything from murder pamphlets to state speeches in order to encourage more compassionate and regulated behaviour. To the soldier and author Thomas Gainsford, civility held society together. Since 'rudenesse and inciuiltie keep a man from respect', proper nurture prevented the English from being like the natives who did 'eate one another in necessitie, or rather wantonly or wilfully only in sauage inhumanitie'.¹²⁹ It was specifically in his discussion of clemency and courtesy that William Vaughan urged 'reformed Christians' to 'follow the trace of Gentlemen, & not like vnto the heathenish Canniballes, or Irish karnes'.¹³⁰ Vaughan's book was specifically designed for men who wished to better 'gouerne themselues, their houses or their countrey', and he urged them to 'ponder the wordes of our Saiour Christ, who taught vs to bee courteous'.¹³¹

The fascination and curiosity towards native habits, coupled with distaste for unmannerly behaviour, contributed to a distinct strand in discourse that used Amerindian customs to reflect on English conduct. The destructive potential of uncivil behaviour, informed by events in the colonies and in the fractured nature of colonial government, informed the way gentlemen articulated their conceptions of civility and kept matters of savagery in public memory. 'The constant asseruation of modern Pilgrims, who all tell us of so many monstrous shapes of men in these parts', wrote Thomas Gainsford in 1618, attracted the morbid curiosity of 'our ciuill people' largely because they were inherently defined through their inferiority, with the English *encouraged* to define themselves in terms of cultural difference.¹³²

What is especially striking is the way that gentlemen themselves adopted and engaged these tropes to comment on the behaviour of their peers. Chapman's later works were less concerned with blatant English imperial glory than with the

¹²⁸ Kemys, *A relation of the second voyage to Guiana.*, sigs. A2v, A4r.

¹²⁹ G.L., *The rich cabinet* (London, 1616; STC 11522), sig. O4v.

¹³⁰ William Vaughan, *The golden-groue* (London, 1600; STC 24610), sig. I3r.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

¹³² Thomas Gainsford, *The glory of England* (London, 1618; STC 11517), sig. B4r.

inability, or unwillingness, for Englishmen to resist the allure of uncivil behaviour, something Drayton also adopted in his later works. ‘Of his Ladies Not Coming to London’, and Song 16 of *Poly-Olbion*, drew on concepts of savagery to promote English conformity in ways that Drayton’s earlier ‘Ode to a Virginia Voyage’ did not. ‘For thankes and curt’sies sell you presence then/To tatling women, and to things like men’, the narrator complained, ‘And be more foolish then the *Indians* are/For Bells, for Knives, for Glasses, and such ware’; elsewhere, Drayton complained that the gentry failed to uphold their responsibilities for trifles like tobacco.¹³³ Here, the ancient concept of luxury offered up new vices to spoil the lives of those meant to govern with moderation.

Dudley Digges, a promoter of the Virginia Company whom James knighted in 1607, printed his deceased father’s *Politique discourses* in 1604, which included the need for moderation in public drinking. ‘Let your wisdom direct you to contemne their folly that betray their owne’ by over-drinking, Digges wrote, although ‘somefooles [*sic*] like the Indian *Chirihechenses* [Chichimecas] thinke him most valiant that drinks most’.¹³⁴ The English often recounted their belief that the tendency on the part of native tribes to intoxicate themselves with drugs and alcohol contributed to their inability to develop their systems of government. Though numerous cosmographies translated into English from Spanish or French, including José de Acosta’s *Naturall historie of the indies* (1604) and Pierre d’Avity’s *The estates, empires, & principallities of the world* (1615) described the Chichimeca of Mexico, Digges specifically compared uncivil Englishmen to the natives themselves. ‘Let the barbarous *Brasilians* drinke drunke before they enter into consultations, let their light heads be far from bringing forth weightie counsailes’, Digges urged, but ‘*you*, in whose hands consists the safety of kingdoms...keepe your wittes about you’.¹³⁵

‘Savage rudnes’, wrote Simon Grahame, made gentlemen ‘ignorant of civill instructions’.¹³⁶ The gentleman who shirked self-government ‘played the *infant perdu* freely, still assuring thy selfe, that thy father hath a fatted Calfe to be kilde’, yet such vain hopes were like ‘the *smoake of Tobacco*’, those ‘*Indian hearbs*’ that produced nothing but black smoke.¹³⁷ The association between

¹³³ Joan Rees, ‘Hogs, Gulls, and Englishmen: Drayton and the Virginian Voyages’, *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 13 (1983), pp. 20-31, pp. 29-30.

¹³⁴ Thomas Digges, *Four paradoxes or politique discourses* (London, 1604; STC 6872), sig. L4r.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. L3v.

¹³⁶ Simon Grahame, *The anatomie of humors* (Edinburgh, 1609; STC 12168), sig. D4r.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, sigs. C2v, T3v.

tobacco and seditious talk was common in invectives against tobacco-smoking. The encouragement of wise men and philosophers, wrote Sir John Melton in 1609, offered ‘firme grounds to set a ciuill man in the right way’ by encouraging proper ‘gesture, speech and outward graces’, but those who sought to serve the state had a duty to show moderation and good judgement even in private spheres.¹³⁸ So much of print, Melton complained, ‘may be tearmed the mushroom conceptions of idle braines, most of them are begotten ouer night in Tobacco smoake and muld-sacke... They sauour of no study, and lesse iudgement’.¹³⁹ A Cambridge graduate and subsequent member of Gray’s Inn, Melton considered tobacco, and the discussions and output that came with it, as unfit for gentlemen concerned with state affairs, though ‘common people’ were quick to delight in such works. Tobacco shops were inverted worlds where ‘rascalls’ believed themselves qualified to make sound judgements, ‘making the Day Night... not onely of the Common light, but the light of the Minde, by inuoluing themselues in the thicke clouds of Ignorance and Heresie’.¹⁴⁰ This invokes the rules of civility printed by the king’s printer, Robert Barker, in 1615, where defining civil behaviour was achieved through prohibitions when dining: ‘Take no Tobacco/Touch no State-matters’.¹⁴¹

Drunkards and ballad-mongers, mocked Richard Brathwaite in 1631 – who had already satirised tobacco smokers in ‘The Smoaking Age’ fourteen years before – were ‘naked *Uirginians*... see how they will hug, hooke, and shrugged over these *materials*’, the pot and pipe.¹⁴² Such English ‘Virginians’ were compared to Powhatan priests with a ‘long black lock on the left side hanging down’, for Englishmen, too, seemed to prefer growing out their hair.¹⁴³ ‘I have heard Sir Thomas Dale and Master Rolph say’, Purchas recounted, that this fashion ‘was first by our men [worn] in the first plantation... borrowed from these savages – a fair unlovely generation of the lovelock, Christians imitating savages, and they the devil!’¹⁴⁴ Purchas may have learned more about this hair style by

¹³⁸ John Melton, *A sixe-folde politician* (London, 1609; STC 17805), sig. I6.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, sig. D2v.

¹⁴⁰ John Melton, *Astrolgaster, or, the figure-caster* (London, 1620; STC 17804), sigs. E2v-E3r.

¹⁴¹ *Table-observations* (London, 1615; STC 23634.7).

¹⁴² Richard Brathwaite, *Whimzies: or, a new cast of characters* (London, 1631; STC 3591), sig. B3v.

¹⁴³ Tomocomo, ‘Interview in London (1617)’, in *Jamestown Narratives: Eyewitness Accounts of the Virginia Colony: the First Decade: 1607 – 1617*, ed. Edward Wright Haile (Virginia: Roundhouse, 1998), p. 881.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

interviewing Tomocomo, a member of Pocahontas' London entourage who confirmed the tradition of Powhatan priests growing their hair long on one side.

The 'unlovely...lovelock' also invokes William Prynne's 1628 invective against lax societal values, especially against trends for long hair and for 'painting' one's bodies like America's indigenous peoples. 'Our sinister, and vnlovely Loue-lockes, had their generation, birth, and pedigree from the Heathenish, and Idolatrous Virginians', Prynne alleged.¹⁴⁵ They, in turn, 'tooke their patterne from their Deuill Ockeus: who visually appeared to them in forme of a man, with a long black Locke on the left side of their head...so that if wee will resolute the generation of our Loue-locked...the *Virginian Deuill Ockeus* will prooue to be the natural Father'.¹⁴⁶ Prynne, though hyperbolic, expressed anxieties that were entirely usual for his time: that 'God himselfe hath expressly Comanded all Christians whatsoever: not to imitate, vse, or follow, the vaine, vnnaturall, ridiculus...Fashions...or Habits of Infidels'.¹⁴⁷

Prynne was himself a member of Lincoln's Inn, entering the Inns in 1621, precisely when authorities were clamping down on the more flamboyant sartorial displays from wayward students insistent on wearing long boots and growing their hair. Prynne's attempt to promote civil behaviour seems directly informed by Tomocomo's presence in London, though whether he had read about him in Purchas' account, or actually seen him, is unknown. 'A Virginian comming into England', Prynne recounted, had 'blamed our English men for not wearing a long locke as they did: affirming the God which wee worship to bee no true God, because hee had no Loue-locke'.¹⁴⁸ Prynne used the physical presence of Algonquians in England to criticise English habits. Other writers picked up on this term to denote the particular style: 'men wearing side and long haire, and some wearing it longer on one side than the other, by them now called a love-locke'.¹⁴⁹ Following the Guiana voyages of 1590s, the penchant for long hair had similarly been described as a native trait, '[o]ne locke *Amazon-like* disheueled'.¹⁵⁰

Prynne's attack against sartorial excess contained a Puritan vein that was consistent, if extreme, with Protestant views at the time, which held that 'savage' intemperance associated with native drinking, smoking, and apparel were unfit for

¹⁴⁵ William Prynne, *The vnlovelinesse, of loue-lockes* (London, 1628; STC 20477), sig. B2v.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, sig. B3r. See also sig. Aa2v.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., sig B3v. Compare to Purchas' interview with Tomocomo, in *Narratives from Virginia*, p. 881.

¹⁴⁹ James Hart, *Klinike, or The diet of the diseased* (London, 1633; STC 12888), sig. Aa2v.

¹⁵⁰ Joseph Hall, *Virgidemiarum* (London, 1598; STC 12717), sig. E4v.

imitation, hindering men from being able to participate in affairs of state. Churchmen and statesmen alike directly associated the rejection of Protestant values with an unstable polity. Without Protestantism, ‘euery common-weale [will become] a Chaos, euery Monarchie an Anarchy’, preached Matthew Stoneham in 1608 before an audience that included the barrister and future chief justice Sir Edward Coke.¹⁵¹ Stoneham’s sermon was aimed directly at the judges and magistrates who had a duty to promote civil behaviour. ‘Let Theologie die, and no policie can liue...at this day [this] is proued among the rude & naked Indians in the Westerne parts of the world’.¹⁵² Summoning the starkest image of poor government, Stoneham invoked a world that God had abandoned, like pagan America: ‘reason would become rage, laws licence, well gouerned men as brutish and sauage as beasts...the world it selfe a wilderness’.¹⁵³ ‘Wee maruell much at the rude and ignorant *Indians*’, John Moore warned, ‘but wee neuer thinke of our owne folly, who forgoe the treasures of heauen for very baubles’.¹⁵⁴ ‘It is for the Infidell *Virginians*, for feare of the Devil, to adore and please him’, Henry Burton advised, ‘but faithfull Christians, doe by the true feare and worship of God, secure themselues from all Devills’, including Catholics who supported papal deposition and the undermining of civil order.¹⁵⁵

The 1622 Powhatan attack discussed in the following chapter further shows the ways in which contemporary colonial events prompted a discussion of government and behaviour in England. Gentlemen at the Inns penned some of the most vehement responses to the attack. Simonds D’Ewes, a student at the Middle Temple, referred to the ‘inhumane wretches wee had given peace too thus long’ who had wiped out colonists in Martin’s Hundred (owned by the Richard Martin of the Middle Temple, who spoke in parliament on behalf of the Virginia Company).¹⁵⁶ Another student, William Wynn, reported that the ‘savages’ in Virginia, by ‘[traffiquing] into our English howses’, had transgressed bounds of trust that would likely lead to war.¹⁵⁷ It was in indulging savagery, rather than condemning it, that government broke down, and members of the Inns were active proponents of this idea.

¹⁵¹ Matthew Stoneham, *Two sermons of direction for iudges and magistrates* (London, 1608; STC 23290), sig. B5r.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, sig. B5r.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, sig. F2v.

¹⁵⁴ Moore, *A mapp of mans mortalitie* (London, 1617; STC 18057), sig. O3v.

¹⁵⁵ Henry Burton, *The baiting of the Pope’s bull* (London, 1627; STC 4137.3), sig. ¶3r.

¹⁵⁶ Quoted in ‘Notes’, *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 68:1 (1960), pp. 107-8.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

It was after hearing news of the attack and the death of friend and fellow Inns member, George Thorpe, that Christopher Brooke wrote his poem advocating the complete eradication of native American society. The poem featured numerous members of the Inns and their crucial role in advancing colonisation in America, including the present governor Francis Wyatt and the treasurer George Sandys, but Brooke also used the event to spur his England-based audience to reflect on their own standards of behaviour. Christians must perform ‘in Manners, Life, and Act, those parts/That really confirme you’, or risk disastrous consequences.¹⁵⁸ The rejection of savagery went to the core of what civility was: ‘Most hold Legitimate to common Eyes,/When in themselues, themselues they Bastardize’.¹⁵⁹ To Brooke, the only thing more devastating to political stability than savagery were Englishmen who did not restrain such behaviour. This ‘[e]xample’, written in the blood of their friends and fellow countrymen, should be ‘printed in your hearts, and understood’.¹⁶⁰ The anonymous *Good newes from Virginia* praised the English for their valiant exploits against the Powhatan following the 1622 attack, but Brooke used the event to berate the lacklustre behaviour of his peers instead.

Conclusion

The influence of humanism on political expression imbued writers with the awareness that language was not arbitrary. From classical to biblical sources, authors had a wealth of examples from which to draw their tropes and metaphors, and they did so to address internal concerns. Political discourse and advice manuals allowed their hearers and readers to ‘see’ reason through the employment of certain images, carefully selected. ‘The places from whence translations may be taken are infinite’, Henry Peacham wrote in 1593, ‘yet of that infinite number certaine are chosen out, as most apt’.¹⁶¹ The ‘most apt’ metaphors were also extremely radical ones: it was deliberate provocation, especially after 1622, to compare one’s peers to cultures who practised human sacrifice or who had laid waste to the Virginia colony.

¹⁵⁸ Christopher Brooke, ‘A Poem on the Late Massacre in Virginia (1622)’, sig. B2r, printed in *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 72:3 (1964), pp. 259-92.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, sig. B2r.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁶¹ Henry Peacham, *The garden of eloquence* (London, 1593; STC 19498), sig. C2v.

The influence of colonisation on testing and ultimately reinforcing the bounds of civil behaviour can be situated partly within the wit culture of the Jacobean Sireniacs and the ‘fluid discursive spheres’ that London sociability and the Inns encouraged.¹⁶² Despite their subversion of certain societal norms, documents like Hoby’s commonplace book suggest that an engagement with colonisation could inspire inward-looking contemplation as much as it might encourage a celebration of wild abandon. A distaste for Englishmen exhibiting a lack of self-awareness, and a need for political conformity, could be found even in the more daring praises of exoticism. The inherent difficulties between promoting expansion and overcoming savagery emerged from the travel narratives themselves: ‘The *Tobacco* of this place is good: but the *Indians* [are] Canibals.’¹⁶³

The networks fostered at the Inns of Court encouraged gentlemen to engage in the colonial moment, whether through investing in newly-formed joint-stock companies, or serving on the colonial councils that met in private homes, court, and parliament. Lawyers were also involved in the process of writing up and acquiring patents for colonisation. In 1620, Sir Ferdinando Gorges reported that prior to appearing in parliament to secure his patent, he ‘entertained for my councell Mr. *Finch of Grayes Inn*’, which was crucial to his acquiring permission to settle areas of New England.¹⁶⁴ Private faith undoubtedly motivated many who proposed projects that combined personal gain with public good, framing the desire to convert those seen to live outside Christian salvation within initiatives that would advance the interests of the state as well as their own. An impassioned hatred for Spain further fuelled the desire to establish an English presence in North and South America. In August 1586, Francis Drake, returning from his brutal raids on the Spanish West Indies, ‘came into the Middle Temple Hall at dinner time’, where benchers broke into applause and congratulated him ‘with great joy’.¹⁶⁵ Support for colonisation was especially strong at the Middle Temple. The ‘Drake lantern’, ostensibly from *The Golden Hind*, continues to hang in Middle Temple Hall, where an oak desk said to contain a part of the deck also survives [Figure 4.5].

¹⁶² Michelle O’Callaghan, “‘Talking Politics’: Tyranny, Parliament, and Christopher’s Brooke’s The Ghost of Richard the Third (1614)”, *Historical Journal*, 41:1 (1998), pp. 97-120, p. 104.


¹⁶³ Kemys, *A relation of the second voyage to Guiana*, sig. E2r.

¹⁶⁴ *Sir Ferdinando Gorges and His Province of Maine*, p. 40.

¹⁶⁵ *The Middle Temple Records, Vol. I: 1501 – 1603*, ed. Charles Henry Hopwood (London: Butterworth & Co, 1904), pp. 285-6.



Figure 4.5. The Drake lantern (above) and the Drake desk (below). (Images are author's own.)



Whether or not the lantern and desk *do* come from Drake's ship, the association itself is significant. Financial investment and political involvement cannot, on their own, account for the way that Amerindian incivility was engaged with in Jacobean discourse. Though ethnographic descriptions of natives fascinated readers, it is the imaginative response to ideas from America, and their uses in commenting on English behaviour, that remained its more innovative characteristic. On a micro-level, cataloguing the effect of this response can be difficult. It is impossible to say whether individual instances of using savagery as slander fulfilled the intended aims of shaming those accused of uncivil or irreligious behaviour. But taken as a collective whole, perceptions of Amerindian incivility indicate that evolving concepts of civil behaviour were not crystallised so much as challenged by state expansion into the Atlantic. In *From Courtesy to Civility*, Bryson emphasised the conservative reality of aristocratic rule in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, despite historians' attempts to locate radical fault lines that foreshadow the ruptures caused by the civil war and eventual modernisation.¹⁶⁶ In leaving the expansionist projects endorsed by gentlemen out of her discussion – especially when arguing that precepts of civility were as intellectual as they were social – Bryson missed the opportunity to use cultural difference to strengthen her claims. Further, a closer investigation of the effects of colonisation on civility would also have allowed Bryson to locate a real point of change. In the unprecedented act of creating and settling colonies beyond the British Isles, new influences entered the civilising agenda.

Perceptions of natives in the 1580s – 'our poore sauages' – became, after prolonged settlement, a more pervasive cultural presence that represented less the ease of conquest than the perils of it. The strain of libertinage detected by both Bryson and O'Callaghan was partly conveyed through the allure of the exotic set against a disdain for 'savages' and uncivil behaviour. The adoption of the practice of smoking by members of the Inns, coupled with their political allegiance to the king (however much they might challenge the extent of his authority in relation to common law), suggests that the tension between exoticism and civility was more than a trivial component in developing attitudes towards status interaction. In straddling the line between license and conformity, praising tobacco (and, later, everything from pineapples to sugar) while endorsing the state-sponsored subjugation of 'savages' outside English control, members of the Inns were prime

¹⁶⁶ Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, p. 282.

promoters of a shifting definition of civil society in which order did not come from the absence of cultural difference, but from the ability to master and govern it.

What this chapter has further suggested is that the Inns of Court played a central role in promulgating a westward imperial outlook, especially among Protestant gentlemen. The ardent militarism cultivated by Prince Henry, and the colonial projects endorsed by Robert Cecil, did not die after Henry or Cecil's deaths in 1612. Rather, drawing on their fathers' experiences in colonising Ireland, and desperate to combat the Catholic threat despite James' hopes for peace, gentlemen increasingly turned to the colonies as a viable theatre for political involvement. This was especially true of the 1620s, where members of the Inns showed frustration at James' lack of initiative in providing support for the Bohemian cause. The king, as one Middle Templar put it, had 'sat still and looked on' as Spanish forces defeated the Palatinate in 1620; the champions of Protestant orthodoxy, James' daughter Elizabeth and his son-in-law Frederick V, were now languishing in exile.¹⁶⁷ These sentiments were not unconnected to the gentlemen who strolled through London with their pipes, supporting the Virginia and Bermuda companies in parliament and praising the feats of their fellow members, like George Sandys and Francis Wyatt, for combatting 'savages' in Jamestown.

¹⁶⁷ *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Vol. 1: During the Reigns of James I and Charles I*, ed. James Orchard Halliwell (London: Richard Bentley, 1845), p. 264.

Chapter Five

‘The sauages of Virginia our project’¹: The Powhatan in English Political Thought

Members of the Inns of Court expressed their awareness of the actions of men like Sandys and Wyatt in Virginia, and this chapter examines the correspondence between colonists and London policy-makers that made such knowledge available. It draws connections between the struggles in Jamestown, and the changing attitudes of councillors in London who faced the task of stabilising the colony and making settlement immediately viable.

The first English voyages to Virginia – especially the 1607 arrival of the *Godspeed*, *Susan Constant*, and *Discovery* – are well documented. So are the hardships endured by the 104 colonists who, fearing attacks from the Spanish, established a fort along the brackish waters of the James River, where disease contributed to the high death rates further effected by hunger, cold, and skirmishes with the Algonquian Powhatan. When Christopher Newport arrived at Jamestown with the second supply of settlers in 1608, the original colonists were reduced to 38. By James’ death in 1625, the population had been in a state of flux, pending between extinction and stability, for eighteen years, surviving almost exclusively through its tobacco exports and the bounty of surrounding tribes. Eleven governors had attempted to impose a functioning society through a mix of martial law and common law, in regimes that alternated from stabilising to brutal.

The plight of Jacobean colonists, and their struggles with the neighbouring Powhatan, has been the subject of much study.² Yet by this point, a disconnect has already occurred. The narrative has travelled with the colonists to the shores of the Chesapeake, where their relationship with those in London – those who saw themselves in charge of the enterprise – has been side-lined. What did councillors

¹ Robert Gray, *A good speed to Virginia* (London, 1609; STC 12204), sig. C4v.

² J. Frederick Fausz, ‘An “Abundance of Blood Shed on Both Sides”: England’s First Indian War, 1609-1614’, *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 98 (1990), pp. 3-56; Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: the Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1975); Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000); Bernard Bailyn, *The Barbarous Years: The Peopling of British North America: The Conflict of Civilizations, 1600 – 1675* (New York: Knopf, 2012); Helen C. Rountree, *The Powhatan Indians of Virginia* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989); Martin H. Quitt, ‘Trade and Acculturation at Jamestown, 1607 – 1609: the Limits of Understanding’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 52:2 (1995), pp. 227-58; James Horn, *A Land As God Made It: Jamestown and the Birth of America* (New York: Basic Books, 2005).

do with the information colonists sent them, and how did these accounts, riddled as they were with failures, uncertainties, embellishments, and accusations, affect the way the London council regarded not only colonial conditions, but the necessity of government more widely? While the last chapter looked at the general adoption of tropes of savagery in London as a result of colonial involvement, this chapter situates Anglo-Amerindian conflict within English conceptions of conformity and political stability. It explores some of the ways in which the cultural ambiguities of colonisation, and the trial-and-error nature of government implemented by various governors, contributed to the way political circles in London debated and defined the nature of government. Further, experiences in Virginia forced policy-makers, including James I, to refine their approaches to colonisation, with interactions with local tribes becoming a crucial part of that process. Studying the exchange of ideas between the first permanent settlement in North America, and the councillors and investors in London, reveals a definitive moment in the Crown's decision to oversee plantation after 1624. Since Jamestown was the first English colony in North America to survive beyond its first year, the particular concerns about savage behaviour that emerged in the 1610s and 1620s marked English discourse in specific ways.

Historiography

However incidental, it is convenient that the Virginia Company years (1606-1624) and James' reign coincide almost exactly, rendering the company a unique component of Jacobean history. Concerns with tobacco taxation and the company's insistence on industry and investment returns should not lead to the assumption that the company served a purely economic function. James' reign saw 'tremendous increase in the number of those having some word of authority in the direction of Virginia's affairs', meaning there were often more members sitting on Virginia councils in London than there were settlers alive in Jamestown.³ Lists of investors include substantial sums by leading members of parliament, including Sir Edwin Sandys and Sir Dudley Digges [Figure 5.1].

³ Wesley Frank Craven, *Dissolution of the Virginia Company: the Failure of a Colonial Experiment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1932), p. 296.

Subjects'.⁴ One of the reasons James felt compelled to intervene directly in Virginian affairs was because so many of his English subjects had perished.

The most comprehensive study of the Virginia Company in London remains Wesley Craven's *Dissolution of the Virginia Company*, written over eighty years ago. The book analyses company business and the escalating disputes between the two factions, headed by the parliamentarian Sir Edwin Sandys and Henry Wriothesley, earl of Southampton on one side, and the merchant Sir Thomas Smyth and Sir Robert Rich, earl of Warwick on the other. Although Craven acknowledges that 'the events which made of Virginia the first royal colony...[brought forth] many of the considerations which later dictated an attempt to bring all colonial settlements in a more closely knit and better administered unit under the direct supervision of the Crown', he nonetheless concludes that colonisation at this time remained a purely economic enterprise, a statement supported by Jack P. Greene and Kenneth Andrews.⁵ While colonial history is becoming a vital dimension in the study of early modern state formation, recognised by historians like Michael Braddick and David Armitage, early colonisation continues to be explored in terms of commerce and empire-building rather than the English imperialism of the seventeenth century.

This slights what is often perceived as the poorly-regulated enterprises overseen by the Virginia Company, since the company ultimately 'failed', ending with bankruptcy and dissolution in 1624. Jamestown remains something of an embarrassment on both sides of the Atlantic. Scholars who focus on the Chesapeake continue to battle the fact that the arrival of the colonists at Plymouth – thirteen years after the establishment of Jamestown, and a year after the first meeting of the Virginian House of Burgesses in 1619 – continues to be the favoured prologue to the American story.⁶ This suggests that Jamestown is relegated to the sidelines not only because of its confusing opening decades, fraught with intense internal division and, consequently, changing and inconsistent policies towards surrounding tribes, but because a sense of unease or culpability taints a knowledge of these events. Historians struggle to make sense

⁴ Quoted in Craven, *Dissolution of the Virginia Company*, p. 272.

⁵ Craven, *Dissolution of the Virginia Company*, p. 335; Andrew Fitzmaurice, *Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonisation, 1500-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 68.

⁶ Horn, *A Land As God Made It*; Karen Ordahl Kupperman, 'The Founding Years of Virginia – and the United States', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 104 (1996), pp. 103-12.

of ‘the alternatively promising and punishing relations between the colonists and the Powhatans in Tidewater Virginia’, and scholarship remains divided over how to interpret these early years of settlement.⁷ Bernard Bailyn’s *The Barbarous Years* shares the view of many seventeenth-century gentlemen – that Anglo-Powhatan encounters were ‘written in fiere and blud’ – while Karen Ordahl Kupperman prefers to focus on moments of intercultural exchange and mediation, but tends to leave out the active role London councillors and the Crown played in this relationship.⁸

As Kupperman and J. Frederick Fausz have stressed, the tendency to concentrate on later, less confusing periods of colonial history has created a gap in historical understanding.⁹ This is no different in English scholarship, which tends to focus on the colonies only once *soupcous* of empire seem to emerge from the historical record.¹⁰ The inclination towards American exceptionalism on one hand, and a neglect by seventeenth-century English historians to embrace the colonial dimension, means that the two areas of study rarely fruitfully converge. Yet, as this chapter argues, the instabilities of colonisation in this period are integral to how discussions of savagery developed in England, with the London council still managing to exert relatively close regulation of the colony in a way that became impossible after the Great Migration of the 1630s. It was precisely the devastating death rates, the colonists’ frequent complaints to London, fears of Spanish attacks, regional warfare, and rumours of poor government that kept London councillors involved with Virginia to the extent they were. In 1612, Sir John Digby informed Sir Dudley Carleton from Madrid that the Spanish were ‘discontented’ by the fact that the ‘council of state’ in England was handling affairs in North America.¹¹ ‘I will spend most of this week’, wrote the member of

⁷ J. Frederick Fausz, ‘The Invasion of Virginia: Indians, Colonialism, and the Conquest of Cant: A Review Essay on Anglo-Indian Relations in the Chesapeake’, *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 95:2 (1987), pp. 133-56, p. 140.

⁸ George Wyatt, ‘A letter of advice to the Governor of Virginia, 1624’, ed. J. Frederick Fausz and Jon Kukla, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 34 (1977), p. 115; Kupperman, *Indians and English*; Kupperman, *The Jamestown Project*.

⁹ Kupperman, ‘The Founding Years of Virginia’, pp. 103; Fausz, ‘An “Abundance of Blood Shed on Both Sides”’; Fausz, ‘The Invasion of Virginia’.

¹⁰ David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Alison Games, ‘The English Atlantic World: A View from London’, *Pennsylvania History*, 64 (1997), pp. 46-72.

¹¹ Sir John Digby to Sir Dudley Carleton, 20 October 1612, in *Calendar of State Papers: Colonial, Vol. I, 1574-1660*, ed. W Noel Sainsbury (London: Her Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1860), p. 14.

parliament Edwin Sandys in 1622, ‘in writing to Virginia.’¹² Shifting opinions about Amerindian willingness to accept English civility made encounters with the Powhatan loom large in these narratives and reports. By involving himself with colonial affairs, for example, Sir Julius Caesar, Master of the Rolls, began to gather intelligence on the best way to subjugate natives, based on the advice of his brother-in-law, the colonist John Martin.

To Sandys, colonial affairs were a matter of state business, to be prioritised alongside discussions of free trade and impending war in Europe. Yet, as one historian has noted, scholarly interest in the ‘Atlantic world’ and the movement of people has tended to narrow in on commercial and social ties with Europe more than intellectual or cultural ones.¹³ Though colonists repeatedly protested that ‘restless discourse’ in London damaged their survival, their concerns also indicate how pervasive interest in Virginia was perceived to be.¹⁴ ‘I informed Your Majesty how urgently these [people] are pushing forward with establishing themselves in Virginia’, pressed the Spanish ambassador Pedro de Zuñiga from London, adding, several weeks later, that ‘everyone [is] exerting themselves to give what they have to so great an undertaking’.¹⁵

To understand this interest in expansion, the approach to Jacobean colonisation needs some recalibration. This dimension of English rule is entirely absent from most books on Stuart history, yet evidence abounds for the intersection between the Crown and its first North American settlement. This is an intersection that, if not properly understood, renders it difficult to appreciate why references to ‘savage Indians’ often figured as shorthand for larger concerns about government and conformity in Jacobean discourse. The connection between Whitehall, Jamestown, and the London public are rarely considered as an integrative whole.

The separation between ‘domestic’ and ‘colonial’ State Papers further encourage a compartmentalisation that was not always present in reality. Gossip,

¹² Sir Edwin Sandys to John Ferrar, 23 September 1622, FP 416, *Virginia Company Archives* <www.virginiacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk> [accessed 23 September 2014].

¹³ L.H. Roper, *The English Empire in America, 1602-1658: Beyond Jamestown* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009), p. 22.

¹⁴ Thomas Dale to Salisbury, 17 August 1611, in *Jamestown Narratives: Eyewitness Accounts of the Virginia Colony: the First Decade: 1607 – 1617*, ed. Edward Wright Haile (Virginia: Roundhouse, 1998), p. 552.

¹⁵ Pedro de Zuñiga to Philip III, 1 April & 12 April 1609, in *The Jamestown Voyages Under the First Charter, 1606 – 1609: Vol. II*, ed. Philip L. Barbour (London: Hakluyt Society, 1969), pp. 158-9.

newsletters, and journal entries about Pocahontas, new governors, or the king's decision to send arms to the colonists are found in the midst of news about Spanish threats, disgraced courtiers, and parliamentary affairs. In 1614, the barrister Richard Martin came before the House of Commons to plead for 'the vpholding of Virginia', accompanied by the earl of Southampton, the earl of Mulgrave, and one-time governor of Virginia Lord De la Warre.¹⁶ Martin grew so irritated with the behaviour of his audience, 'schooling them what they should do', that he was called to the bar to publicly apologise, which earned him the forgiveness of the Commons but not 'the Lords that accompanied him...[who were] more angry w[i]th him than all the rest, and will not be satisfied'.¹⁷

The above example is just one reminder that understanding Jamestown purely as the foundation for future empire is insufficient. The connection between London and Virginia must be seen in terms of the interpersonal relationships and the political economy discussed in Chapter Two in order to understand its more immediate impact on Jacobean society. Firstly, because members of the ruling elite, in subscribing to Virginia, invested far more than money in the company and its voyages. The dissolution of the company was a messy, drawn out, and highly personal affair. Members gave each other the lie, brawled along the Royal Exchange, and were placed under house arrest, some of them even losing their tempers in front of the king, who reprimanded them publicly. But secondly, Anglo-Powhatan exchanges and the first prolonged encounters with those the English assumed to be 'savages' figured significantly in both colonial reports and in opinions made by Londoners. The conflicts that arose in the meeting of two cultures, both literally and ideologically, was an inherent component of expansion that councillors had no choice but to confront. For this reason, the Virginia Company years were crucial in dictating how Londoners understood savagery and cultural difference. The changing relationship between settlers, policy-makers, and native Americans reveal the significant fact that the English government increasingly sought to condemn cultural difference as standard policy. This equally recognised the political dangers of allowing subjects to be seduced by American customs, at a time when Amerindians posed a real threat to English survival in North America.

¹⁶ Chamberlain to Carleton, 19 May 1614, TNA: PRO, SP 14/77, f. 41v.

¹⁷ Ibid.

The Politics of Conformity

The Virginia Company charters professed the conversion of ‘savages’ as the primary aim of colonisation, echoing Richard Hakluyt’s aims in his ‘Discourse of Western Planting’ of 1584. This act of transformation, of bringing what the English believed to be culturally-underdeveloped peoples to civility and Protestantism, was fundamental to English attempts to secure stability and order in Virginia, underpinning the instructions given to governors until the outbreak of the Anglo-Powhatan war of 1622. At the same time, the emphasis on native superstition invited comparisons between Amerindian behaviour and religious unorthodoxy in England. This section considers how authors and policy-makers, including James himself, linked initiatives to civilise the Algonquian to post-Reformation concerns over stability and obedience in England. The stringent policies against superstition in Virginia, and against Catholic challenges to orthodoxy within England, encouraged the articulation of a distinct vision of *imperium* in which cultural fluidity presented a challenge to the king’s view of royal authority.

An adherence to English values was essential to creating subjects, and the belief that Virginia was impeded by superstition made religion an important aspect of achieving political ascendancy. Professing the aim to make ‘a Virginian...thy Neighbour, as well as a Londoner’ projected a vision of incorporation and inclusion, but it also emphasised the current division between ‘savage’ Americans and civil Londoners.¹⁸ London preachers echoed these views in their sermons to members of the Virginia Company and the wider public, and were prime proponents in seeing James’ vision of *imperium* as a monarchical project that would transform savagery. Robert Gray, in *A good speed to Virginia* (1609), actively propounded the use of force in conversion and settlement, anticipating the more stringent governmental policies of the 1620s. Gray portrayed Amerindians in predictable terms: ‘the report goeth, that in Virginia that people are sauage and incredibly rude, they...wander vp and downe like beasts, and in manners and conditions, differ very little from beasts’.¹⁹ ‘All Politicians

¹⁸ Quoted in Thomas Festa, ‘The Metaphysics of Labour in John Donne’s Sermon to the Virginia Company’, *Studies in Philology*, 106:1 (2009), pp. 76-99, p. 92.

¹⁹ Gray, *A good speed to Virginia*, sig. C2v.

doe with one consent,' Gray said, 'holde and maintaine, that a Christian king may lawfullie make warre vpon barbarous and Sauage people, and such as liue vnder no lawfull or warrantable gouernment, and may make a conquest of them'.²⁰ The earliest propaganda for English settlement was founded on the fact that 'savages', because they did not seem to possess sophisticated forms of law and government, did not make proper use of their land. Though Gray advocated kind dealings towards Amerindians, he reached the stark conclusion that 'we might lawfully make warre vpon the Sauages of Virginia our proiect'.²¹

This project against savagery, expressed through the belief that force was justified to subject Amerindians to the Crown and to initially cultivate and settle the land, was often voiced. The same year, William Symonds compared the English to the Israelites wandering through the wilderness on their way to the holy land. Comparing them to the idolatrous Gentiles who opposed the Israelites, American natives became obstacles to God's designs for his chosen people. In their struggles to find the Promised Land, the Israelites 'were cursing and killing enemies', Symonds said, who were 'no better than Canibals' and those 'savages' the English currently faced.²² The lessons of the Old Testament reminded the English that 'in a strange Countrey, we must looke for enemies...for that did God foretell vnto *Abram*, that hee and his seed must find'.²³ In such situations, force was called for and, indeed, encouraged, for God did not tolerate false gods. 'Here then is a *warrant*', Symonds urged, 'that where godly men are constrained to encounter with cursers, such as are the Priests of the Gentiles, it is Gods ordinance to bring a curse vpon them, and to kill them'.²⁴ The comparison between Israelites and Canaanites was frequently used by puritans in New England in the 1620s and 1630s.

The Virginia council's instructions to Sir Thomas Dale in 1609 emphasised the relationship between heathenism and the right for state intervention. 'We thinke it reasonable,' the council maintained, that

you first remoue from them their Iniocasockes or Priestes by a surprise of them all and detayninge them prisoners, for they are so wrapped vp in the fogge and miserie of their iniquity, and so tirrorified with their continuall tirrany Chayned

²⁰ Ibid., sig. C4r.

²¹ Ibid., sig. C4v.

²² William Symonds, *Virginia. A sermon* (London, 1609; STC 23594), sig. Gv.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid., sig. G2r.

vnder the bond of Deathe vnto the Divell... We pronounce it not crueltie nor breache of Charity to deale more sharpely with them and to proceede even to dache with these murtherers of Soules and sacrificers of gods images to the Divell.²⁵

The devil-worship of American tribes was considered part of the overarching problem of Amerindian resistance, serving as a reminder that fears of savagery were neither abstract nor metaphorical. Savagery, to the English, was a physical and mental condition that sprang from a lack of self-control and knowledge, and could only be redressed with a combination of force and education. While medieval notions of savagery might focus on wildness or uncouthness, sixteenth and seventeenth century contained a strong element of idolatry or superstition, rendering it especially threatening to Protestant civility. Observations of Powhatan rituals invited contrasts:

For, Religion 'tis that doth distinguish vs,
From their bruit humor, well we may it know
That can with vnderstanding argue thus,
Our God is truth; but they cannot doe so.²⁶

As in Ireland, the problem of idolatry entailed a political threat: 'as it is a greate sinne, soe it is allsoe a matter of most dangerous consequence'.²⁷ James himself sought to target Algonquian religious rites when he heard news of the probable slaughter of the surviving Roanoke colonists in 1609, over 20 years after the attempted Elizabethan settlement in modern-day North Carolina. He asked that the English 'revenge only upon his *Quiyoughquissocks* [priests], by whose advice and perswasions was exercised by that bloody Cruelty'.²⁸ In the early stages of settlement, 'the company's Indian policy...premiered on the treachery of Wahunsunacock [Powhatan] and his priests, was at the heart of the colony's new beginning'.²⁹ The assumption was that until native American rituals might be completely eradicated, civility would fail to take root. 'I should more admire Virginia with these inhabitants,' Alexander Whitaker wrote from Jamestown in

²⁵ Virginia Council, 'Instructions, Orders, and Constitutions to S[i]r Thomas Gates knight', May 1609, in *VCR: III*, pp. 14-15. According to George Percy, Dale carried out these instructions with vigour. See George Percy, 'Trewelacyon', reproduced in full in Mark Nichols, 'George Percy's "Trewelacyon": A Primary Source for the Jamestown Settlement', *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 113:3 (2005), pp. 212-75.

²⁶ John Smith, *The generall historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles* (London, 1624; STC 22790), sig. F3r.

²⁷ The Judgm[en]t by way of p[ro]testacon of the Archb[isho]pp and Bishoppes of the Realme of Ireland, 23 January 1624, BL: Add MS 12496, f. 340r.

²⁸ William Strachey as quoted in Horn, *A Land as God Made It*, p. 147.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

1611, ‘if I did not remember that Egypt was exceedingly fruitful, that Canaan flowed with milk and honey before Israel did overrun it, and that Sodom was like the garden of God in the days of Lot’.³⁰

Twenty-six-year-old Whitaker expressed a vivid interest in the earthiness and power of Algonquian rituals, describing an almost dream-like world saturated with devils, vipers, rain dances, rattles, and fires. Yet those who participated in these formidable customs ‘tossed smoke and flame out of a thing like a censer’, and the ‘[i]mage of their god’ that Whittaker sent to the London council resembled to him ‘a deformed monster’ – a term also used to describe the pope.³¹ Whitaker saw the rituals as indicating the Powhatan ability to contemplate holy matters, however mistakenly, and anticipated sharing ‘the treasure of the Gospel with them’.³² This could not be done without initial violence, as governors like John Smith and Thomas Dale indicated when they openly reported the devastation of Algonquian places of worship. The reaction to these holy places were ones of mistrust and unease, and the violence against them were not unlike the iconoclasm practised against Catholic churches into the 1640s, where destroying ‘idoltrous’ images were spurred by biblical imperative and often considered to be political acts of reform.³³ ‘We Beate the Salvages outt of the Island burned their howses ransaked their Temples, Tooke downe the Corpes of their deade kings from their Toambes’, reported George Percy, ‘and Caryed away their pearles Copp[er] and bracelets wherew[i]th they doe decore their kings funeralles’ [Figure 5.2].³⁴

The dangers of nonconformity remained a concern of James’ in relation to both Virginia and England. On 29 November 1618, James dined at one of his royal residences and hunting lodges in Newmarket with Sir George Yeardley, about to assume his governorship of Virginia. Sitting with Prince Charles, the duke of Buckingham, and members of the king’s privy council, Yeardley

³⁰ Alexander Whitaker to William Crashaw, 9 August 1611, in *Jamestown Narratives*, p. 550; Alexander Whitaker, *Good neues from Virginia* (London, 1613; STC 25354), sig. G2v.

³¹ Whitaker to Crashaw, in *Jamestown Narratives*, p. 550.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ For discussions over iconoclasm, see John Walter, “‘Abolishing Superstition with Sedition’? The Politics of Popular Iconoclasm in England, 1640-1642’, *Past and Present*, 183 (2004), pp. 79-123; Natalie Zemon Davis, ‘The Rites of Violence’, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France: Eight Essays* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975), pp. 152-88; Margaret Aston, *The King’s Bedpost: Reformation and Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

³⁴ Percy, ‘Trewe Relacyon’, p. 245.

explained his aims for colonisation directly to James, where ‘for a long hower and a halfe [the king] reasoned w[i]th him a lone & onely of Virginia’.³⁵




Figure 5 2. Thomas Hariot, *A brief and true reporte* (London, 1590; STC 12786), sig. D2r-D3r.

Concerns over savage behaviour and establishing civil structures occupied an ample part of this extraordinary account of the king’s conversation. Anxious that the Powhatan receive proper indoctrination, James inquired into ‘what inclination the savages had to Christian religion, and how many of them had bine converted or christened’.³⁶ The conversion and civilising of the Powhatan was, to James, closely tied with the need for English conformity. He inquired after the ‘quality of our ministers in Virginia’, and ‘wished that both now & heereafter they would ever conforme themselves to the church of English, & would in no sorte (albeit soe farre from home) become authors of Novelty or singularity’, promising that English ministers who returned from service in Virginia would be well preferred upon their return.³⁷ Inquiring after the physical landscape of the English settlement, James ‘commanded that o[u]r churches should not bee built like Theaters or Cockpitts, but in a decent forme, & in imitation of the churches in

³⁵ A report of S[i]r Yearllyes going Governor to Virginia, 5 December 1618, FP 93, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virginiacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 9 September 2014].

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid. John Ferrar drew a hand pointing to the words ‘authors of Novelty or singularity’ in the margin of his copy, reminding himself to ‘note this well’.

England'.³⁸ Establishing political stability therefore entailed razing what the English deemed to be illegitimate spaces of worship among local tribes, and supplanting it by civil structures that promoted an adherence to English civility.

Conformity to the Church of England, already seen in the company's ordinances against Powhatan priests and in the need to establish English models of sacred spaces, continued to figure large in the success of the enterprise, but it also meant that *nonconformity* in England was often articulated in relation to savagery and Amerindian behaviour. Experiences in Virginia became a means of emphasising the dire situation of religion within England, describing a society as imperilled as that of the devil-worshipping Amerindians. 'To fall downe and worship the Deuill' in superstition was 'to sacrifice to him [along] with the poore Virginians, and the Heathenish Sauages' wrote Stephen Jerome in 1614, warning his congregation to 'take thou heede of this cursed course, and Satanicall practice in thy sicknesse'.³⁹ Those who were 'worse then the *Indians*, in some of their blinde and idolatrous sacrifices' were dangerous because they 'impoverished the church' and 'impoverished the common-wealth', becoming little better than cannibals who 'deuoured the people of God'.⁴⁰ Even Catholics complained that 'to make vs seem Pagans, you do not sticke to say, we worship Idols, we direct prayers not to Christ'.⁴¹

In connecting the devil's power over benighted Virginians to the superstitions plaguing England, the aim of converting native inhabitants further allowed authors to probe the health of the English realm. 'Surely the Deuill is the same here, that he is in the Indies', warned the member of parliament Francis Rous, 'bee yee weary of your gods, O yee Heathen Christians, and serue the true God'.⁴² The English might, 'in scorne...term [them] Sauages', but 'the worse thou callest them, the worse thou callest thy selfe'.⁴³ Expansion and conformity were both tied to Protestantism, for the English could hardly participate in converting other peoples if they were superstitious themselves, so that cultural and religious deviance became a challenge to James' vision of *imperium*. Further, because Catholicism and Spanish designs for a universal monarchy were so entwined,

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Stephen Jerome, *Moses his sight of Canaan* (London, 1614; STC 14512), sigs. Gg5v-r.

⁴⁰ Thomas Adams, *The blacke devil* (London, 1615; STC 107), sig. Kv.

⁴¹ John Floyd, *The ouerthrow of the Protestants pulpit-babels* (St-Omer, 1612; STC 11111), sig. Nv.

⁴² Francis Rous, *The diseases of the time* (London, 1622; STC 21340), sig. E6r.

⁴³ Ibid, sig. E5v.

Catholics were seen as opponents to English designs in North America. ‘The papists’, preached William Crashaw to the Virginia Company, ‘approue nothing that *Protestants* vndertake’.⁴⁴

Preachers like Alexander Whitaker in Virginia, and Robert Cushman in New England, sent manuscripts of their sermons to friends in England, who used contemporary examples from America to emphasise the need for English values to their congregations. Travel news seemed to confirm the assumption that godlessness would taint even ‘civilised’ subjects whose exposure to the wilderness eventually led to rebellion:

It is reported, that there are many men gone to that other Plantation in *Virginia*, which, whilst they liued in England, seemed very religious, zealous, and consciounable; and now they have lost euen the sap of grace, and edge to all goodnesse...It is indeede a matter of some commendations for a man to remoue himselfe out of a thronged place into a wide wildernesse...[but] hauing their owne lusts...his substance is nought.⁴⁵

The title of the sermon itself was indicative – it was a sermon preached ‘in an assemblie of his Maiesties faithfull subiects’, contrasted against those who had failed to uphold English norms and Christian virtues. A gentleman and poet from County Durham, John Hagthorpe, made references to the behaviour in Amerindians that were fuelled by a real concern that he would have to migrate to America with his family if his financial conditions did not improve. His fears of savage regression were therefore not abstract, but fuelled by a knowledge of current discoveries that influenced his preaching. The English in Virginia were

[E]xposed to their treacherous Enmie so that they cannot goe hunt in the woods, nor trauell in safety, but with great numbers...Whereas, if they had settled themselues, some of them in *Pamunkie Riuer*, they might haue liued secure from the saluages, there being but 8. mile at the head, betwixt it and *James River*, as an Iland.⁴⁶

The ‘rude, barbarous, and vnarmed Saluage’ was ‘a ludicrous enemie’, best to be completely avoided.⁴⁷ Hagthorpe also invoked a story of an English gentleman in Virginia who had survived the 1622 massacre. Having held ‘no correspondency or

⁴⁴ William Crashaw, *A sermon preached in London before the right honorable the Lord Lawarre* (London, 1610; STC 6029), sig. H2v. See also John Hagthorpe, *Englands-exchequer* (London, 1625; STC 12603), sig. Ev.

⁴⁵ Robert Cushman, *A sermon preached at Plimmonth in New-England* (London, 1622; STC 6149), sig. C2r.

⁴⁶ Hagthorpe, *Englands-exchequer*, sig. E3v.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, sig. E4r. For English concerns over deformity and sinfulness, see Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

commerce with the saluage, [he] scaped free and vntoucht', since 'the Saluages did not know his house as they did the rest'.⁴⁸ There was a certain safety in intolerance.

James' dinner conversation, as in the writings of churchmen, suggests that a concern with civility and advancing Protestantism entailed underlying preoccupations with culture. Civility was a strategy for inclusion, but inclusion into a society with carefully-prescribed rules and expectations, and one that ultimately relied on obedience to the king and on a rejection of specific behaviours. Encounters with Algonquian 'idolatry' only seemed, to the English, to confirm the need to regulate unorthodoxy within the realm as well as beyond it. A view to bring Virginia within James' *imperium* made cultural conformity a necessity, as James himself articulated, a sentiment echoed by those who experienced life in Virginia themselves. To 'make a great nation' in Virginia, preached William Symonds, a clergyman who went on to edit John Smith's *Map of Virginia* (1612), the English must 'keepe them to themselues'.⁴⁹ Fears of cultural ambiguity amongst the English were not merely rhetorical. A Spanish informant wrote to Philip III in 1612, five years after the foundation of James Fort, that 'I have been told by a friend, who tells me the truth, that...Englishmen after being put among them have become savages'.⁵⁰ A clash of cultures on the northern shores of the Atlantic mattered to English political and territorial strength on both sides, as the Spanish ambassador understood. Without the ability to control a regression to savagery, the monarch exposed his weakness in failing to secure the obedience of his subjects.

Savagery as Degeneration

The English hopes of incorporating Virginians within an English polity also brought to light the dangers of regression. Writing to Sir Philip Sidney from Roanoke, Sir Ralph Lane, a veteran of the Irish campaigns of the 1580s, complained that 'sauages as well as wild men of [my own] nation' were hindering

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Symonds, *Virginia. A sermon*, sig. F2r.

⁵⁰ Flores (Zuñiga) to Philip III, 1 August 1623, in *The Genesis of the United States: A Narrative of the Movement in England, 1605 – 1615: Vol. I*, ed. Alexander Brown (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1890), p. 572.

attempts to settle the region.⁵¹ The mistrust of the wilderness, and the consequences that might arise from abandoning hierarchies and cultural beliefs, were a common refrain in those first decades of contact. The realities of Anglo-Amerindian relations, and the hardships of settlement, meant that ideas of savagery were frequently used to impart the dangers of cultural abandonment and the necessity to conform to English values. An assessment of Anglo-Powhatan exchanges in Virginia will indicate the difficulties governors experienced in maintaining English ideals, but it also contextualises the vehemence towards cultural ambiguity shown by non-travellers, who saw the colony as an example of the perils of abandoning civility.

Events in Jamestown between 1607 and 1622 served constant, often traumatic reminders that the idealism of Elizabethan visions of America, and the hopes of members of the Virginia Company to convert Amerindians, were repeatedly undercut by the difficulties of establishing ‘a new BRITAINE in another world’.⁵² The brutal winter of 1609-1610, with its ‘Starving Time’ that reduced Jamestown from 500 to 60 men and women, reminded the company that for all their hopes for profit, the survival of the colony was by no means assured. Recalling the events in a letter to his nephew Algernon Percy (later tenth earl of Northumberland) in 1624, George Percy recorded the harrowing litany of miseries that struck the colonists. Although famine, native attacks, disease, and cold took the lives of hundreds, stories of desertion and attempted mutiny reinforced the desperate need to maintain order to prevent utter devastation. Colonists and councillors alike saw much of the events in the colonies as a struggle for the preservation of English values amongst an onslaught of horrors. Though Percy movingly described the hardships suffered by those in the fort, he did not excuse the colonists’ failure to uphold their duties. He showed little sympathy for those who ‘cryeing owtt we are starved, [w]e are starved’ went through the marketplace claiming ‘there was noe god’, noting that they were killed by natives that same day in a clear manifestation of divine punishment.⁵³ Those who cared only for their own safety, like the group of men who attempted to flee to nearby Kecoughtan, similarly found just ends when they were found ‘slayne w[i]th their

⁵¹ Sir Ralph Lane to Sir Philip Sidney, 12 August 1585, *CSP: Colonial, Vol. I*, p. 3.

⁵² Richard Crakanthorpe, *A sermon at the solemnizing of the happie inauguration* (London, 1609; STC 5979), sig. D3v.

⁵³ Percy, ‘Trewe Relacyon’, p. 251.

mowthes stopped full of Breade, beinge donn as itt seamethe in Contempte and skorne'.⁵⁴ To Percy, as to the governors who imposed martial law on the colony from around 1610, those who abandoned their duty to the commonweal deserved punishment to the point of death.

Meanwhile, gentlemen including Percy and Lord De La Warr strove to maintain veneers of civility, importing clothing, furniture, and costly personal items at huge expense. Excavations at the Jamestown settlement have uncovered objects ranging from feather beds to lace shirts, imported drug jars from the continent and even China to a finely-wrought silver grooming tool shaped like a dolphin [Figure 5.3]. These indicate attempts on the part of gentlemen to establish a semblance of their lives and routines in England, where displays of hierarchy were seen as essential to implementing a stable society. If campaigns against tribes like the Paspahegh and Chickahominy were ruthless under the regime imposed by men like Sir Thomas Dale and Sir Thomas Gates, so were their tactics against Englishmen who failed to obey their orders. Those caught trying to run away to surrounding tribes, Percy reported, were 'taken ageine [by] S[i]r Thomas in a most severe mannor', some hanged and others 'burned, some to be broken upon wheles others to be Staked and some to be shott to deathe'.⁵⁵ Percy found the treatment 'extreme and crewell' but recognised why Gates chose to do this: '[t]o terrify the reste for attemptinge the Lyke'.⁵⁶ Fears against the abandonment of civility were so strong that such action seemed entirely justified, as the secretary in Virginia, William Strachey, iterated when he published Dale's laws in London. 'Contending with all the strength and powers of my mind and my body', Strachey wrote, 'I confesse to make [Virginia] like our natiue country', a transformation only possible through an active and ruthless policy towards disorderly behaviour.⁵⁷ Such action was entirely justified as colonists had 'set down in a strange land, sauage and trecherous'.⁵⁸

Sir George Yeardley's governorship of Jamestown in 1619 replaced martial law with what the council in London hoped would be 'a Magna Charta', laws and ordinances that would 'not be chested or hidden like a candle under a

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 247.

⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 236.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ William Strachey, *For the colony in Virginea Brittania. Lawes diuine, morall and martiall* (London, 1612; STC 23350), sig. G4v.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

bushell’ but available for reference by any members of the colony.⁵⁹ In seeking to establish a community modelled on that of England, with a committee of gentlemen gathering in the local church in a general assembly, measures were taken to regulate Anglo-Powhatan relations. The council decided to ‘change the savage name of Kiccowtan’ to Elizabeth City and to make their plantations closer together ‘in these doubtfull times between us and the Indians’.⁶⁰ Attempts to bring civility to the Powhatan manifested themselves in the decision to educate native children in English schools, but the council’s policies towards them were cautious, with a view ‘neither utterly to reject them nor yet to draw them to come in’.⁶¹ Colonists were prohibited from giving or selling hoes, dogs, and gunpowder to neighbouring peoples, nor could they visit nearby villages without specific leave, though these rules were not always adhered to.



Figure 5.3. Grooming tool, Historic Jamestowne, c. 1607, 656-JR. (Image is author’s own.)

⁵⁹ A report of S[i]r Yearllyes going Governor to Virginia, 5 December 1618, FP 93, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virginiacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 9 September 2014].

⁶⁰ ‘Proceedings of the Virginia Assembly, 1619, in *Virtual Jamestown Project* <<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu>> [accessed 6 February 2014].

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

The assembly's ambiguous resolves towards the Powhatan were more precise when it came to English misdemeanours. Council members had a duty to combat 'ungodly disorders, and comitters wherof'.⁶² On 4 August, the council called a captain forward on charges of speaking 'unreverently and maliciously against this present Governor, whereby the honour and dignity of his place and person, and so of the whole Colonie, might be brought into contempte'.⁶³ This was Henry Spelman, one of John Smith's boy-interpreters and nephew of the antiquarian Sir Henry Spelman, who first lived with an adopted Powhatan family ten years before. Spelman denied many of the accusations made by fellow interpreter Robert Poole, but not that he had informed Opechancanough, a tribal chief and Wahunsunacock's younger brother, that 'within a yeare there would come a Governor greater than this that nowe is in place', which the assembly decided 'hath alienated the minde of Opochancano from this present Governour, and brought him in much disesteem', bringing 'the whole Colony in danger of their slippery designes'.⁶⁴

This was a serious charge, and copies of the inquest were preserved by several members of the London council. The assembly deliberated 'several and sharpe punishments', but eventually inclined towards sympathy for twenty-four-year-old Spelman.⁶⁵ Having mediated between members of the Powhatan confederacy and English settlers for over a decade, the council may have been sensitive to Spelman's forced exclusion from English society, where the very traits that made him un-English – for example, speaking regional native dialects – were an important asset in negotiations. Nonetheless, his actions were attacked for being profoundly disloyal. The assembly degraded Spelman of his captaincy and indentured him to Yeardley for seven years. Nor did the council refrain from a final biting remark: that Spelman, when hearing his sentence and failing to show gratitude or remorse, acted 'as one that had in him more of the Savage then of the Christian'.⁶⁶

Fears of Englishmen 'going native', a topic that would fascinate readers of captivity narratives in the later seventeenth century, can thus be glimpsed from

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid. A sentence Spelman never fully carried out. He died in 1623 in a failed trading expedition.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

early on.⁶⁷ The implications of cultural degeneration were, if anything, especially dangerous at this time because the English presence in North America remained so tenuous. To undermine government at Jamestown was to threaten the survival of the entire colonial effort. Considering how pervasive anxieties were of a Spanish attack, the thought of the colony falling due to English mismanagement must have been a humiliating prospect. The spy and prisoner Don Diego de Molina reported to the Spanish ambassador in London that ‘the fortifications which they have are so low and so fragile that a kick could destroy them’, while ‘the hard work...kills [the colonists], and increases the discontent in which they live...[h]ence a good many have gone to the Indians’.⁶⁸ One such man was William Parker. When Thomas Dale and Ralph Hamor conducted negotiations with Wahunsunacock in 1614, they were shocked to find an Englishman so like the Indians ‘in complexion and habite’ that Hamor claimed to recognise him only because he spoke English.⁶⁹ Dale incurred Wahunsunacock’s resentment by insisting that Parker return to Jamestown to live among the English.

These instances show some ways in which cultural associations, like attire and language, played a part in expressing political allegiance. More specifically, they indicate how important shows of civility were in the highly-charged politics of colonial settings, where cultural fluidity often seemed to offer a direct challenge to orthodoxy. When the assembly derided Henry Spelman for being a ‘savage’, the reproach indicated how far political success depended on a refusal to sympathise with American culture. Spelman’s reluctance to offend his companion Iopassus, when pressed by Captain Argall to inquire into his religion, was one thing; it was another to report to Opechancanough, as he was said to have done, that ‘S[i]r George should be but a *Tanx wiroans*, that is, a petty governor not of power to doe any thing’.⁷⁰ In this instance, Spelman framed English political offices in relation to Indian ones. Governor Yeardley was depicted in Powhatan terms, as a *tanx wiroans* [werowance], just as Opechancanough became elevated in status to a king. Spelman’s familiarity with ‘the Indian language’ and his

⁶⁷ Linda Colley, *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600 – 1850* (London: Pimlico, 2003).

⁶⁸ Don Diego de Molina to Don Alonso de Velasco, 28 May 1618, in *Jamestown Narratives*, pp. 748-9.

⁶⁹ Quoted in Horn, *Land as God Made It*, p. 222.

⁷⁰ Copie of the Examinations of Robert Poole touching H. Spilman, 13 July 1619, FP 113, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virgionacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 20 September 2014].

willingness to speak to the Powhatan about English affairs became ‘p[re]judiciall to the State in generall’.⁷¹

Spelman is but one example. The other interpreter involved in the inquest, Robert Poole, was accused of ‘being even turned heathen’ by John Rolfe in 1620, by which Rolfe meant his negotiations were not done for the good of the colony, and therefore became treasonous.⁷² Though colonists trusted Poole less than Spelman, his power to undermine the colony through over-close association with native tribes made the accusation especially damaging to English interests. Reverend Jonas Stockham deeply mistrusted this fluidity, reporting that ‘we haue sent boies amongst [the Powhatan] to learne their Language, but they return worse than they went’.⁷³ ‘I am no States-man’, Stockham acknowledged, ‘but I can find no probability by this course to draw them to goodnesse...till their Priests and Ancients haue their throat cut’.⁷⁴

Stockham’s ruthless, yet commonplace, opinion indicates the raw concerns over savagery that dominated the early Jamestown years. Even as English colonists sought to understand and convert Powhatan culture, their actions often confirmed, and might even be prompted by, the fears and stereotypes voiced by Londoners. Councillors were inundated with letters that catalogued the effects of degeneration and misgovernment, providing stark confirmation of how easily government floundered without strict regulation. ‘Our second shipp is returned out of the partes of Virginia,’ Sir Ferdinando Gorges reported from Plymouth in 1608, where the men meant to be establishing St George’s fort for the Virginia Company were idly ‘deuidinge themselues into factions, each disgracing the other, euen to the Sauages, the on[e] emulatinge the others reputation amongst those brutish people’.⁷⁵ Encounters between the ‘exceeding subtill’ natives beyond the Sagadahoc colony, and the colonists ‘whose conuersation, & familiarity, they haue most frequented’, blurred the lines between peoples that the English had gone to draw.⁷⁶

Those in England, then, were exposed to information that convinced them of the need for cultural rigidity. While Virginia Company propaganda may have

⁷¹ John Rolfe to Sir Edwin Sandys, January 1620, FP 151, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virgionacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 20 September 2014].

⁷² *Ibid.*

⁷³ Reverend Jonas Stockham, reported in Smith’s *Generall historie*, sig. T2v.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ Sir Ferdinando Gorges to the Earl of Salisbury, 7 February 1608, Hatfield MS, CP 120/66r.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

effectively encouraged Englishmen and women to journey to America, most Londoners expressed little desire to do so. To the Englishmen not swept away by the rhetoric of bounty, the rumours from Jamestown evoked pure chaos, a land that, without political stability, also lacked the stabilising influence of community. A libel, likely circulating during the Virginia Company lottery of 1612, cut through the language of abundance found in print: ‘Virginia made the toombe/For us’.⁷⁷ Even colonial promoters like William Crashaw were forced to acknowledge the disparagements that undermined these projects. In 1613, Crashaw praised the efforts of his friend Whitaker for having gone to Virginia to minister to the settlement of Henrico two years before, yet Whitaker was worthy of praise precisely because he remained an exception. He travelled to Virginia despite ‘the earnest diswasions of many his nearest friends, and the great discouragements which he daily heard of, touching the businesse and Countrey it selfe’.⁷⁸ Whitaker’s decision was nothing less than ‘heroicall’, though ‘men may muse at it; some may laugh, and others may wonder at it’, comments that suggested that people were wary of the dangers of settlement, but also of the destabilising effects of the unfamiliar landscape on the quality of their lives.⁷⁹

The relatively young, single, and often poorer travellers who sailed from London to Virginia must have seemed especially vulnerable to abandoning English ways in the absence of community. ‘Maruell not if honest and vnderstanding Christians be so hardly drawne ouer to these places, as namely into *Virginia*,’ wrote the schoolmaster John Brinsley, ‘where as there are in the same so manifold perils, and especially of falling away from God to Sathan, and that themselues, or their posterity should become vtterly sauage, as [the savages] are’.⁸⁰ Writers on either side of the Atlantic specifically framed their concerns over degeneration in terms of savagery’s power to undermine English structures, especially among those of lower status. Intermarriage between Amerindians and the English, William Symonds believed, ‘may breake the neck of all good success of this voyage’.⁸¹

⁷⁷ ‘If either lottery or lottes’ (1623), *Early Stuart Libels* <www.earlystuartlibels.net> [accessed 5 November 2013]. The poem expressed both a strong anti-Scots sentiment and disenchantment with the colonial endeavours: ‘Let them be gulld that list to bee:/Virginia getts no more of mee.’

⁷⁸ Alexander Whitaker, *Good newes from Virginia* (London, 1613; STC 25354), sigs. A3r-A3v.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, sig. A4r.

⁸⁰ John Brinsley, *A consolation for our grammar schools* (London, 1622; STC 3767), sigs. A2v-A3r.

⁸¹ Symonds, *Virginia. A sermon*, sig. F2r.

The willingness to exchange culture, rather than impose it, seemed to policy-makers to indicate a willingness to reject English authority. Gentlemen in Jamestown expressed the belief that without conformity to English government, the settlers ‘would in shorte time growe so insolent as they would shake off all government, and there would be no living among them’.⁸² This justified vigorous policies by the king and his council towards savagery, but it also emphasised the ways in which cultural ambiguity was seen to mar and impede the very aims these initial enterprises set out to achieve. The association between government weakness and savagery made it necessary to cultivate ‘the better disposed of the Natives...thereby they may growe to a likeinge and love of Civility’.⁸³ As colonists in Virginia promised their London backers stronger foundations for their polity after the first general assembly, the London council continued to emphasise the need to transform Powhatan culture into an English one. Raising young natives who were then to return to their communities would ‘prove also of great strength to our people against the Savages’, turning them into ‘fitt Instruments to assist afterwards in the more generall conversion of the heathen people’.⁸⁴ This goal was strikingly apparent in a watercolour by John White, painted during or shortly after his time in Roanoke in 1585, which portrayed the young daughter of a local chief holding an Elizabethan doll, and seeming to point to herself with her other hand [Figure 5.4]. In condemning hybridity and drawing boundaries between cultures, the English hoped to ‘take away the plea of *I did not know*’.⁸⁵ Effacing savagery relied on active participation in civil ideals.

London and the Massacre of 1622

The dangers of tolerating non-English culture came to the fore of public debate in 1622. On the morning of 22 March, various tribes, in an initiative led by Opechancanough, attacked the plantations scattered along the James River. Having visited and dined with the English, as they were accustomed to doing, between 500 and 600 warriors from tribes including the Pamunkeys, Appomattocks, Chickahominies, and Warrascoyaks engaged in hand-to-hand

⁸² ‘Proceedings of the Virginia Assembly’ (1619).

⁸³ ‘Instructions to the Gouvernors for the tyme beinge & Counsell of state in Virginia’, 1621, FP 285, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virgionacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 22 September 2014].

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ Strachey, *Laws diuine, morall, and martiall*, sig. A4v.



Figure 5.4. John White watercolour, 'A chiefe Herowans wyfe of Pomeoc and her daughter', c. 1585, BM 1906,0509.1.13.

combat against male and female colonists using whatever tools were most readily available to them, from table knives to farming tools.⁸⁶ The result was devastating. The settlement of Falling Creek was wiped out altogether, while Martin's Hundred, seven miles from Jamestown, suffered losses of nearly ninety per cent.⁸⁷ Some plantations successfully warded off the attacks, only to face famine and the gruesome task of burying the dead. Between 300 and 400 colonists – roughly one-third of the colony – were killed in a single day. Fledgling industries like iron manufacture and glass-blowing were destroyed. The Indian

⁸⁶ Horn, *Land as God Made It*, pp. 255-8.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

college at Henrico, which had drawn funds from parishes across England, lay wasted, as did countless churches and houses across the plantations. Colonists nearest to Jamestown, warned of the attack by a converted Powhatan boy, fled to the fort for protection. Had they not done so, the colony may have been destroyed altogether.

The massacre irrevocably changed Anglo-Amerindian relations, as colonists agonisingly realised that they had grossly misjudged their Algonquian neighbours, who may have been planning the attack for years. Colonists described the massacre as an invasion of savagery that amounted to betrayal. The Amerindians' intimate knowledge of English settlements and inhabitants had made this more than an impersonal act of war. Yeardeley's regime had brought years of relative peace, and colonists in the years between 1619 and 1622 seemed to believe that 'Powhatan, King of the sauages' would induce his people to be 'faithful subjects of the King of England', with peace prevailing for so many years that 'our people went among [the Powhatans] unarmed and the Savages became so friendly that they often visited the English and dined with them'.⁸⁸

Strikingly, English writers blamed the English for the disaster. Some twenty years later, after the same Opecanough conducted another, equally destructive attack, authors continued to attribute the event to 'the *English*, [who] by reposing trust and confidence in the *Indians*, gave the opportunity'.⁸⁹ Looking back on the time before the attack, George Sandys reported contemptuously that colonists lived 'lyke libertines out of the eye of the magistrate, not able to secure themselves'.⁹⁰ He noted that even 'if they had had anie knowledge of the purpose of the Indians, the most part could not possiblie have prevented their treacheries'.⁹¹ One petition to James remarked that 'the Hostilitie w[i]th the Infidells' had largely subsided after 1614, but that 'wee boast not consideringe that itt lulled the English asleepe in too great securitie and consequently gaue op[or]tunitie to the late bloody Massacre'.⁹²

⁸⁸ 'Voyage of Anthony Chester', narrated 1620 and published in Leyden 1707, in *Virtual Jamestown Project: First Hand Accounts of Virginia, 1575-1705* <<http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/vcdh/jamestown>> [accessed 1 December 2013].

⁸⁹ William Bullock, *Virginia impartially examined, and left to publick view* (London, 1649; Wing B5428), sig. C2v.

⁹⁰ George Sandys to Sir Miles Sandys, 30 March 1623, in *VCR: IV*, p. 70.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² 'An answer to a Petition deliuered to his Ma[ies]tie by Alderman Iohnson in the names of sundry Aduenturers and Planters', 7 May 1623, in *VCR: II*, p. 395.

The reproach, rather than sympathy, towards English colonists characterised most responses in England, and it is worth investigating why. As reactions to the news were reported and discussed in following weeks, what the massacre especially brought to the fore was the belief that a tolerance of Amerindian culture had made such a devastating attack possible. Accounts of the massacre were described as an invasion of savagery, the narratives framed in a ways that highlighted the inevitable perils of allowing Amerindians to penetrate society. To most Londoners, the events brought to question Amerindian willingness to be converted and incorporated into English systems of government, but it also raised serious questions over English competence. This must have seemed especially relevant in the bloody aftermath of the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War in Europe, and concerns over the effeminisation of the English elite that frequently came under pointed critique. This was illustrated by the frontispiece of Samuel Ward's *Woe to drunkards* (1624), which attributed idleness and overindulgence to declining English honour and virtue. 'O maners, O tymes' – the Ciceronian lament appeared under images that contrasted the martial chivalry of previous eras against a panoply of distinctly Jacobean fashions, including oversized garters, flowered shoes, and tobacco pipes.⁹³ In Virginia, the perceived indulgence of the English colonists demonstrated this English decay in martial ability. John Chamberlain expressed his belief that the willingness to indulge native behaviour had sowed the seeds for such an incalculable disaster. It was the 'disgrace and shame as much as the loss' that made the event so lamentable, for 'no other nation would have been so grossly overtaken'.⁹⁴ The ramifications of poor management in other parts of James' *imperium* affected the reputation of England as a whole.

The shock of the massacre seemed to prove that political chaos sprang from cultural ambiguity. Nathaniel Rich, cataloguing the ills besetting the plantation, noted that it was hardly a surprise that 'the sauages...took the aduantage', a result of 'o[u]r owne p[er]fidious dealing w[i]th them & the supine negligence in letting those furious wild people to grow vpon the[m] & to delude them with faire shewes'.⁹⁵ This accusation of 'too great securitie' in the midst of

⁹³ Samuel Ward, *Woe to drunkards* (London, 1622; STC 25055).

⁹⁴ 'Proceedings of the Virginia Assembly', 1619, in *Virtual Jamestown Project* <<http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/vcdh/jamestown>> [accessed 1 December 2013].

⁹⁵ Nathaniel Rich, 'Draft of Instructions to the Commissioners to Investigate Virginia Affairs', 14 April 1623, in *VCR: IV*, p. 118.

obvious danger was addressed by the colonial governors, who defended themselves against allegations of too much acculturation. ‘Whereas in the beginning of your L[et]res... you pass soe heavie a Censure vppon us’, protested the governor Francis Wyatt and Edwin Sandys’ brother, George, ‘[a]s yf we alone were guiltie, you may be pleased to Consider what instructions you haue formely given us, to wynn the Indyans to us by a kinde entertayninge them in o[u]r howses’.⁹⁶

1622 marked a crucial shift in English policy-making. While the English sought to ‘civilise’ the Algonquian, purposeful dissent made such initiatives impossible. To the council in London, plans for an integrated, obedient Protestant now polity seem irrevocably out of reach. The ‘vnwelcome newes, that had beene heard at large in Publicke Court, that the *Indians* and [the English] liued as one Nation’ with ‘the Saluages as frequent in their houses as themselues’ was nothing less than scandalous.⁹⁷ Jamestown, it was reported, was in ‘pieces’, and ‘the market-place, and streets, and all other spare places planted with Tobacco’.⁹⁸ Behind anxieties over two cultures living as ‘one Nation’ was the central problem of allegiance. The converted Powhatan boy who helped save Jamestown from attack became proof of the loyalty that came with adhering to English values.

Edward Waterhouse, in the widely-disseminated report on the attack, commented that ‘the hearts of the English were euer stupid, and auerted from beleeuing any thing that might weaken their hopes of winning the Sauages to Ciuilitie’.⁹⁹ The ‘sauages’, Waterhouse maintained, could not be won over, for the massacre had shown their adherence to uncivil behaviour. ‘Not being content with taking life alone, they fell after againe vpon the dead’, Waterhouse reported, ‘defacing, dragging, and mangling the dead carcasses into many pieces, and carrying some parts away in derision, with base and bruitish triumph’.¹⁰⁰ Yet this event, Waterhouse maintained, also contained some good, for it allowed the English to apply greater force against resistance. The English were set ‘at liberty by the treacherous violence of the Sauages’ for it was ‘right of Warre, and law of Nations’ allowed them to ‘inuade the Country, and destroy them who sought to

⁹⁶ ‘Council in Virginia. Letter to Virginia Company of London’, 20 January 1623, in *VCR: IV*, p.10.

⁹⁷ Smith, *Generall historie*, sigs. R2v.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, sig. Vv.

⁹⁹ Edward Waterhouse, ‘A Declaration of the State of the Colony’, 1622, in *VCR: III*, p. 553.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 551.

destroy vs'.¹⁰¹ Widely circulated and referenced in London, Waterhouse's tract equated savagery with rebellion, a view that seemed to confirm that, like the Gaelic Irish he had encountered in Ulster twenty years before, 'savages' and English authority were irreconcilable.

A renewed vigour against savagery found voice in a poem by Christopher Brooke, included in the Virginia Company's propaganda campaign after 1622 alongside Waterhouse's *Declaration*.¹⁰² Brooke was heavily involved with the Virginia Company and an established lawyer at Lincoln's Inn. His urge to apply unmitigated force against the Powhatan was not just an opinion based on fantasy or popular stereotypes, but informed by letters from Virginia. As a member of parliament, Inns of Court lawyer, member of the company and close friend and neighbour of John Donne, the aim of Brooke's poem was not just to sensationalise the event but to locate the root of political instability. Amerindians were 'men-monsters...[c]onfin'd in vnbelief, and damn'd to Hell', 'Soules drown'd in fresh and blood...oppos'd to Good...[e]rrors of Nature'.¹⁰³ English order had been turned to chaos, not least because the English themselves had been too indulgent:

Yee are call'd Christians in the common voice,
But are yee so in Essence, and in choice
From vn baptized Soules? And do your hearts
Performe in Manners, Life, and Act, those parts
That really confirme you?...Let not ease
Rock yee in sensual slumbers...
Stupid, and senselesse in *securitie*.¹⁰⁴

Brooke blamed the English for allowing 'this blurre', this preference for the exoticism of experience, to mar the necessary vigilance that 'makes Life secure'.¹⁰⁵ The consequence was a separation between the English and 'those parts that really confirme you', again equating loyalty with Protestantism and devotion to the interests of the king. A broadside from 1623, written by a 'gentleman in that colony', further indicates the way in which affairs in Virginia captured the popular imagination.¹⁰⁶ *Good Newes from Virginia* (different from Alexander Whitaker's 1613 work of the same name) turned the events of 1622

¹⁰¹ Ibid, p. 556.

¹⁰² Christopher Brooke, 'A Poem on the Late Massacre in Virginia', *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 72:3 (1964), pp. 259-292.

¹⁰³ Ibid, pp. 275, 285.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 279.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 282-283.

¹⁰⁶ 'Good newes from Virginia, 1623', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 5:3 (1948), pp. 351-58.

into a song that reinforced the ‘sauage treacheries’ of the ‘sauage foe’.¹⁰⁷ The poem narrated the events recorded by Wyatt in his letters to the London council, this time for a much wider dissemination, in which those involved in expelling savagery became heroic figures:

Bould worthy Sir *George Yardly*
 Commander cheife was made...
 Against the King *Opukingunow*,
 Against this sauage foe...

Stout Master *George Sands* upon a night,
 Did brauely venture forth;
 And mong’st the sauage murtherers,
 Did forme a deed of worth.

For finding many by a fire,
 To death their lives they pay:
 Set fire of a Towne of theirs,
 And brauely came away...

The Kings of *Waynoke, Pipskoe*,
 And *Apummatockes* fled:
 For feare a way by *Charles* his Towne,
 Nor one dares show a head.¹⁰⁸

Violence was not a last resort but an essential step in establishing a civil polity. Local names were invoked only to be razed and spoiled. In celebrating English action against the Powhatan, those who listened to or sang the verses were invited to accept the actions of colonists against those who practised what was projected as illegitimate violence. The poem was more geographically informed than earlier pro-imperial works like Chapman’s 1606 ‘De Guiana’, but this knowledge had only hardened views towards savagery.

For all the professed interest in assimilating Amerindians, the English increasingly recognised the fundamental incompatibilities between acculturation and establishing Virginia as ‘another England’. A willingness to tolerate or even indulge in Amerindian customs became a threat to political stability. ‘Before the last Massacre’, commented Sir Nathaniel Rich, ‘o[u]r Colonyes were almost made subiectes to the Sauages’, forced into a state of quasi-bondage because of their dependence on Amerindian goods and resources.¹⁰⁹ The need to make subjects English, and to separate them with increasing rigidity from their Amerindian

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, p. 353.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, pp. 353-356.

¹⁰⁹ ‘Draft of Instructions to the Commissioners to Investigate Virginia Affairs’, 14 April 1623, in *VCR: IV*, p. 118.

neighbours, assumed a new emphasis. In the years following the massacre, James made Sir Francis Wyatt the colony's first royal governor in 1624. Wyatt recommended that the king keep a permanent body of troops at the council's disposal. 'In small bodies', Wyatt protested, it was not possible 'to prevent the suddaine incursion of the Salvages', and maintaining stability required direct assistance from the English state.¹¹⁰ This was also seen in a proposal, drafted in London and written in the king's name, to combat the 'diuelish purpose' of a 'people voyd both of Religion and Ciuilitie' by ordering the justices of peace in every English county to provide two 'young and able men between the ages of 18 and 22 yeares' to be shipped to Virginia.¹¹¹ These men would protect the plantations from the 'naked and cowardly Indians, and tendering the lives and safety of his Subiects there, w[hi]ch by the practise of those Savage people may continually be endangered'.¹¹²

In effect, the massacre had induced English subjects to see Virginia as the extension of England that promoters had long desired it to be. The colonists who had allowed 'those furious wild people to grow vpon the[m]' must now draw more distinct bounds.¹¹³ The ballads, poems, treatises, and letters written in 1622 encouraged people to actively condemn those who refuted English values and indulged savagery, wherever they might live. Interest in the affair filled diaries and personal letters, where the attack went beyond threatening those in the colonies themselves. Simonds D'Ewes, a law student at the Inns of Court, recorded on 7 July 1622 that '[f]rom Virginia wee had exceeding badd newes for the inhumane wretches wee had given peace too thus long, conspired together...[the colonists] were slaine chieflye in St Martins Hundred'.¹¹⁴ The gentlemen of the Inns of Courts, who had likely grown up on tales by Hakluyt or encountered them in university curricula, showed express interest. Six weeks later, D'Ewes added that he was 'partaker of an exact discourse of the massacre as I may learne it of our men in Virginia'; he deferred from commenting on the event until he could 'gett the thing it selfe' through further reading.¹¹⁵ This suggests an

¹¹⁰ 'Governor Wyatt and the Council of Virginia to the Privy Council', 18 May 1626, in *VCR: IV*, p. 164.

¹¹¹ 'Draft proposal to raise men for Virginia', 1622, FP 415, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virgionacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 18 September 2014].

¹¹² *Ibid.*

¹¹³ Rich, 'Instructions', in *VCR: IV*, p. 118.

¹¹⁴ Quoted in 'Notes', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 68:1 (1960), pp. 107-108.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

active engagement with Virginian affairs, or at least a desire to appear involved. As in debating other current, sensational affairs, news from Virginia seemed to lend political currency, reinforced by the sense of solidarity in referring to ‘our men in Virginia’.

Another student, William Wynn, wrote to his father Sir John Wynn on 12 July 1622: ‘In Virginia, the savages have by a wile come (as they weare wont) to traffique into our English howses, and with our owne weapons slewe 329 of our men’.¹¹⁶ ‘Tis thought’, Wynn reported, ‘that Counsell will resolve upon a war against these barbarouse villaines’.¹¹⁷ The Cambridge Reverend Joseph Mead, an avid collector and writers of news, received the news at the same time. He wrote on the 13 July that ‘this week ill newes come from Virginia (which every man reports that come to London)’, that ‘the Indians...fell upon [the colonists] & beat out their braines scarce any escaping’.¹¹⁸ Indicating that the Amerindians seem to have been influenced by a malign local god, he prayed for ‘our God, the God of Gods’, to ‘confound them quickly’.¹¹⁹

Several lost works, surviving only as brief notes in the Stationers’ Register, serve as a reminder that the works on the massacre that *do* survive may only skim the surface of London reactions. A lost ballad titled ‘Mourning Virginia’ was approved for print on 10 July 1622, just weeks after the news reached London.¹²⁰ In August 1623, Sir Henry Herbert, master of revels, licensed ‘A Tragedy of the Plantation of Virginia’ for the Curtain Theatre.¹²¹ Though these titles indicate little about the content of these texts, Herbert would hardly have approved a play that critiqued English involvement in the Chesapeake, and the ‘tragedy’ of Virginia presumably recounted the deaths of the English in the massacre. The presence of Amerindians on stage would have exposed large audiences to the colonial situation, but also contained them yet again within an Anglo-centric narrative that reinforced the necessity for civility at home, serving functions not unlike the court masques described in the previous chapter. Whether, like Brooke’s poem, the play ended with bloody resolutions and an appeal for the utter destruction of native ways of life is uncertain, though the

¹¹⁶ Ibid., p. 108.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Joseph Mead, ‘The Indian Massacre’, p. 408.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 409.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Cited in Claire Jowitt, *Voyage Drama and Gender Politics, 1589 – 1642: Real and Imagined Worlds* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), pp. 201-2.

history of the Elizabethan and Jacobean stage indicates that endorsers of the play would not have been hesitant to stage elaborate and violent spectacles.

'Our Royal Empire': Sovereignty Over Savagery

The massacre brought the urgency of company mismanagement to the fore, with each faction blaming the policies of the other for the dire state of the colony. A distraught John Ferrar equated the Powhatan attack to the carnage found in the London courts. 'Wee have hadd a Massacre...no lesse unexpected nor daungerous then yo[u]rs, p[er]happs more', he wrote to Francis Wyatt, 'the execuc[i]on beinge not uppon mens bodies...butt uppon the Honour Credit & reputac[i]on of those...whereon under God the Colloneys life seemeth to depend'.¹²² The colonists' relationship to the Powhatan and the resentments between opposing company factions could be described the same way: 'the tearmes betwixt vs and them are irreconcilable'.¹²³ The disagreements and resentments grew so heated that members of the company ultimately appealed directly to the king to arbitrate, despite the potential damage such an act might cause to their private interests. The massacre represented nothing less than a crisis of order, and this section explores how James' involvement with Virginian affairs affected his own conception of *imperium* in the 1620s.

The struggle of James' subjects in new frontiers did not only affect the king's image as sovereign to the Powhatan, but questioned his ability to care for the welfare of his people, wherever in the world they were. After fifteen years of the Virginia Company's relative freedom in managing the colony, with charters that gave it increasing power, the royal investigation of 1623 allowed James to proclaim his sovereignty over his subjects in more forceful ways. He asked his privy councillors to carry out various investigations that involved travel to Virginia and confiscating company papers from private households, by force if needs be. Considering the 'faction and distraction among them, being followed on both sides w[i]th much eagernes and animositie', James wrote the Commons forbidding them to intervene and promising 'to rid them of the thornie business

¹²² Coppie of a Letter to S[i]r Frauncis Wyatt and M[aste]r George Sandys by the seat lower, 18 December 1622, FP 437, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virgionacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 18 September 2014].

¹²³ The Generall Assemblies Replie to those foure propositions made vnto them by the Commissioners, 20 March 1623, TNA: PRO, CO 1/3, f. 48r.

touching Virginia'.¹²⁴ The king, Chamberlain reported, would no longer rely on the lower houses to debate the matter, but bring the business under his own decision-making.

To the king, as to many observers, the company had proven itself incapable of proper government without his direct interference. The very nature of a joint-stock company endowed it a democratic potential that did not sit comfortably with the privy council. Captain John Bargrave accused Sandys of harbouring a 'malicious heart to the Government of a Monarchy', though Bargrave's insistence that Sandys proposed a 'popular Government' in Virginia did not seem to be taken seriously, even by Sandys' opponents.¹²⁵ Nonetheless, Sandys himself admitted that if the king disapproved of the company's government, he would need to change its joint-stock system. 'These Plantations, though furthered much by your Majesty's grace,' Sandys pointed out, were not upheld by the king's purse but by private adventurers who would naturally fail to take interest in 'the regulating and governing of their own business [if] their own votes had been excluded'.¹²⁶

After years of admonishing the Virginia council for their disagreements and poor handling of affairs, James finally 'reserved of the whole cause to his own hearing'.¹²⁷ The king and privy councillors set about drafting a new charter for Virginia, a matter that involved dozens of members of the privy council. 'There is a Commission of Privy Counsellors and others appoynded to advise upon a fit Patent to be giuen to the Company of Virginia...[at] last being ouerthrowne', Sir Francis Nethersole reported to Carleton.¹²⁸ 'The Reformation intended as I heare is that there shall be a Company for trade, but not for Gouernment of the Countrey of w[hi]ch his Ma[ies]ty will take care'.¹²⁹ Nethersole added that the 'popularitie of the Gouer[n]ment' had 'beene also o[uer]throwne' as it was 'displeasing to his Ma[ies]ty'.¹³⁰ James took the final measures necessary to assume clearer control of his colony in 1624, after pressuring the Virginia

¹²⁴ John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 30 April 1624, TNA: PRO, SP 14/163, f. 110r.

¹²⁵ Craven, *Dissolution of the Virginia Company*, p. 277. John Smith also expressed the opinion that troubles came from too many men seeking to govern Virginia, with each charter less restrictive than the one before.

¹²⁶ Craven, *Dissolution of the Virginia Company*, p. 284.

¹²⁷ The King to the Speaker of the House of Commons, 28 April 1624, TNA: PRO, SP 14/163, f. 106r; John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 30 April 1624, TNA: PRO, SP 14/163, f. 110r.

¹²⁸ Sir Francis Nethersole to Dudley Carleton, 3 July 1624, TNA: PRO, SP 14/169, f. 19r.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*

Company to surrender its patent.¹³¹ Colonisation, ‘this worthie action reserved by the Devine providence’, was to ‘bee perfected and Consumate, by his Royall hands’, where the stabilising presence of the sovereign became an important element in the colonising process.¹³²

During the months of debate over the company’s fate, policies and encounters with the Powhatan figured large. The deprivation of the Starving Time was attributed partly to an inability to trade successfully for corn and other goods. Members of the company invoked the nightmarish conditions to remind their audiences that ‘some were driven through unsufferable hunger unnaturally to eate those things w[hi]ch nature most ahorr[s]...[including] an Indian digged by some of his grave after he had lyene buried three dayes, and wholly deuoured’.¹³³ Others ‘put themselues into the Indians hands though o[u]r enemies, and were by them slayne’.¹³⁴ The massacre had crystallised the idea that it was the ‘trecherous enemy the Savadges’ who helped bring about the ‘ru[i]ne of o[u]r state’, though the governor and council tried ‘their uttermost and Christian endeavo[u]rs in proseucuting revenge against the bloody Savadges...employeine many forces abroad for the rootinge them out’.¹³⁵ Assimilation through civility had failed, and the dissolution of the company forced discussions about sovereignty to be articulated in relation to the reality of events in Jamestown.

In this way, the correspondence that survives from the Virginia Company years – letters, commissions, reports, even poems involving members of the council – serves a distinct role in how the Crown came to project its *imperium* in an active way. Quentin Skinner argues that modern ideas of the state derived less from the evolution of legal theories than from the early histories, advice books, and mirror-for-princes literature that emerged from the political turmoil of Italian city-states in the late medieval period.¹³⁶ These tracts focused on how a ruler might obtain honour and glory while promoting their subjects’ well-being, but the issues raised were equally concerned with more abstract ideas of statecraft. This

¹³¹ Lord President Mandeville to Secretary Conway, 17 October 1623, TNA: PRO, SP 14/153, f. 87.

¹³² Governor Wyatt and Council of Virginia to the Privy Council, 17 May 1626, ‘Documents of Sir Francis Wyatt, Governor’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 8:3 (1928), p. 157-67, p. 166.

¹³³ ‘A copy of a Brief Declaration of Virginia in the first 12 years’, 1624, FP 532, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virgionacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 18 September 2014].

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

¹³⁶ Quentin Skinner, ‘Language and Political Change’, in *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*, ed. Terence Ball *et al.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 96.

view of political power, Skinner argued, as personal and open to some counsel was not unlike the absolute monarchy propounded by the Stuarts in early seventeenth-century England, where the powers of government were often inseparable from the character and will of the king.¹³⁷ Skinner argues that such thinking developed specifically from advice manuals and treatises in Europe, incorporating reactions against ideologies of popular sovereignty that sprang from the religious wars in France. A case might also be made for the letters that came to the attention of the king and privy council as a result of the early colonial projects. The Virginia Company's struggles and ultimate appeal to James called for solutions that would benefit the common good in language that corresponds to that observed by Skinner. However coincidental, it is notable that John Chamberlain himself associated the Virginia Company quarrels with those between the Ghelphs and Ghibellines, supporters of competing claimants to political authority in the northern city-states of medieval Italy.¹³⁸ In evoking an exaggerated historical example of public dispute over political authority, Chamberlain emphasised how important current debates about the colonies had become to the political centre in England, where men even quarrelled in the streets and along the Royal Exchange.¹³⁹

The political danger of savagery became especially relevant as a result of experience in America, where the articulation of political disintegration in letters between Virginia and London stemmed from specific reactions against Powhatan actions. George Wyatt's letter to his son Francis, written shortly after the massacre, contained many of the stylistic devices characteristic of fifteenth and sixteenth century advice manuals. 'Let the severitie of justice not let blud too m[uch] that it cause not a Consumption in the body too weake alreddy', Wyatt urged, adding, 'State secrets and Hopes are safest kept [in] one bosome'.¹⁴⁰ At the same time, the letters have a distinct new element in their discussions of encounters with the Powhatan. Wyatt adapted commonplace attitudes towards rule and government by applying them to a world that had not been part of the English governing landscape even twenty years before. 'Your brow of Providence is to

¹³⁷ Ibid., p. 103.

¹³⁸ John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 26 July 1623, TNA: PRO, SP 14/149, f. 64r.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ George Wyatt, 'A Letter of Advice', p. 116.

looke with Janus two waies’, Wyatt wrote, ‘on your owen Countrimen Christians, and on the Salvage Infidels’.¹⁴¹

It was the opinions towards those ‘salvages’ that bore most on how stability and authority might be justified and achieved. Caution around ‘savages’, Wyatt wrote, was ‘[t]he first Military precept your Barbarians have tought you now’.¹⁴² These were hard lessons, he acknowledged, and only knowledge of the land and its peoples would prompt his fair-minded son to take the necessary initiatives to strengthen the vulnerable colony. Francis, Wyatt urged, must learn ‘[n]ot to trust a faithles trust’, but to respond to the devastation of the massacre with force.¹⁴³ Wyatt’s advice to form a permanent militia which might protect the area from attack sprang from a need to fight savagery: ‘your Militia...will searve you against suche an Enimie...the wilde and fierce Savages’.¹⁴⁴

Similarly, George Percy’s ‘Trew Relacyon’, also written in 1624, used the specific conditions in Jamestown that he had undergone to expound on more general ideas towards rule and conduct. As Mark Nicholls suggests, Percy’s ‘Relacyon’ read like a letter of advice. It contained ‘more than a touch of counsel and guidance’ with an emphasis on morality and deference to authority ‘entirely appropriate to a narrative fashioned by an older generation for the instruction – and improvement – of the young’.¹⁴⁵ This reinforces the notion that those who wrote about colonisation saw it as a clear parallel to the need for civility in England. The experiences wrought among the uncertainty and hardships of that ‘new’ world were not insignificant, even to those who never travelled there, but a comprehensive part of a wider English identity. The behaviour of *all* English subjects, contrasted but also compared unfavourably to those ‘savages’ in the wilderness, were part of an overarching civilising project that sought to promote deference and submission within the English realm and its *dominia*.

This is not to imply that all letters by counsellors and governors from Jamestown were specifically written to advise policy-makers on abstract matters of state, but that one significant consequence of the struggles and debates over Virginia was to force the articulation of specific ideas of *imperium*, and to do so in ways that put these ideas more concretely into motion. ‘We humbly refer unto

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 120-121, 125-127.

¹⁴⁵ George Percy, ‘Trew Relacyon’, p. 237.

your Princely consideration', the assembly wrote to James in 1624, '[i]nvoking that divine and supream hand to p[ro]tect us' [Figure 5.5].¹⁴⁶ Like the advice manuals of humanist writers to their prince, reports from the colonies were carefully-constructed documents filled with rhetorical devices and purposeful language that imparted individual opinions on significant matters of government. In other cases, privy councillors specifically asked for details on how the colony 'now stands in respects of the Saluages'.¹⁴⁷ When Wyatt wrote to the London assembly describing how the colony might be secured in 1623, he did so in response to their specific requests for information.




Figure 5.5. The answer of the generall assemblie in Virginia to King James, 16 February 1624, FP 527, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virginiacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 9 September 2014].

¹⁴⁶ The answer of the general assemblie in Virginia to King James, 16 February 1624, FP 527, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virginiacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 9 September 2014].

¹⁴⁷ The general Assemblies answer to those Propositions made by the Com[m]issioners to be p[re]sented to the lords of his Ma[ies]ties most hono[ur]able priuy Council, 20 March 1623, BL Add MS 62135(II), f. 211r.

The ‘Discourse of the Old Company’, written in 1625, serves as a final example. Composed by defeated members of the company after the loss of its charter, it proposed to debate the best form of government for the affairs in Virginia, acknowledging that Virginia’s best hope for survival now rested in the king’s direct control. The document was largely used as a space for members to defend and justify their actions against the slanders brought about by the company’s fall, but the very fact that the Sandys-Southampton faction used ‘those Twelue yeares Governm[en]t’ between 1607 to 1619 to paint a picture of stunning failure only emphasise how instabilities in Jamestown prompted political change. Members described the destitution, poor defences and resource control, martial law, few women, ‘doubtfull Termes’ with the Powhatan, and severe restriction of ‘their Lib[er]ties, being violently deteyned as seru[an]tes’ to conclude that nothing but the king’s ‘Royal authoritie’ would work for the good of everyone involved.¹⁴⁸

Only strict royal control – not through a separate governing council, but through parliament itself – would allow Virginia to truly be incorporated into the English state. The political economy discussed in other chapters helps explain how the bankrupt company, aware of its own inability to rely solely on private donors, saw the sovereignty of the king over colonial endeavours as an integral step to establishing fairer commercial activity. Yet the need to articulate this kingly involvement depended on a discussion of savagery:

The wounds w[hi]ch since that great wound of the Massacre, it hath more lately received, from their hands whom it least beseemed, are still so wide & bleedinge, that vnlesse his Ma[iest]ie, and yo[u]r Lo[r]dshipps as deputed from him, shall vouchsafe to apply a Sovereaine hande for the healing of them, *wee are resolute of opinion*, that it is impossible, the Plantation carried as formerly by private persons, should either prosper or long subsist.¹⁴⁹

As the lawyer Thomas Floyd wrote, the chief purpose of monarchy – the ‘royal estate of an empire or gouernment’ – was to avoid the ‘sturdy stormes of pinching misery’ and dissent.¹⁵⁰ The aftermath of the massacre called for a more forceful manifestation of sovereignty, so often invoked in ideas of *imperium*. In 1624, Captain Bargrave wrote to the duke of Buckingham, describing draft proposals

¹⁴⁸ ‘Discourse of the Old Company’, April 1625, in *VCR: IV*, pp. 519-21.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 530 [emphasis mine].

¹⁵⁰ Thomas Floyd, *The picture of a perfitt common wealth describing aswell the offices of princes* (London, 1600; STC 11119), sig. B10v.

given to the king, 'whoe promiseth to read it himself, this being the sole and onlely safe and profitable way to plant Virginia'.¹⁵¹

The internal disputes, the significance of the massacre, and news from the colony prompted James to make a declaration of his sovereignty that few of his subjects ultimately contested, as he increasingly involved himself in colonisation in more intrusive and active ways. For all James' concern with absolute authority, the Virginia Company had not, in its early stages, been a domain where the king had sought to impose his authority with any real force. As late as December 1618, James admitted he had not been sufficiently invested in Virginia, and the early 1620s must therefore be seen as a decisive moment in which the English Crown recognised its responsibilities towards overseas settlement for the first time.¹⁵² Following his father's death in March 1625, Charles immediately affirmed that he would maintain the plantation as he did the rest of his dominions, expressing his belief that joint-stock companies were good for business but dangerous to the state. Virginia would 'immediately depend upon Our Selfe, and not be committed to any Company or Corporation', Charles proclaimed, 'to whom it may be proper to trust matters of Trade and Commerce, but cannot bee fit or sage to communicate the ordering of State-affaires'.¹⁵³

The royal oversight of Virginia made the praises of kingly *imperium* somewhat more plausible by the 1620s than they had been ten or twenty years before. At the very least, members of the council and parliament recognised that such claims needed more powerful royal articulation. Proposals were discussed by the king and his councillors concerning the most effective ways to curb power in the colony. Sir Julius Caesar, heavily involved with the royal investigation, collected reports from his brother-in-law John Martin, then in Virginia. Though Martin had reasons to preserve company interests, he also showed attention to how kingly prerogative should fit into these interests more carefully. Members of the nobility, Martin suggested, could be appointed 'by his Ma[ies]ties counsel and company two seates, the first in Opuhankanos Island in Pamaunkey river... The

¹⁵¹ Captain John Bargrave to Buckingham, October 1624, TNA: PRO, SP 14/173, f. 150r.

¹⁵² A report of S[i]r George Yeardlyes going Governor to Virginia, 5 December 1618, FP 93, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virginiacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 9 September 2014].

¹⁵³ Quoted in Horn, *Land as God Made It*, p. 279.

second at Okanahone River', to better control the natives and keep oversight over colonists themselves.¹⁵⁴

Martin also included thoughts on 'The manner howe to bringe in the Indians into subiection' as a natural part of this discussion of sovereignty, a document which, alongside proposals for new titles for distinguished governors, induced Caesar to note, 'The manner howe to make a Royall plantation it seemeth not improbable'.¹⁵⁵ To stabilise Virginia, it was necessary to 'severr and devide the faculties of Soueraigntie and the command of the forces...that they shall never meet diuided in power but to advance our politick end of yeilding the plantac[i]on to England'.¹⁵⁶ This can also be seen in a project proposal kept by John Ferrar that proposed to create a Virginian nobility with titles that could only be held in America. These Virginian earls, viscounts, barons, and baronets would bring 'faythe and fidellyty to the Crowne of England' and 'indeavouer themelves for to bring that plantacyon to p[er]fecyon'.¹⁵⁷

Samuel Purchas praised the Crown's attention to Virginia in his sermon of 1622, delivered at Paul's Cross. Purchas provided the most encompassing vision of the realisation of *imperium*, defining monarchical sovereignty as the ability to create order from wildness, converting savagery to obedience. A legitimate king, proclaimed Purchas, was not a king without a territory, 'as the *American Caciques* and *Werowances*...the Sauages' were.¹⁵⁸ The king was a man with the power to subdue those who 'bordered on the confines of Humanitie', for 'how great a parte of wide and wilde *America*, is now new-encompassed with *this*, with *His Crowne*?'¹⁵⁹ Preaching on the anniversary of James' deliverance from the Gowrie Conspiracy over twenty years before, Purchas reinforced to his audience that James' monarchical power was both bestowed by God, surviving even attempts on James' life, and favoured by God, apparent in James' success at uniting the wilderness territories under his control. '*Ireland*, where sometime Treason had her Throne...where Warres had made a Wildernesse, and wilder Nature,' Purchas

¹⁵⁴ John Martin to Sir Julius Caesar, [1622?], BL Add MS 12496, f. 436r.

¹⁵⁵ John Martin, 'The manner howe to bringe in the Indians into subiection', 1622, BL Add MS 12496, f. 439r.

¹⁵⁶ 'Right ho[nora]ble I haue tendered to my Lord President...', 9 Dece[m]b[er] 1622, BL Add MS 12496, f. 433r.

¹⁵⁷ 'A proiect from M Caswell for creating Noblemen in Virginia', July 1619, FP 12, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virginiacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 19 September 2014].

¹⁵⁸ Samuel Purchas, *The kings towre* (London, 1623; STC 20502), sig. D4v.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, sigs. D4v-D5r.

declared, ‘now submitteth...to our Language, Discipline, Customes, Habitation’.¹⁶⁰

Purchas’ language mirrored those of colonists and councillors themselves. Sir Nathaniel Rich attributed the miseries that had befallen those in the colony to ‘sauage’ attacks and ‘p[ar]tlie through want of good gou[ern]ment and direcons both here and there’.¹⁶¹ The new patents for Virginia were to be confirmed by acts of parliament that provided stronger measures of security against both. The American enterprises ‘would be greatly increased, if by his Ma[iest]ies Royall authoritie, w[i]th consent of Parliament, bothe Plantacons might be annexed to the Imperiall Crowne of this Realme’.¹⁶² Purchas’ vision of James’ *imperium* was further expressed in multiple editions of *Purchas his pilgrimes*, reprinted at least five times between 1613 and 1625. It seemed apparent that the colonial enterprises and James’ claims to absolute rule in his ‘Britain’ were understood to be part of the same unifying design, so that the acts and policies of one territory affected those in another. Only when the inhabitants of America, both English and Amerindian, acknowledged James as sole ruler could ‘that Virgine Country...proue to vs the *Barne of Britaine*’.¹⁶³ The foundation of a society built on England’s own laws and institutions could only emerge through the enforcement of hierarchy and strict regulation, initially forced upon an uncompromising landscape through the king’s singular power, a ‘singular, masculine, reall, regall, absolute [power] ouer his own’ subjects.¹⁶⁴ To make Virginia part of the English – and eventually British – imperial project, James and his councillors were forced to define the nature of English monarchical power, and to take practical step to addressing how England might successfully enlarge and control its boundaries. James’ articulation of his sovereignty was in some instances bound up in his awareness of people outside his immediate territories, whose conformity – or lack of – held implications for his own power.

Conclusion

The presence and possibility of America was, by this time, woven into the lives of those who, though never intending to travel themselves, were drawn to

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., sig. D5r.

¹⁶¹ Sir Nathaniel Rich, ‘Notes of Letters from Virginia’, May/June 1623, in *VCR: IV*, p. 161.

¹⁶² ‘Discourse of the Old Company’, April 1625, in *VCR: IV*, p. 547.

¹⁶³ Daniel Price, *Sauls prohibition staide...with a reproofe of those that traduce the honourable plantation of Virginia* (London, 1609; STC 20302), sig. F2v.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., sig. D6r.

discussions on government and state that America raised. This inevitably hardened stereotypes about natives, but it also fostered a more nuanced dialogue about the bounds of monarchical sovereignty and kingly responsibility. The very uncertainty of the earliest English colonial endeavours, their survival persistently under question, made them a topic of relevance, but also genuine interest, to a variety of people who never planned on actually travelling there. This allowed subjects, both publicly and privately, to participate in discussions about obedience and conformity through the shared language of civility and the rejection of savage behaviour.

The establishment of the royal colony was by no means a foregone conclusion. Enterprises in the Chesapeake in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were often undertaken for commercial reasons by privately-funded Englishmen, a trend that ended in the mid-1620s when the Crown began to impart a ‘dramatically new vision of colonisation’ that involved larger migration schemes and closely-regulated colonial activity.¹⁶⁵ The turmoil and questions over government that arose out of the uncertainties in Virginia, and the Virginia Company’s own disagreements, contributed significantly to the state’s hardening stances on savagery. In order to achieve regional stability, it was necessary to subdue the Powhatan ‘lest the Indians should tak corage to pursue what they had begun’.¹⁶⁶ To quell the allure of Algonquian culture, and the political threat of Opechancanough’s tribal alliances, the English acknowledged that the establishment of kingly sovereignty involved the subjugation of other peoples. The colony needed to adopt what ‘may be aptly termed a Militarie intendencie’ that would plant garrisons and bring ‘a certaine revenew to the Crowne, it shall tie Virginia as fast to England as if it were one terra firma with itt’.¹⁶⁷ James’ eventual decision to involve himself directly in ‘that worke w[hi]ch wee have begunne’ is significant.¹⁶⁸ Firstly, it suggests that James was prepared to assume responsibility for matters in Virginia, and that his interference was the result of the letters and petitions presented to him and his privy council, especially after

¹⁶⁵ Kupperman, ‘The Founding Years of Virginia’, p. 109.

¹⁶⁶ ‘A copy of a Brief Declaration of Virginia in the first 12 years’, 1624, FP 532, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virgionacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 18 September 2014].

¹⁶⁷ ‘Right ho[nora]ble I haue tendered to my Lord President...’, 9 Dece[m]b[er] 1622, BL Add MS 12496, f. 433r.

¹⁶⁸ ‘Commission to Sir Francis Wyatt’, 26 August 1624, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 8:3 (1928), p. 160.

1619. It also indicates James' recognition that addressing affairs in America were crucial to settling the tensions wrought between members of the elite in his own realm.

Beyond justification or calls for reform, what these letters and reports also reveal is the originality of the language of savagery that made its way to London. Alongside classical and Christian notions of government and society, and amidst fears of the encroaching threat of Catholic unorthodoxy, experiences in Virginia showed an increasing knowledge of a region that had only recently entered into the English political imagination. 'I would...render this whole country unto His Majesty', Thomas Dale promised the earl of Salisbury in 1611, if it were only possible to 'overmaster the subtle, mischievous Great Powhatan'.¹⁶⁹ Councillors learned of 'Kiskaick, somewhat short of Powhatan's chief town, called Worowocomaco ... [where] should my second plantation be, for that would make good the inland and assure us likewise of the Pamunkie River'.¹⁷⁰ Ballads invoked 'Waynoke, Pipskoe/And Apummatockes'. For the first time, specific tribes figured in Jacobean ideas about government, where the English hoped to drive natives to 'seek a stranger country or accept a well-liked condition of life with us'.¹⁷¹ London gossips, courtiers, churchmen, and the king himself discussed Pocahontas, Wahunsunacock and his brother Opechancanough, tobacco, and the Chesapeake over dinner and in private homes, at company-hosted banquets and in the Star Chamber.

The convergence of new cultural terms with political debate prompted discussions about statecraft in ways that letters that glossed over conflict, or inflated harmonious relations, did not. When George Popham wrote to the king from the Sagadahoc colony in 1607, he blandly portrayed the surrounding tribes' perfect obedience. 'No person in the whole world is more admired than the Lord James,' Popham wrote, and the natives 'further declare that no god is worthy of true adoration but the god of the lord James, under whose authority & command they would cheerfully, & willingly fight'.¹⁷² Yet the colony lay abandoned the following year, after news of the death of his older brother lured the governor Raleigh Gilbert back to England. Similarly, letters from the uninhabited island of

¹⁶⁹ Thomas Dale to Salisbury, 17 August 1611, *Jamestown Narratives*, p. 554.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁷² George Popham to King James, 13 December 1607, BL MS, CO 1/1, f. 6r.

Bermuda, and from a sparsely-populated Newfoundland, had little need of reporting confrontation with indigenous peoples, and were consequently less useful in stimulating discussion over rule. While Bermuda and Newfoundland figured large in debate over commodities like tobacco, fish, and ambergris, prolonged interaction with the Powhatan necessarily involved discussions of subjugation and rule.

Given this connection between English subjects and the reality of native peoples, what James' concern with sovereignty and political allegiance further indicates is how much the idea of Virginia went beyond colonial policy. When he berated his own subjects for 'savage' behaviour, whether through tobacco-smoking or incivility, James spoke as one who knew that the contemporary reality of 'savages' were dangerous to English orthodoxy. Letters and reports from North America emphasised the importance of making Virginia English, but they also prompted a counter-emphasis – that England was not like Virginia. Comparisons between Amerindians and Englishmen described were explicitly invoked to describe those who rejected state expansion. Though some might be 'discouraged from this worthy enterprise [of colonisation], by raylers and scoffers', wrote John Bonoel, such men were 'next a kinne, indeed, to the hatefull Sauages, enemies herein to God, their King, and Country'.¹⁷³ As in so many other instances, Englishmen who resisted the wishes of 'God, King, and Country' were not merely uncivil but actively *against* civility and all that it entailed. This ambiguity, and perceived indulgence, led to fears of failing to achieve political and cultural ascendancy based on actual experience. The English, after all, had not ventured to Virginia 'to make Sauages and wild degenerate men of Christians, but Christians of those Sauage, wild degenerate men'.¹⁷⁴ It was the awareness of how behaviour threatened civility, as reports from Virginia throughout this period almost uniformly complained, that savagery became such a germane and prominent example of imperilled sovereignty in England, as subsequent chapters will show.

By the time Thomas Hobbes published *Leviathan* in 1651 – himself a shareholder in the Virginia Company, attending meetings with his patron Lord Cavendish in the 1620s – he sought to paint a picture of civil government that both conceded the original rights of the people while promoting absolutist

¹⁷³ John Bonoel, *His Maiesties gracious letter to the Earle of South-Hampton* (London, 1622; STC 14378), sig. M3v.

¹⁷⁴ Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimes* (London, 1625; STC 20509), sig. M6r.

political allegiances, reconciled in citizens choosing to ‘renounce and transfer’ their authority to a guardian of state, the monarch.¹⁷⁵ Without a king, Hobbes maintained, the state remained a headless aberration, a government no more effective than that held by ‘savages’ living outside the structures and institutions that society offered. Hobbes specifically evoked Amerindian ways of life as examples of lust-driven communities that let nature dominate reason, drawing on tropes about continual warfare that were partly a reflection of the ideas crystallised under James. Where sovereign authority did not rule, thought Thomas Heigham in 1624, chaos followed, turning men ‘more sauage then the sauages of America’.¹⁷⁶ Any who succumbed to ‘rebellious affections and lusts’ were ‘the deuils disciples...Sauages’ – like their American counterparts, they deserved ‘the rod of the Magistrate...and the yoke’.¹⁷⁷ As the next chapter will explore, nowhere did the ‘affections and lusts’ from America seem more manifest than in the practice of tobacco-smoking.

¹⁷⁵ Skinner, ‘Language and Political Change’, p. 117.

¹⁷⁶ Thomas Heigham, *The ghosts of the deceased sieurs* (London, 1624; STC 5129), sig. C6v.

¹⁷⁷ Thomas Granger, *A familiar exposition or commentarie on Ecclesiastes* (London, 1621; 12178), sig. M7r.

Chapter Six

The Seductions of Savagery: Tobacco and Dissent in London

In December 1624, university tutors at Cambridge frantically made arrangements for a royal visit. This included setting clear instructions for their students' own behaviour. Aware of James' personal preferences and keen to avoid his displeasure, the heads of colleges forbade students to smoke anywhere near the king's presence. Any who 'p[re]sume to take any Tobacco in or neere Trinitie Colledge hall nor neere any place where his Ma[ies]tie is', they ordained, 'is vppon payne of final expelling [from] ye Vniu[er]sitie'.¹

Though James published his *Counterblaste to tobacco* (1604) shortly after ascending the English throne, denouncing the corruption of manners brought about by smoking, it is in these other sources that one sees just how far James' famed aversion for tobacco went beyond rhetoric. Most proclamations that dealt with the tobacco trade were prefaced by a reminder of how much James detested the commodity: 'It is not unknowen what dislike Wee haue euer had of the use of Tobacco, as tending to a general corruption, both of mens bodies and manners', and James appeared to have professed the same over dinner on at least two occasions.² When he prepared to attend a sermon at St Paul's Cathedral in 1620, desiring to 'stir vp others by his princely example', the king ordered that tobacco houses near the west gate of the church be 'pulled downe to the ground and the sellers and vaultes filled vp, that there be noe signe left remaining of any such houses or vaultes there'.³

Yet smoking proliferated in Jacobean London, and scholars tend to dismiss James' dislike of tobacco – and indeed anti-tobacco tracts more generally – as the dull rantings of a pedant set on hampering the inevitable. However, as previous chapters have examined, concerns over conformity and political stability

¹ 'Orders and Monitions', 8 December 1624, in *Records of Early English Drama: Cambridge, Volume 1*, ed. Alan H. Nelson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), p. 597.

² *By the King. A proclamation to restraine the planting of tobacco in England and Wales* (London, 1619; STC 8622); A report of S[i]r Yeardlyes going Governor to Virginia, 5 December 1618, FP 93, *Virginia Company Archives*, <<http://www.virginiacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 9 September 2014]; *By the King. A proclamation concerning tobacco* (London, 1624; STC 8738); Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, 21 September 1604, TNA: PRO, SP 14/9, f. 137r.

³ A letter to the Lord Bishop of London and the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedrall Church of St Paule, 23 March 1620, TNA: PRO, PC 2/30.

in relation to America were a consistent thread in discourse, whether in discussions of apparel or religious orthodoxy, and conceptions of savagery offered points of tension through which colonists and Londoners alike engaged with politics and theories of government. These concerns, as Chapter Five argued, took on a stronger urgency in the context of colonial mismanagement in Virginia. This chapter further examines the London-Virginia connection that affected English policy-making, and contends that the scholarly tendency to downplay the association between smoking and native culture, so rife until the 1620s, is to overlook the process through which the state consciously modified and framed its policies towards the tobacco trade. The state ‘was not so much made as formed’ by various political, religious, and cultural processes, and studying the tensions that arose out of anxieties over tobacco presents a chance to see tobacco as part of this process.⁴

This chapter therefore eschews the deterministic view put forth by cultural materialists who attribute tobacco more agency than the individuals who dealt with it, and also moves away from considering tobacco solely as a commodity that contributed to the development of merchant empire in the later seventeenth century.⁵ Rather, it considers the personal relationships, opinions, and preferences that figured so large in early seventeenth century policy-making. Anti-tobacco tracts were often engaged in larger debates about civility and degeneration, but also with contempt for authority, criminality, and even treason. The concern here is less for the writings that praised tobacco’s benefits in medical treatises, or the role of tobacco in facilitating London sociability (as explored in the fourth chapter), but with why authorities eventually allowed tobacco to flourish, even when tobacco seemed to stand in opposition to perfect obedience. The ultimate acceptance of tobacco in London should not be seen as modernity’s triumph over

⁴ *Mercantilism Reimagined: Political Economy in Early Modern Britain and its Empire*, eds. Philip Stern and Carl Wennerlind (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 13.

⁵ T.H. Breen, *Tobacco Culture: the Mentality of the Great Tidewater Planters on the Eve of the Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: Norton, 1975); Jordan Goodman, *Tobacco in History: The Cultures of Dependence* (London: Routledge, 1994); Peter Mancall, ‘Tales Tobacco Told in Sixteenth-Century Europe’, *Environmental History*, 9:4 (2004), pp. 648-78; Michael Ziser, ‘Sovereign Remedies: Natural Authority and the “Counterblaste to Tobacco”’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 62:4 (2005), pp. 719-744; Jeffrey Knapp, ‘Elizabethan Tobacco’, *Representations*, 21 (1988), pp. 26-66; Sandra Bell, ‘The Subject of Smoke: Tobacco and Early Modern England’, in *The Mysterious and the Foreign in Early Modern England*, ed. Helen Ostovich, Mary V. Silcox, and Graham Roebuck (New Jersey: Associated University Press, 2008), pp. 153-69.

an authoritarian regime, but the development of a more sophisticated political economy that first needed to divorce the indigenous association of tobacco from its potential profit to the state. This necessity largely emerged from an awareness, on the part of policy-makers, of the colonies' importance in relation to combatting Spanish ascendancy following the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War.

Historiography

Despite its popularity, tobacco in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was a highly ambiguous commodity. Reactions to smoking throughout Europe and the East could be extremely severe. Various popes issued bulls to prevent smoking in certain cities and churches, including St Peter's in Rome. Sultans Ahmed I and Murat IV punished smokers by piercing their noses with pipe stems, and later enforced the death penalty for smoking in the 1630s. Persian and Russian authorities similarly tried bans, whippings, nose-slitting, and public executions to punish offenders.⁶ The English may have tried, for a brief time, to grow tobacco in their gardens, but they also expressed a mistrust of overindulgence with the pipe: 'men looke not like men that vse them'.⁷

Luxury commodities like tobacco and other *flora* of colonialism have received much attention in the cultural turn of the past thirty years. The tendency has been to focus on tobacco's 'sovereignty' – on its dominance over people and economic markets or on the interest given it by physicians in the rise of natural scientific study. Scholars like Jeffrey Knapp and Michael Ziser have focused on James' seemingly powerless aversion for the plant, but place little emphasis either on the London-Virginia connection that figured so large in discussions about tobacco. Though Susan Campbell Anderson and Ziser rightly point out that James' attempt to control the trade was a matter of sovereign authority, Ziser's cultural materialist approach and Anderson's exploration of the ambiguity of James' opposition place little emphasis on the behaviour of English subjects, keeping their focus solely on James' own interaction with tobacco.⁸ A focus on luxury commodities and monarchical ineptitude prompted new historicist scholars

⁶ Jordan Goodman, *Tobacco in History and Culture: an Encyclopaedia* (Michigan: Thomson Gale, 2005), p. 459.

⁷ Thomas Dekker, *The shoemakers holiday* (London, 1600; STC 6523), sig. C3v.

⁸ Susan Campbell Anderson, 'A Matter of Authority: James I and the Tobacco War', *Comitatus*, 29 (1998), pp. 136-63.

to see tobacco as a proto-imperial indulgence with a power that was destined to overcome any individual who opposed it, royal or not.⁹ While this yields interesting insights, it nonetheless diminishes the dynamic interchange that occurred between various opponents of tobacco, who often had differing reasons for condemning the plant.

Equally, it is not enough to group all anti-tobacco sources under vehement polemic. Though many of the arguments in the physician Philaretus' *Work for chimney-sweepers* (1602) were used by subsequent authors, Knapp's article does not attempt to tell the whole story. It promises to unlock how the reception of tobacco in England reflected a pervasive view in the 'divine potential' of trifles, ascribing much importance to brief mentions of tobacco in sources like Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (1590) or apocryphal stories of Walter Raleigh, while believing that Philaretus' opposition to tobacco came 'too late' to have much significance.¹⁰ This idea of opposition coming 'too late' presupposes that those who inveighed against tobacco never changed their minds or altered their positions. As this chapter will show, the growing attention to colonisation under James allowed policy-makers to change the way they wrote about tobacco in the 1620s, as its more 'savage' connotations began to disappear alongside a firmer English presence in North America and a more virulent opposition to Spanish authority.

Most recently, work by Phil Withington and Angela McShane has explored how altered states through alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs from the sixteenth century onwards were seen to contain a transformative power that was both mistrusted and encouraged in the assertion of masculine identity. As Withington points out, while intoxicants are imbedded in economic development, they are also 'more variegated' in meaning, acting as 'the lubricant of political patronage' and 'the embodiment of taste, civility, privilege, subordination, and exclusion'.¹¹ Viewing tobacco alongside other intoxicants have therefore placed

⁹ Knapp, 'Elizabethan Tobacco', pp. 29-30; Mancall, 'Tales Tobacco Told'; Jeffrey Knapp, *An Empire Nowhere: England, America, and Literature from Utopia to the Tempest* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), Chapter Four.

¹⁰ Knapp, 'Elizabethan Tobacco', pp. 20, 33.

¹¹ Phil Withington, 'Introduction: Cultures of Intoxication', *Past and Present: Supplement 9* (2014), pp. 9-33, pp. 20, 14. See also Phil Withington, 'Intoxicants and Society in Early Modern England', *The Historical Journal*, 54:3 (2011), pp. 631-57; Michelle O'Callaghan, *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Adam Smyth (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004).

consumption within an economic, social, and political framework, where the state's interest – or disinterest – in controlling drugs shapes the way intoxicants might be used within any given polity. The work by Withington and McShane on the Intoxicants Project has sought to place intoxicants within their institutional and counter-cultural contexts, but the breadth of its scope has perhaps contributed to this tendency to put too much emphasis on the popularity of social lubricants including tobacco, or at least to focus less on the moment of resistance that came before the widespread smoking habits of the 1630s. The most significant jump in tobacco consumption can be traced in the years between 1630 and 1669, where legal tobacco consumption rose from 0.02lbs to .93lbs per capita; exploring attitudes towards tobacco in the decades before this is crucial to explaining the process through which tobacco became such a prevalent social practice.¹² Given the social currency tobacco still has today, the historical reality of tobacco's ambiguity in the early seventeenth century has not hitherto been extensively studied because it is deemed irrelevant. Yet assessing the tension between tobacco and civility under James offers insight into the process through which smoking ultimately lost its association with disloyalty and sedition as it came under stricter Crown control.

Tobacco in England

On a certain level, tobacco was one commodity among many and was, like any herb or drug, incorporated by physicians, travellers, writers, and planters into a larger understanding of pre-existing medicines. As a remedy, 'a suitable niche for tobacco was already present'.¹³ One of the earliest English engagements with medicinal tobacco from the Indies was a translation of the Spanish physician Nicolás Mondares' *Joyfull newes out of a new found world* (1577). The book included an illustration of the tobacco plant and a section outlining the virtues of tobacco, reprinted several times in ensuing decades. Mondares offered a detailed explanation of how tobacco healed headaches, rheums, toothaches, bad breath, and 'any grieffe or venomous humour'.¹⁴ Describing how best to apply tobacco to the body in each of these occasions, he concluded that 'in woundes newly hurte

¹² Goodman, *Tobacco in History*, p. 60.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

¹⁴ Nicolás Mondares, *Joyfull newes out of the newe founde worlde* (London, 1580; STC 18006), sig. Kk2v.

and cuttings, strokes, prickles, or any other maner of wounde, our *Tobacco* doth marueilowes effectes'.¹⁵ Numerous writers in James' reign reiterated this belief, including the anonymous *A new and short defense of tabacco* (1602) and William Barclay's *Nepenthes, or, The vertues of tabacoo* (1614).¹⁶ Surviving copies of several medicinal treatises show markings and underlining in the pages describing tobacco, including the margins of one book where someone wrote '*Tobacco*' for easier reference.¹⁷ These traces of evidence suggest that some readers approached medical treatises with a real desire to understand the effects of tobacco on health and illness.

In many cases, physicians argued that a temperate consumption of tobacco would remove many of the aches and discomforts inconveniencing people in their day-to-day lives without leading to abuse. With a dry consistency that would offset the dampened humours caused by illness, tobacco seemed to offer a proven cure. Fynes Moryson wrote of Lord Mountjoy, the lord deputy of Ireland, that

He tooke Tobacco abundantly, and of the best, which I thinke preserued him from sicknes, (especially in Ireland, where the foggy aire of the bodys, and waterish foule...doe most preiudice the health), for hee was very seldome sicke.¹⁸

Edward Reynolds, who served in the household of the earl of Essex and accompanied him on campaign, wrote a letter to his brother in 1606, hoping some of 'Cosen Bagges tobacco' would help combat the pains in his chest with which he had been 'freshly assaulted'.¹⁹ Tobacco-smoking therefore offered a practical solution to everyday ailments. Edmund Gardner praised tobacco in moderation, warning that its benefits would disappear under abuse, and would fail to 'bring both their mindes and bodies to a better temper and moderation'.²⁰

Those who discouraged tobacco spent a significant amount of ink outlining its adverse effects. Health, and therefore disease, was still largely understood in relation to the four humours, modelled heavily on the work of

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. Ll3v.

¹⁶ *A new and short defense of tabacco, with effects of the same, and of the right vse thereof* (London, 1602; STC 6468.5); William Barclay, *Nepenthes, or, The vertues of tabacoo* (Edinburgh, 1614; STC 1406).

¹⁷ John Cotta, *A short discoverie of the vnobserued dangers of seuerall sorts of ignorant and vnconsiderate practisers of physicke in England* (London, 1612; STC 5833), sig. B3r; Elezeur Duncan, *The copy of a letter written by E.D Doctour of Physicke* (London, 1606; STC 6164), sig. A4r.

¹⁸ Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary* (London, 1617; STC 18205), sig. Ff3v.

¹⁹ Edward Reynoldes to Owen Reynoldes, 24 February 1606, TNA: PRO, SP 14/18, f. 169r.

²⁰ Edmund Gardiner, *Phisicall and approved medicines* (London, 1611; STC 11564.5), sig. A2r.

Galen, where the four complexions – sanguine, phlegmatic, choleric, and melancholic – were seen to affect personality and physical characteristics in ways that were related to nature’s four elements, rendering bodily imbalance the root of more significant disorders.²¹ The physicians who sought to discourage tobacco related the imbalance caused by tobacco to the upset of the natural humours in the body. The London physician Edmund Gardiner sought to show tobacco’s ill effects based on empirical observation, noting the internal damage it would cause. Too much tobacco infected ‘the braine and the liuer, as appears in our Anatomies, when their bodies are opened’, showing ‘their kidneyes, yea and hearts quite wasted’.²²

One of the main arguments of the anonymous physician who called himself ‘Philaretus’ was that tobacco not only had physical but psychological effects. Tobacco was a ‘great increaser of melancholy in vs’, opening the mind to ‘melancholy impressions and effects proceeding of that humour’.²³ Melancholic dispositions arose, Philaretus explained, from black bile, corresponding to the element of the earth and caused by the thickness of a patient’s blood. The unnatural rising of bile or yellow choler by hot and dry tobacco would form sediment in the blood, producing an unnatural form of melancholy that would perpetuate itself due to the earthy waste in the blood. The clergyman and physician Eleazar Duncan made similar conclusions in his own treatise: ‘when the blood growth thicke and grosse, the minde is dull and sad’.²⁴ Melancholy led to dangerous imaginings, targeting the ‘principall faculty of the mind’ where ‘*Imagination, or Reason* is corrupted’.²⁵ It pierced the ‘cauties and ventricles of the braine’ and bred ‘terror, feare, discontentment of life, false and peruerse imaginations, and fantasies most strange’.²⁶ Though these effects may seem exaggerated, they demonstrate attempts to explain what is now understood to be depression, offering a view into how seventeenth-century individuals understood the psychology of disease and chemical imbalance.

²¹ Margaret Healy, *Fictions of Disease in Early Modern England: Bodies, Plagues and Politics* (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001), p. 20.

²² William Vaughan, *Approved directions for health, both naturall and artificiall* (London, 1612; STC 24615), sig. F8v.

²³ Philaretus, *Work for chimney-sweepers* (London, 1602; STC 12571), sig. F4v.

²⁴ Eleazar Duncon, *The copy of a letter* (London, 1606; STC 6164), sigs. A4v-A5r.

²⁵ Robert Burton, *The anatomie of melancholy* (Oxford, 1621; STC 4159), sigs. A6v, C8r.

²⁶ Philaretus, *Work for chimney-sweepers*, sig. G3r.

Civility and tobacco-smoking, therefore, were not automatic associations despite their role in advancing sociability. The dangers of melancholy were considered especially destabilising to gentlemen whose minds must be fit to run their estates and participate in governing the realm. Once inside the blood, tobacco would overthrow the balanced state of body before moving to the brain. Quoting Galen, Duncan summarised that ‘the best complexions haue the best maners’.²⁷ A healthy man possessed uncontaminated blood and a tempered brain, a mind ‘affable, courteous, and civil’, while a melancholy man was prone to solitariness and to withdrawing from society, making him ‘repugnant and contrary’.²⁸ This was echoed by William Herbert, third earl of Pembroke, who incurred royal displeasure for having an affair with the daughter of a Cheshire gentleman at court. He lamented that his banishment had caused him much suffering, and wished to have a change of climate that might ‘purge me of Melancholie, for els I shall neuer be fit for any ciuill society’.²⁹ The physical body’s upset humours therefore withdraw a subject from the public eye.

It should be noted that physicians who prescribed tobacco did not necessarily advocate *smoking* it. Though the occasional tobacco, taken through a pipe, was recommended by some physicians, others called for the ‘leaves be ashed or warmed in imbers and ashes’, and it was the irrational custom of breathing in that ‘Nicotian fume’ that seemed to most unsettle John Cotta.³⁰ For burns, one doctor advocated making a ‘salue or ointment of Tabacco’, since it ‘anoynt the grieffe, & killeth the malignant heat of any burning or scalding’.³¹ Often, boiling or crushing leaves was seen to be the most efficient way to use the plant as a purgative. The sins of ‘pride, fulnesse of bread, and contempt of the poore’ was directly linked to plague in one 1625 pamphlet, but tobacco was not catalogued as one of the country’s sins – instead, it was recommended as a panacea against the plague.³² This tobacco was not to be smoked, but ‘smelled vnto’ and followed by a draught of beer and a restorative walk.³³

²⁷ Ibid., sig. A4v.

²⁸ Ibid., sigs. G2v-G3r.

²⁹ The earl of Pembroke to Sir Robert Cecil, 13 August 1601, Hatfield MS, CP 87/95.

³⁰ Henry Butts, *Dyets dry dinner* (London, 1599; STC 4207), sig. P5v. Cotta, *A short discouerie of the obserued dangers*, sig. B3r.

³¹ Henry Lyte, *Rams little Dodeon, a briefe epitome of the new herbal* (London, 1606; STC 6988), sig. Vr.

³² *The Red-Crosse, or, Englands Lord haue mercy vpon vs* (London, 1625; STC 20823) [single sheet].

³³ Ibid.

The king imposed high taxes and a stricter regulation of grants and licences, raising the duties on tobacco by 4,000 per cent, from 2*d* to 82*d* per pound.³⁴ It was perhaps the fluctuating price of duties that prompted people to try to grow their own. In the sixteenth century alone, several thousand printed books in Europe included material from the Americas, with many of those describing tobacco, its uses, and advice on how to grow it.³⁵ James approved licenses to sell tobacco in Ireland as in England and Wales, and surviving letters between policy-makers and merchants testify to a number of people allowed to grow tobacco since ‘a good rent is growne to the kinge’ and proved profitable despite pitfalls.³⁶ For every petition made to the king by enterprisers complaining that their crops were ‘badd and unvendible’, there were petitions by men like Sir Arthur Chichester, lord deputy of Ireland, who in 1610 asked for a licence to farm and sell tobacco.³⁷ Tobacco proved easy to grow, and one acre of English tobacco, before it become prohibited to grow in England, yielded anywhere from 29*l* to 100*l* profit – certainly inviting to a farm labourer who made around 9*l* a year.³⁸

There is frustratingly little direct, material evidence of who made or distributed pipes prior to 1630, but vestiges of clay pipes indicate the role of London companies in manufacturing a market for tobacco through the making of pipes.³⁹ Early pipes have been found in pits of dirt and rubble in London, some of them very plain while others carry markings of foliage, Tudor roses, or initials.⁴⁰ Pipes were made with clay, which was rolled into a brass mould and fired in furnaces. These were relatively easy to make but broke often, and were not meant to be kept for long. Examples of early pipes have been found most frequently in Bristol, London, and Newcastle, hinting at the dissemination of tobacco from ports in different areas around the realm.⁴¹ The king’s grant to the Tobacco Pipe Makers of Westminster gave its members sole privileges for making and

³⁴ Goodman, *Tobacco in History*, p. 148.

³⁵ Mancall, ‘Tales Tobacco Told’, p. 670.

³⁶ Sir George Carewe to Viscount Cranborne, May 1605, Hatfield MS, CP 189/81r.

³⁷ Thomas Alabaster to the Earl of Salisbury, 1607, Hatfield MS, CP Petitions 1186; Remembrances concerning the Public, given to Mr Treasurer, 29 January 1610, TNA: PRO, SP 63/227, f. 237.

³⁸ Goodman, *Tobacco in History*, p. 142. On the process of cultivating tobacco, see Alexis Liebaert and Alain Maya, *The Illustrated History of the Pipe* (Suffolk: Harold Starke Publishers, 1994), pp. 113-20.

³⁹ Goodman, *Tobacco in History*, p. 64.

⁴⁰ Adrian Oswald, *English Clay Tobacco Pipes* (London: British Archaeological Association, 1976), p. 4. A searchable database of clay tobacco pipe makers’ marks from London can be found on the Museum of London website <<http://archive.museumoflondon.org.uk/claypipes/>>.

⁴¹ Oswald, *English Clay Tobacco Pipes*, p. 4.

distributing pipes, and Philip Foote acquired a license to provide clay to the pipe makers for 21 years.⁴² Conversely, the extent to which this monopoly actually extended beyond London is questionable, and it is worth remembering that the figures above do not include the tobacco that was illegally distributed and consumed, though it is impossible to know the extent of this trade except that it was pervasive enough to warrant numerous proclamations calling for redress.

Tobacco boxes, like pipes, were ‘an indispensable accompaniment’ that ‘contained not only the smoking tobacco but all of the devices necessary to produce the smoke’, including flint, steel, tongs, and a tobacco pipe.⁴³ These boxes were often made of wood, while those most likely to survive were those wrought with gold, pearls, and other costly materials.⁴⁴ Thomas Dekker included a description of the preparation process in *The Guls Horne-Booke* (1609), where

our Gallant must draw out his Tobacco-box, the ladell for the cold snuffe into the nostrill, the tongs and priming Iron: All which artillery may be of gold or siluer (if he can reach to the price of it) it will bee a reasonable vsefull pawne at all times, when the current of his money falls out to run low.⁴⁵

Joan Thirsk’s *Economic Policy and Projects* argues for the rise of a consumer society in early modern England, and it is possible to situate the making and distributing of pipes and tobacco boxes within this development. New techniques of manufacture and methods of cultivation from the second half of the sixteenth century brought an increased market for knitted goods, tobacco pipes, buttons, alum, linen, hemp, and flax, all of which combined to stimulate ‘economic energies that filtered through the very heart of the national economy’ by allowing labourers, husbandmen, women, and children to sustain a livelihood while acquiring new goods that were produced within the country.⁴⁶ The belief that men were ‘genuinely concerned to find constructive solutions to the problem of poverty’ while pursuing private interests allowed learned men to promote

⁴² ‘Grant to the Tobacco-pipe Makers of Westminster’, 30 July 1619, in *Calendar of State Papers: Domestic, 1619-1623*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London: Longman, 1858), p. 67; ‘License to Philip Foote to sell clay for making tobacco pipes’, 24 July 1618, TNA: PRO, SP 14/141.

⁴³ Goodman, *Tobacco in History*, p. 66.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

⁴⁵ Thomas Dekker, *The guls horne-booke* (London, 1609; STC 6500), sig. Er.

⁴⁶ Joan Thirsk, *Economic Policy and Projects: The Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008), p. 7.

humanistic values while developing economic policies that would benefit individuals and the region.⁴⁷

Though tobacco-growing proved to some to be an uncertain endeavour, it yielded obvious profit to those who knew how to acquire and sell it. An estimated 60 per cent of tobacco consumed in England in the 1610s was sold illegally, evading James' customs and inciting his numerous proclamations censuring those who thought it fit to ignore the king's laws.⁴⁸ Before John Rolfe, Ralph Hamor, and other colonists in Virginia began sending their own crops to England, much of England's tobacco came from Spain, where an estimated 44,000*l* was spent on tobacco in 1616, up from 8,000*l* when James first ascended the throne.⁴⁹ The English recognised the weakness of this dependence. Tobacco dominated the Spanish trade, so that the English were investing in a commodity that bolstered a country whose Catholicism was a perceived threat to English activities in the Atlantic, not to mention to England itself. It was only in 1624 that the English banned the import of Spanish tobacco, granting the Virginia and Somers Islands companies sole importation rights.

Incivility and Disorder

Why, if tobacco might be so economically advantageous, did it meet such resistance? The mathematician Thomas Hariot praised the commodity because it 'preserueth the body from obstructions... wherewithall wee in England are oftentimes afflicted'.⁵⁰ On the other hand, Hariot had been to Virginia, and his descriptions of Amerindians were unsettlingly foreign and decidedly un-English. Tobacco, or *vppówoc*, Hariot wrote,

is of so precious estimation amongst [the Indians], that they thinke their gods are maruelously delighted therwith: Whereupon sometime they make hallowed fires & cast some of the powder therein for a sacrifice... all done with strange gestures, stamping, sometime dauncing, clapping of hands, holding vp of hands, & staring vp into the heauens, vttering therewithal and chattering strange words & noises.⁵¹

⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 18, 32.

⁴⁸ Goodman, *Tobacco in History*, p. 147.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Thomas Hariot, *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia* (London, 1588; STC 12785), sig. C3v.

⁵¹ Ibid. For the role of tobacco in native ceremonies, see Lee Irwin, *Coming Down From Above: Prophecy, Resistance, and Renewal in Native American Religion* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008).

A great deal of the criticism against tobacco exhibited concerns over behaviour, and anxieties in the 1610s and 1620s should not be divorced from the mistrust the English directed towards Amerindian cultural practices as a contemporary example of the reality of savagery. The fumes of tobacco that the Amerindians imbibed for their drunken effects no longer seemed strange to the English, Samuel Purchas maintained, because it was now a widespread custom for man ‘to become of an English-man, a Sauage Indian’.⁵² Seen in light of tobacco’s political connotations, an English subject’s transformation into ‘a Sauage Indian’ was to Purchas a matter of utmost concern. The contaminating nature of tobacco, seen to encourage wastefulness and decay, can be seen in the 1616 will that left a gentleman’s household goods to his eldest son, unless his siblings ever caught him taking tobacco, in which he would forfeit everything.⁵³ To detractors, smoking allowed individuals to express a certain contempt for their circumstances or their surroundings in a very visual, sensory way.

Tobacco was an ‘all-compounded evil’ that should have been ‘too bad... for th’English imitation’.⁵⁴ Fears of imitation underline how closely smoking continued to be related, at this time, to the natives from whom the practice had been adopted. The association between tobacco and savage behaviour remained closely connected in the decades following its first appearance in England, prompting one physician to write in 1621 that the ‘vaine dreams and visions, which this fume suggesteth’, rendered natives ‘bewitched’ and full of ‘watonnesse and delight’.⁵⁵ He connected the Amerindians’ use of tobacco with acts of sacrifice and spirituality in distorted terms that hint at the popular hearsay of such stories, before proposing to ‘leauē the Americans, and come to our Europeans, who (well-neare) vse the fume of Tobacco with as much excess as they doe’.⁵⁶

This concern with savagery was key. The London council advocated a complete eradication of Powhatan temples and burial grounds because they were ‘superstitious’ and prevented English Protestantism and civility from taking root.

⁵² From Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimage* (London, 1613; STC 20505), sig. Ooo4r.

⁵³ ‘Copy will of Peter Columbelle of Kegworth, Esq’, 20 October 1616, Nottinghamshire Archives: DD/FJ/4/29/4, *The National Archives* <<http://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/rd/1f20a838-b4d5-4928-9d78-9570212a531f>> [accessed 18 April 2014].

⁵⁴ Thomas Scot, *Philomythie* (London, 1622; STC 21871), sig. Ir.

⁵⁵ Tobias Venner, *A briefe and accurate treatise, concerning, the taking of the fume of tobacco* (London, 1621; STC 24642), sig. B2v.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, sig. B4v.

It hardly seemed consistent to indulge in a plant that the Algonquian themselves used as primary instruments in their religious rituals, including sun-worship and in navigating their spiritual dream realms. Contrary to the strict regime of prescribed devotional practices in Catholicism, Protestant subjects were expected to be accountable for their own spiritual lives, and tobacco was attacked as a distraction from that aim.⁵⁷ Tied to anxieties over imitating Amerindians, therefore, was the issue of choosing not to conform to the Protestant church, and the structures of deference that it propagated. Savagery was not an allegory but a state of being – a literal, physical condition of cultural underdevelopment. Since civility played such a significant role in how authorities established deference and conformity, the threat of behaving uncivilly represented real problems for the promulgation of hierarchical obedience.

Yet civility, however essential, was also fragile, and tobacco came to the attention of authorities precisely because it was seen to threaten the bonds of civil society. Smokers were depicted as deliberately placing themselves outside civil society. Savage behaviour was expected, authors wrote, among the ‘savages’ of America, but to choose to behave like natives produced a quite different and altogether more serious problem. The Powhatan had yet to be exposed to a better condition: the English, in adopting uncivil customs, preferred to live like degenerates, and it was this arrogance that cropped up again and again in descriptions of tobacco-smokers. The ‘[s]trangers savage Ignorance’ was lamentable, but ‘wilful Arrogance’ far worse.⁵⁸

Tobacco’s association with pride made it feature often in discourses concerning civil behaviour and the law. Smoking was a practise associated with the theatre, prison, and criminality. The playwright Christopher Marlowe, brilliant author of daring plays staged between 1587 and his death in 1593, included an ode to tobacco in his translation of Ovid’s elegies, as well as passing references to it in other poems. He endorsed its ‘heavenly power’, its effects as an epiphany-inducing rapture of the senses that would ‘clarify/the cloudy mists before dim eyes appearing’.⁵⁹ His praise of its sweet fumes enhanced the exoticism of his heady verses, but Marlowe’s own association with tobacco proved somewhat less

⁵⁷ Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 6, 287.

⁵⁸ Josuah Sylvester, *Tobacco batterd, or pipes shatterd* (London, 1621; STC 23582a), sig. F4v.

⁵⁹ Marlowe, *Ovids elegies*, sig. Gv.

enchanting. Richard Baines' damning charges against the playwright for the privy council quoted Marlowe as saying that 'all they that loue not tobacco and boies were fooles' in the same indictment that contained the playwright's apparent penchant for brutality and his irreverent quips about Christ and his followers, specifically Protestants.⁶⁰ Though the veracity of the Baines Note is disputed, it associated Marlowe with atheism, smoking, and sedition in the final months before his eventual death, possibly murdered as a spy.

A libel against Sir Walter Raleigh and other opponents of the earl of Essex, likely composed after Essex's return from Ireland, associated the tobacco-smoking Raleigh with similar language used to denounce Marlowe. The libel described the debauchery of Raleigh and his coterie:

Heele swere by God and worship Devill for gaine
Tobacco boye or sacke to swaye his paine.⁶¹

As 'licentious poems on individuals and political events, typically circulated anonymously in manuscript', libels were 'a recognised feature of literary and political culture', and tobacco functioned in these verses to reinforce Raleigh's association with rebellion and un-English (and unchristian) behaviour.⁶² The assumption that tobacco was the mark of the rogue manifested itself seventeen years later at Raleigh's death. On the scaffold, delivering his final words, Raleigh sought to refute accusations that he encouraged the death of the earl of Essex, denying that he 'stood in a window over him when he suffered in the Tower, and puffed out tobacco in disdain of him'.⁶³ Dying for treason, Raleigh disassociated himself publicly from the idea of tobacco-taking as a gesture of contempt. Yet his need to refute this accusation underlines this association between tobacco and nonconformity, strengthened by stories of the tobacco pouch found in his cell after his execution.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ David Riggs, *The World of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Faber and Faber, 2004), p. 327.

⁶¹ 'A dreame alluding to my L. of Essex, and his adversaries', 1599, Bodleian MS, Don. C.54, f. 19r-20r, in *Early Stuart Libels* <www.earlystuartlibels.net> [accessed 18 April 2014].

⁶² Andrew McRae, 'Reading Libels: An Introduction', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 69:1 (2006), pp. 1-13, p. 1. Tobacco's presence in this libel is indicative of the criminal association of tobacco not only in Raleigh's case but in politics more generally.

⁶³ *The arraignment and conviction of Sr Walter Rawleigh* (London, 1628; Wing A3744), sig. E2r. See also 'Trial of Sir Walter, Knight, for High Treason, at Winchester, 17th November, 1603', in *Criminal Trials, Vol. I*, ed. David Jardine (London: M.A. Nattali, 1846), p.510.

⁶⁴ Knapp, 'Elizabethan Tobacco', p. 37.

Raleigh's private smoking habits contrasted to the description by one witness of the 'base and rascal peoples' lining up on the streets throwing 'tobacco-pipes, stones, and mire at him' during his trial.⁶⁵ This suggests that concerns over smoking and a loss of control were partly a matter of status and social position. Though gentlemen might indulge in the pipe in their chambers at the Inns of Court or in their private homes, they condemned the disorders that seemed to arise from tobacco in the hands of the general population. A debate in the House of Lords in 1621 led to the conclusion that tobacco and ale were now 'inseparable in the base vulgar sort', and inevitably accounted for the 'Idleness, Drunkenness...[and] Decay of their Estates' that resulted.⁶⁶ The threat lay largely in the fact that tobacco was not only smoked in urban areas, where 'riot and excesse' was expected, but 'begun to be taken in every meane village, even among the basest people'.⁶⁷

In 1617, the Lord Mayor of London George Bolles issued a proclamation calling for a reformation of abuses in Newgate prison [Figure 6.1]. He pointed out that 'notorious Mutinies and Out-rages' had been committed by the negligence of the prison guards who allowed their prisoners to become 'drunke and disordered, permitting them wine, Tobacco, [and] excessiue strong drinke'.⁶⁸ The major ordered that gaolers and keepers 'not suffer the taking of Tobacco by the dissolute sort of prisoners in the common gaole' and that 'no Tobacco nor Tobacco-pipes, Candles, or other things to fire their Tobacco be brought to them' so that 'Mutinies and Insolencies may bee preuented'.⁶⁹

This proclamation indicates several things. Firstly, that tobacco was accessible in prisons, and might be one locus where its popularity spread. Withington's discussion of intoxicants does not consider prison, but the association between smoking and intellectual creativity fostered by writers like

⁶⁵ Jardine, *Criminal Trials*, p. 461.

⁶⁶ 'Tobacco', 3 May 1621, in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 1, 1547 – 1629* (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1802), p. 605. See also the license for an alehouse in Kent, which set out that 'you shall not vtter, nor willingly suffer to be vttered, Drunke or Taken, any Tobacco within your House, Celler, or other place thereunto belonging', *Know all men by these presents, that wee Thomas Walsingham, William Wythiness, and Henry Sneglar, knight...* (London, 1620; STC 9175).

⁶⁷ 'A Proclamation to restraine the planting of Tobacco in England and Wales', 30 December 1619, in *Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603 -1625*, ed. James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973), p. 458.

⁶⁸ *By the Maior. A proclamation for the reformation of abuses, in the Gaole of New-gate* (London, 1617; STC 16727.1).

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

Christopher Marlowe and John Beaumont might also suggest a relationship between tobacco and a sense of freedom or escapism. It also highlights the concern that authorities had over the corrupting effects of tobacco when taken by the non-elite. Bolles, eventually knighted by James, clearly outlined tobacco as contributing to the disordered behaviour that threatened ‘mutinies’ and riotous

By the Maior.

A Proclamation for Reformation of abuses, in
the Gaole of New-gate.



Whereas of late, notorious Mutinies and Out-rages have bin committed by the Prisoners within the Gaole of New-gate, which is conceived to grow through the negligence of the Keepers, suffering their Prisoners to become drunken and disorderd, permitting them Wine, Tobacco, excessive strong drinke, gaming, and revel of all manner of lewd behaviour. By reason of which libertie, dissolute and lewd persons, who commit Theftes and Robberies, take a kind of comfort, and gather heart in the saide Gaole, and are in some sort incited to commit Felonies, upon hope of the lewd Company, and such lewd Comforts as they finde in the saide Gaole. For Reformation wherof, and to prevent askeall all manner of oppression in the Gaolers, and to take away all manner of hope in such as shall be thither sent for offences, that they shall not finde such lewd and harmful comforts as they have heretofore there found, and to the end, to containe the Prisoners within a discipline, that Mutinies and Insolencies may be prevented.

1. First, It is thought fit, ordered, and Commanded by the Lord Maior and Court of Aldermen, That the Maior of the saide Gaole, be attendant himselfe upon the saide Gaole, and that the same be not farmed out, directly, nor by any manner cunning or indirect meane whatsoeuer.

2. Secondly, That the Gaoler, Keepers, Seruants, or vnder Officers, shall not permit or suffer any Beere or Ale to be receiued or brought into the saide Gaole or Prison, but onely of the price of eight Shillings the barrell, or of foure Shillings the barrell, nor suffer the dissolution of Prisoners in the Common gaole, to haue any Wine at all to be brought vnto them.

3. Thirdly, that there be a full Ale-quart of eight Shillings Beere or Ale solde for a penny, and so deliuered to the Prisoners, and according to that rate, pint or halfe pint: and the like measure of foure Shillings Beere or Ale for a halfe penny: and that the Prisoners haue Bread and all other Victuals according to the assize, and at vsuall and common prices, and that there be no oppression or exaction for their beds or lodging.

4. Fourthly, that the Gaoler, Keepers, Seruants, or vnder Officers in the saide gaole, shall not suffer the taking of Tobacco by the dissolution sort of prisoners in the common gaole: and to that end shall search and view all whatsoeuer that shall be brought into the saide prison for the vse of any prisoner there, that no Tobacco nor Tobacco-pipes, Candles, or other things to see their Tobacco be brought to them.

5. Fifthly, That the saide Gaolers, keepers, seruants, or vnder Officers, do take such care, and vse such diligence, that the men prisoners and women prisoners bee kept asunder, and not suffered to come together in any part of the saide prison, except it be at the time of diuine seruice, receiuing of the Sacrament, or hearing of Sermons.

6. Sixthly, that the saide Gaoler, keepers, seruants, or vnder Officers, shall not take any fee of any Prisoner committed for felony, or suspicion of felony, nor of any person that shall haue occasion to come or resort to them or to any of them, to bring them meate, drinke, or other needfull provisions, for, or in respect onely of turning of the key, or opening the doore for such person bringing such provision to any prisoner.

7. Seventhly, That the saide Gaoler, keepers, seruants, or vnder Officers, shall not suffer any woman to be with any man prisoner alone in the prison, but onely the Wife, Mother, Sister, or neere kind woman of such prisoner, and to knowe to the keeper before she be admitted.

8. Eightly, that the saide gaoler, keepers, seruants, or vnder Officers, shall take no fees for, or in respect of releate or caule of Irons, but such as at his perill he may lawfully iustifie and auoid.

Figure 6.1. *By the Maior. A proclamation for the reformation of abuses, in the Gaole of New-gate* (London, 1617; STC 16727.1).

behaviour. While tobacco does not seem to have been denied any gentlemen in Newgate, and only to ‘the dissolute sort of prisoners’, this marks out the ‘common’ prisoners as those most likely to succumb to uprisings spurred by intemperance and tobacco-taking.

Another set of orders, this time written for Ludgate prison, indicate similar concerns [Figure 6.2]. Signed by the clerk keeper and numerous bailiffs, it declared that

sundrie abuses & disorders doe daylie arise in the prison by varietie of prison[er]s selling and retailing of tobacco in the same as namelie occasioning late meetings & sitting vp in the night not onelie disquieting their fellow prison[er]s in the house but by the notice that is taken thereof by the watch and passengers in the street w[hi]ch tendes much to the hindrance of the house by the loose of that charitie w[hi]ch hath usually byn given.⁷⁰

Until 1601, the orders pertained to the freedoms allowed a prisoner, the conduct of gaolers, and the disorders caused by drinking. It is only after this date that tobacco began to appear in rule books as a matter of concern. Those found trafficking tobacco, since the weed ‘often breedes contention and debate’, would be fined or ‘sitt in the bolts or shackles’.⁷¹ The passage above also indicates that the disorderly behaviour of tobacco-smokers prevented benefactors from donating money to the prison, perhaps believing that those who smoked tobacco did not merit charity. In the courts of law, Sir Thomas Egerton, James’ lord chancellor and master of the rolls, used the image of the dissolute tobacco-smoker in one of his speeches in an important case about *post-nati* citizenship. The responsibility to act on reason was contrasted against the ‘light and shallow distempered reasons of common Discourers’ who were ‘blowne away with a whiffe of [their] tobacco’.⁷² To those engaged with matters of state, the ‘shallow’ and ‘common’ practices of prisoners and frequenters of St Paul’s existed outside the realm of authority.

Smokers were further associated with vagrancy. Natural man should abhor idleness, preached one churchman in 1595; sluggards were ‘vnnaturall, and monsters in nature’ and therefore ‘as good dead as aliue’.⁷³ In this context, those who smoked rendered themselves useless. Tobacco-taking was not only perilously ‘intoxicating’ but caused citizens to ‘smoake away...precious time’ better used in diligence.⁷⁴ John Deacon wrote in 1616 that those who smoked excessively or wantonly were nothing but ‘disordered and riotous persons’.⁷⁵ Among prisoners

⁷⁰ ‘Orders touching Ludgate’, 1597-1604, TNA: PRO, E 215/961.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Sir Thomas Egerton, *The speech of the Lord Chancellor of England, in the Eschequer Chamber, touching the post-nati* (London, 1609; STC 7540.5), sig. M2v.

⁷³ William Burton, *The rowsing of the sluggard* (London, 1595; STC 4176), sigs. B2v-B3r.

⁷⁴ James Hart, *Klinike, or, the diet of the diseased* (London, 1633; STC 12888), sig. Aaa4r.

⁷⁵ John Deacon, *Tobacco tortured, or, the filthy fume of tobacco refined* (London, 1616; STC 6436), sigs. Mv, V2v.

and the wanderers in St Paul's churchyard, idleness signified a lack or disregard of one's calling and purpose, though 'neglect' was also a word frequently used by members of parliament when addressing justices of peace and other law enforcers who failed in their duties. A devotional tract advocating steadfast prayer condemned 'robbers arraigned and iudged ouer night to die the morrow' who smoked tobacco to avoid thinking of their deaths.⁷⁶ This must have been a known occurrence during trials and executions. John Chamberlain, corresponding with Dudley Carleton about state affairs, noted that 'certain mad knaues tooke tabacco all the way to Tyburn' as they went to be hanged.⁷⁷

wheretof sundrie abuses & disorders doe daylie arise
 in this prison by variety of prison^{ers} sitting & sitting
 of Tobacco in the same at namelie occasionings late
 meetings & sitting by in the night not onlie disquieting
 the fellow prison^{ers} in the house but by the noise
 that is taken thereof by the watch & passinge
 in the streete is the more much to the hindrance of
 the house by the losse of that Charitie whiche
 usually byn giuen. And also maketh diuers men
 into frivolous debtes and often butte contention
 and debates in the house it is therefore ordered
 by the M^r Keeper & towards and assistance
 of new prison^{ers} in this house shall from
 hence forth sell or retayle any Tobacco in
 any roome or lodging in this prison wth out the
 licence and ymission of the said M^r Keeper
 on paine of forfeiting for euy time here shall
 bee found soe doing if any to the use of the
 house or to sit in the bolle or shalke at
 the discretion of the M^r Keeper & Steward
 & assistants for the tyme being
 The Clarke Keeper.

Figure 6.2. Orders touching Ludgate, 8 February 1602, TNA: PRO, E 215/961r.

⁷⁶ William Innes, *A bundle of myrrhe: or Three meditations of teares* (London 1620; STC 14091), sig. 14r.

⁷⁷ John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 20 October 1598, TNA: PRO, SP 12/268, f. 141v.

The length between one's conviction and death was general very short – Chamberlain noted in 1603 that a captured priest was arrested on the twelfth of February and executed at Tyburn four days later – and spending ‘precious time with this filthie weed’ was therefore unwise.⁷⁸ Prisoners who smoked tobacco publicly during their arraignments and execution therefore fit into, or willingly voiced, an expression of pride, misconduct, and remorselessness. In terms of gesture, the very act of smoking required the use of the participant's hands in holding the pipe and bringing it to his or her mouth to suck in the smoke. This presented an alternative to the gestures of prayerful repentance so often depicted in woodcuts encouraging penitence.

Tobacco appeared often on the stage, where popular citizen comedies both celebrated and satirised smoking. The works of Jacobean playwrights are full of references to smoking, tobacco shops, and tobacco sellers, hinting at a culture of pipes and libertinage along London's Bankside where the playhouses flourished outside the official bounds of the City. Ben Jonson's works are rife with mentions of tobacco, and performances featured actors smoking on stage. In *Every man out of his humor* (1602), characters including women expressed a familiarity with smoking. The title character of *The alchemist* (1611) sold tobacco, his shop becoming a milieu where other characters in the play gathered to spread rumours and fill their pipes. Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton's *The roaring girle* (1611) included a scene set in a tobacco shop, and the title character Moll Cutpurse was portrayed as a cross-dressing woman with a strong sense of independence and a pipe in her mouth.⁷⁹ Though the grocer's wife in Francis Beaumont's *The knight of the burning pestle* (1613) complained that ‘this stinking Tobacco kils men, would there be none in *England*’, she also rewarded her apprentice for his performance by offering him tobacco for a job well done, suggesting that tobacco operated as a currency of sorts.⁸⁰ Though the association with tobacco might function on the stage as social critique, often attributed to roguish or silly characters, its constant presence also pandered to its popularity amongst its audiences. The Swiss tourist Thomas Platter had, on a visit to the Globe in 1599, noted that men took tobacco ‘in a small pipe, the smoke sucked

⁷⁸ John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 28 February 1603, TNA: PRO, SP 12/287, f. 58r.

⁷⁹ Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton, *The roaring girle* (London, 1611; STC 17908). See also Craig Rustici, ‘The Smoking Girl: Tobacco and the Representation of Mary Frith’, *Studies in Philology*, 96:2 (1999), pp. 159-79.

⁸⁰ Francis Beaumont, *The knight of the burning pestle* (London, 1613; STC 1674), sig. Cv.

into the mouth', a practice that was 'so common with them that they always carry the instrument on them, and light up on all occasions, at the play, in the taverns...drinking as well as smoking together'.⁸¹ Archaeological excavations in the Rose and Globe theatres have uncovered artefacts including coins, dice, leather shoes, clothing, and numerous tobacco pipes.⁸² This supports the literary evidence that tobacco was commonly smoked at theatres, likely while engaging in other recreational activities like gambling or bear-baiting.

Smoke and Treason

The vaulting wordplay and rhetoric embellishments used in anti-tobacco tracts were intended as a means for individuals to confront the consequences that such a commodity might encourage, not only on their physical health but on their behaviour and actions. Such sentiments were therefore rife in conduct manuals. Robert Bradshaw's advice treatise, 'The way to weldoeing', written some time in James' reign, included the story of a captured pirate in Suffolk who 'being redie to dy sayd that the great loue he bore vnto tobacko was the furst and chef occasion of his ouerthrow', since the 'importinat delight in taking that harming smoke' pushed him further into drink, excess, women, and eventually 'theuerie and manie other disorders'.⁸³ 'Iniqitie', Bradshaw concluded, 'shall bring all the earth to a welderness' that could only be salvaged by good governors.⁸⁴ Bradshaw associated poor manners with a tendency to disobedience:

[Question] What is the reason thinke you that somanie greatwons as well as small creatturs transgress and break the kings laws [?]

[Answer] becaus they wer not brought vp in good manors.⁸⁵

This link between tobacco, pride, and disobedience were consistently associated with rebellion, and the presence of these works in private libraries, such as Deacon's *Tobacco Tortured* in the member of parliament Sir Roger Townshend's inventory, or pamphlets collected by James' privy councillor Sir

⁸¹ As quoted in Andrew Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 46.

⁸² R.B. Graves, 'Review of *The Rose and the Globe – Play-Houses of Shakespeare's Bank-Side, Southwark: Excavations 1988-90* by Julian Bowsher and Pat Miller for the Museum of London Archaeology', *Theatre Journal*, 63 (2011), pp. 146-7.

⁸³ Robert Bradshaw, 'The way to weldoeing', [c.1612-1625], BL: Royal MS 17 B XIII, f. 70v.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 91v.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 7r.

Julius Caesar, suggests that policy-makers may have paid attention to the possibilities for ‘the vicious and wild dispositions’ that tobacco induced, bringing ‘melancholicke passions ouer all the Political bodie’.⁸⁶ As one writer reflected, whoever took tobacco ‘did seem to degenerate into the nature of the Sauages, because they were carried away with the self-same thing’.⁸⁷

By yoking ‘savage’ manners to disregarding kingly orders, James turned smoking into a manifestation of political disobedience and a challenge to royal prerogative. James’ *Counterblaste to tobacco* specifically raised uncivil habits as a danger to the civil polity. Part of the danger, he claimed, was the English willingness to abandon their sense of duty for self-gratifying pleasure. The new fashion for the Indian plant, better known to Indians and ‘such *infidels* as did euery day adore and worship the *diuell*’, was a practice that the English now imitated, it seemed, ‘at all times, at all houses, and of all persons’.⁸⁸ This practice seemed to make ‘*Christians* fall out to be *Antichristians*’, pushing otherwise-loyal subjects to sin and error. ‘We haue prouoked the wrath of *God*,’ observed Barnabe Rich, and social concerns over pride and minor disobedience were not far from more dangerous acts of treason.⁸⁹ ‘There is not a more dangerous vice than pride’, precisely because a neglect of duty soon extended to ‘contempt both of Prince and subiect’.⁹⁰

This ‘contempt of prince and subject’ was hyperbolised in the waterman John Taylor’s 1614 poem, ‘Plutoes Proclamation’, in which Satan issued a command ordaining his minions to infect the English with ‘an immoderate desire’ of tobacco that surpassed that of the ‘tanskind Indians’.⁹¹ Composed in Satan’s ‘palace’, the proclamation mimicked official language, beginning, ‘Whereas wee have been credibly informed by our true and never-failing Intelligencers...our welbeloved’.⁹² ‘By the authority of this present Parliament’, the proclamation did ‘straightly charge and command, that...any subjects of our infernall monarchy,

⁸⁶ Deacon, *Tobacco tortured*, ‘To the most potent, learned, and religious prince, James’ and sig. H2v. Inventory mentioned in Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 5-6.

⁸⁷ Camden, *Annales of the true and royall history*, sig. P2r.

⁸⁸ Rich, *My ladies looking-glasse*, sig. C2v; Philaretus, *Work for chimney-sweepers*, sig. Biiir.

⁸⁹ Rich, *My ladies looking-glasse*, sig. C2v.

⁹⁰; Barnabe Rich, *Faultes faults, and nothing else but faultes* (London, 1606; STC 20983), sig. E2r.

⁹¹ John Taylor, ‘Plutoes Proclamation concerning his Infernall pleasure for the Propagation of Tobacco’, in *All the workes of Iohn Taylor the water-poet* (London, 1630; STC 23725), sig. CCC3r.

⁹² *Ibid.*

disperse themselves among the Christians...the more they drinke, the more let them'.⁹³ While Taylor's poem equated smoking subjects with the moral and political destruction of the realm in a humorous way, few subjects would contradict the idea that rebellion was a natural result of social disorder. James' *Counterblaste*, alongside John Deacon's *Tobacco Tortured* (1616) and Josuah Sylvester's *Tobacco batterd, and pipes shatterd* (1616 and 1621), specifically equated tobacco with treason. James' fears in *Counterblaste*, however exaggerated, seemed to Deacon and Sylvester to manifest themselves in the actions of treasonous subjects like the Gunpowder conspirators the following year.

Though frequently overlooked by early Stuart scholars considering James' political rhetoric, *Counterblaste* is a carefully-crafted pamphlet with a politically-charged core, attacking tobacco as a corruption wrought less by the Amerindians themselves than by Englishmen aping them. James reacted against the idea of savagery in order to define a specific brand of obedience. Though smoke may seem the 'smallest trifle', it was tied to 'great matters'.⁹⁴ The wilful adopting of such a 'sauage custom', 'hauing their originall from base corruption and barbarity', only likened addled Englishmen to 'beastly *Indians*'.⁹⁵ James' repetition of words like 'sauage', 'barbarous', 'intemperate', and 'beastly' constructed a powerful image of overwhelming savagery impending over a civil but imperilled realm. Subjects had begun 'counterfeiting the maners of others to oure own destruction'.⁹⁶ The 'maners of the wilde, godless, and slauish *Indians*' were so contrary to reason that they would render England unclean and effeminate; worse, his subjects found it 'too easie to be seduced to make Rebellion, vpon very slight grounds'.⁹⁷

What lay behind these eccentric hyperboles were attempts to prevent the threats that came from wilful defiance, of which smoking was a visual marker of that willingness of act irresponsibly. James called it a 'seduction', and what he and other writers seemed to say was that tobacco-smoking encouraged dangerous thoughts in a way that made its presence in the commonweal a real danger to societal stability. As John Deacon wrote in his own tobacco treatise, 'rebellion is

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ James I, *A counterblaste to tobacco* (London, 1604; STC sig. A4v.

⁹⁵ Ibid., sigs. Br-B2r.

⁹⁶ Ibid., sig. Cr.

⁹⁷ Ibid., sig. A3r.

nothing else but a wilful resisting or rising up against a lawfull authority'.⁹⁸ The corrupting nature of tobacco allowed James to use one of his favourite metaphors, that of 'the proper Phisician of his Politicke-Body' who sought to 'purge it of all those diseases' through 'a iust form of gouernment, to maintain the Publicke quietnesse, and preuent all occasions of Commotion'.⁹⁹ Ultimately, only the king and the tonic of good government could redress society's monstrosities. James closed his *Counterblaste* with an appeal to his subjects' sense of honour and virtue, urging them, after faced with the alluring potential of misleading incivility, to choose temperance and duty over beguiling sin.

Concerns over sin and the potential of sedition manifested themselves most obviously in fears of Catholic subversion. The links between tobacco-smoking 'heathens' and Catholics were hardly lost on Protestants concerned with abolishing superstition. English writers highlighted the connections between Indian smoke and Catholic incense, as with 'savage' fascinations with bells, trinkets, and cannibalism: 'The *Diuell* that hath so many superstitious conceits wherewith to blindfold the *Papist*, is not vnfurnished of vaine impression wherewith to be sot the *Tobacconist*'.¹⁰⁰ Detractors and slanderers of the gospel were seen to 'extoll dumb creatures to the very skies, not much vnlike those idolatrous *Indians* who worship the sun'.¹⁰¹ William Udall, reporting to the government on a plot involving French Catholics who were in association with the earl of Tyrone, spoke of how imprisoned priests 'by a secret note conveyed to me in tobacco' unveiled a plot to bring England to Catholic submission under the pope.¹⁰² Tobacco reinforced the perceived parallels between Amerindians and Catholics, both of whom were considered to be preoccupied with idolatry, ritual and 'savage' violence, and living outside royal authority.

To policy-makers, it had been the Catholic plotters' tendency towards savage behaviour that had given them the confidence to act against their king in the treason of 1605. The '*Vanities, Mysterious Mists of Rome*' were quickly equated to that other danger that 'be-smoaked Christendom'.¹⁰³ As Josuah Sylvester noted in 1621, there were resonances between the smoke of tobacco and

⁹⁸ Deacon, *Tobacco tortured*, sig. X1v.

⁹⁹ James I, *A counterblaste to tobacco.*, sig. A3v.

¹⁰⁰ Rich, *My ladies looking-glasse*, sig. C4v.

¹⁰¹ John Gee, *The foot out of the snare* (London, 1624; STC 11701), sig. Hh2v. See also sig. F2r.

¹⁰² William Udall [second paper], 17 December 1603, Hatfield MS, CP 102/82r.

¹⁰³ Sylvester, *Tobacco batterd, and pipes shatterd*, sig. F8r.

the near-explosions beneath parliament in 1605, where a group of Catholic subjects took their contempt for princely authority to terrifying extremes. In the plot's aftermath, pamphlets were speedily printed cataloguing to execution of Guy Fawkes and other plotters, where their proclivity to tobacco featured as a signifier of their lack of remorse. The imprisoned men were described as awaiting their trial without displaying penitence. Instead, they 'feasted wither their sinnes...were richly apparelled, fared deliciously, and took Tobacco out of measure'.¹⁰⁴ In their trial, their remorselessness became part of their stubborn idolatry, for they did not seem to pray 'except it were by the dozen, vpon their beades, and taking Tobacco, as if that hanging were no trouble to them'.¹⁰⁵ Eleven years after the event, John Deacon made explicit connections between tobacco-smoking and the Gunpowder Treason:

The late disordered enterprise of those our intemperate *Tobacconists*, it was not onely flat opposite to the well-established peace of our soueraigne Lord the King...but very rebellious likewise to his kingly soueraigne it selfe, not onely, because they so desperately attempted the wilful breach of his peace, but for that they so *proudly* resisted his kingly power, and did thereby most impudently declare themselves very obstinate, and open rebels against his sacred Maiestie.¹⁰⁶

Here, the destroyers of the realm were explicitly termed 'tobacconists' whose intemperance and arrogance led them to act against the king and his subjects.¹⁰⁷

Reactions against tobacco focused less on tobacco as a disease than a self-induced harm, representing larger concerns about the internal inceptions of social and political disintegration.

If thou desire to know, and cause demand
Why such strange monstrous maladies are rife?
The cause is plaine, and reason is at hand;
Men like and loue this *smokie* kind of life.¹⁰⁸

James himself expressed similarly in 1619:

[T]o refuse obedience because it is against our mind, is like the excuse of the Tobacco-drunkards, who cannot abstain from that filthy stinking smoake, because forsooth, they are bewitched with it. And this is an excuse for any sinne, they will not leave it, because they cannot leave it.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴ T.W., *The arraignment and execution of the late traytors* (London, 1606; STC 24916), sig. B3r.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. B3v.

¹⁰⁶ Deacon, *Tobacco tortured*, sig. V4r.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 'To the most potent, learned, and religious prince, James', and sig. H2v. Inventory mentioned in Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 5-6.

¹⁰⁸ Deacon, *Tobacco tortured*, sigs. Cc2r-v.

¹⁰⁹ James I, *Meditation vpon the Lord's Prayer* (London, 1619; STC 14384), sig. F6v.

The seductive nature of disobedience (‘men like and love this *smokie* kind of life’) implied that those who took tobacco allowed themselves to be corrupted. To be told – by the king himself – of the corrupting nature of smoking and to do so anyway made the very act of smoking a possible act of defiance. ‘He that dares take Tobacco on the stage,/Dares daunce in pawles, and in this formall age,/Dares say and do what ever is vnmeete’.¹¹⁰

This did not mean, of course, that smoking was always considered an antecedent to rebellious behaviour that threatened the state as a whole, but its frequent association with plotting and seditious thoughts indicate that smoking was frequently considered destabilising to social order. Various constables and London mayors thought it necessary to write to Robert Cecil or the privy council to recount the ‘vile Tearmes’ in which disorderly subjects spoke about their monarch after they had been drinking, just as the harsh persecution of libellers might show a convergence between open speech and political threat.¹¹¹ Policy-makers seem to have deemed the combination of tobacco and alcohol especially corrosive. In 1618, James attempted to prohibit alehouses from selling tobacco in an attempt to suppress ‘the great disorders daylie vsed in Ale-houses’ that were enhanced by the two taken together.¹¹²

Concerns over smoking, as voiced in parliament, prison records, and popular print, seemed to indicate that tobacco created a public space where dangerous or subversive ideas were discussed. These were often, but not always, associated with taverns and alehouses [Figure 6.3]. The soldier Barnabe Rich claimed that Jacobean London had thousands of tobacco shops. While he included the places where tobacco was sold – ‘for it is a commoditie that is nowe vendible in euery Tauerne, Inne, and Ale-house’, as well as by apothecaries and grocers – Rich also remarked that there was ‘a *Cathalogue* taken of all those newly erected houses that haue set vppe that Trade of selling Tobacco, in London & neare about London’.¹¹³ Since sellers ‘are (almost) neuer without company, that from morning till night are still taking of Tobacco’, these spaces evolved into ‘open shoppes,

¹¹⁰ Marlowe, *Ouid his elegies*, sig. F8v.

¹¹¹ Richard Tarvar, one of the Constables of Westminster, to the Council [1599], Hatfield MS: CP 186/152r; William Rider, Lord Mayor of London, to Sir Robert Cecil, 5 May 1601, Hatfield MS: CP 186/16.

¹¹² By the King. *A proclamation concerning ale-houses* (London, 1618; STC 8588) [single sheet].

¹¹³ Barnabe Rich, *The honestie of this age* (London, 1614; STC 20986), sig. D4v.

that haue no other trade to liue by, but by the selling of tobacco'.¹¹⁴ Tobacco shops, wrote the satirist John Earle, were 'the Randeuous of spitting' where communication is smoke', a place, scandalously, where 'Spain is commended



Figure 6.3. *An excellent medley* (London, 1630; STC 19231.5), broadside detail.

'and prefer'd before England it selfe'.¹¹⁵ This may have been a reference to Spanish-imported tobacco in England – which, as another author noted, 'cannot but greatly prejudice the Common-weale' – but also to topics of political discourse.¹¹⁶ The woodcut promoting good table manners, shown in Chapter One, fittingly expressed this relationship between tobacco and dangerous talk:

Tell		Long tales
Take	no	Tobacco
Touch		State-matters. ¹¹⁷

Tobacco appeared in the same grouping as lies and matters of state, suggesting its links to slander and a dangerous meddling of affairs that went beyond displaying shoddy manners.

Given these associations, it might be suggested that tobacco sellers provided discursive sites that prefigured the coffeehouse culture of the mid-

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ John Earle, *Micro-cosmographie* (London, 1628; STC 7443), sig. G10r.

¹¹⁶ C.T., *An advice how to plant tobacco in England and how to bring it to colour and perfection* (London, 1615; STC 23612), sig. Br.

¹¹⁷ *Table-observations* (London, 1615; STC 23634.7).

seventeenth century. These were new spaces occupied by unfamiliar odours and rituals and, unlike alehouses, were seen to stem from the practices of exotic and ‘savage’ cultural others, reinforced by the wooden native Americans that might adorn the facades.¹¹⁸ The dangers of degeneration by ‘going native’ may have furthered the association between tobacco houses and transgressive behaviour. Here were microcosms within a civil polity where the king did not possess sovereign jurisdiction, where ‘a man shall heare nothing but *Distractions*’ and ‘captious and carping speaches’ made with ‘taunting tongues’, so that ‘the wise Surgeons of our State...[must] provide for corrosives and cauterismes against these vgly vlcers’.¹¹⁹ Scholarship has recently turned to spatial dynamics as an analytical category for political history, and tobacco sellers provided a new space for political discourse at a time when London’s topography experienced radical alterations.¹²⁰

Elias’ connection between state centralisation and the Crown’s enforcement of codes of behaviour is apparent in the way that concerns with manners overlapped with discourses of political instability. According to authorities, tobacco shops the bowers where treason was conceived. Tobacco itself was a ‘traitour, and doth treason warke’ by ‘*smokie* mists polluting...[t]hroughout the body euery part imbruing’.¹²¹ When James ordered the tobacco houses *en route* to St Paul’s to be eradicated, he was in many ways exerting his authority over illegitimate or uncivil spaces – a king’s right to colonise places that stood outside those subject to royal authority. By imbibing ‘pure Indian’, subjects seemed to choose ‘savage’ abandon, but the choice to smoke also brought them to places where they might not otherwise gather.¹²²

¹¹⁸ For an early mention of the alluring presence of native Americans as a building’s ‘frontispiece’, see Richard Brathwaite [Blasius Multibibus], *A solemne ioviall disputation* (London, 1617; STC 3585), sig. L6r.

¹¹⁹ William Vaughan, *The arraignment of slander periury blasphemy, and other malicious sinnes* (London, 1630; STC 24623), sig. Qq4r.

¹²⁰ *Political Spaces in Pre-Industrial Europe*, ed. Beat Kümin (Surrey: Ashgate, 2009); John Schofield, ‘The Topography and Buildings of London, ca. 1600’, in *Material London, ca. 1600*, ed. Lena Cowen Orlin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 296-321; J.F. Merritt, *The Social World of Early Modern Westminster: Abbey, Court, and Community, 1525 – 1640* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).

¹²¹ John Deacon, *Tobacco tortured*, sigs.Cc2r-v.

¹²² Barten Holyday, *Technogamia: or The marriages of the arts* (London, 1618; STC 13617), sig. Dr.

Effacing Savagery

Recent scholarship has tended to focus on the more celebratory place of intoxicants within the discursive and social practices of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but it is worth investigating why savagery and disorder was so closely connected under James, before tobacco emerged ‘as an intoxicant of mass consumption’ shortly after his death.¹²³ The developing Virginia-London connection under James is essential to understanding the mistrust of savage behaviour seen to characterise dissent, at a time when colonisation projects were increasingly subjected to royal oversight. When Edwin Sandys wrote to the duke of Buckingham in 1620, he presented the survival of the colony as a matter of James’ personal sovereignty, an issue that stretched beyond fiscal policy. The subversions of the other faction, Sandys wrote, were a ‘derogation of his Majesty’s authority, and contrary to his Royal Instructions’ as well as ‘disheartening of all Adventurers...that it might not prosper’.¹²⁴ The scholarly tendency to ignore Virginia’s place in seventeenth-century politics has contributed to the inclination to focus solely on tobacco’s popularity. This final section considers how controversies over tobacco in early seventeenth-century London were integral to the state’s shifting policies towards intoxicants, where tobacco was increasingly projected as an undesirable, but acceptable, consequence of the state’s more pressing resolve to achieve political stability.

To most detractors, regardless of the contexts in which they opposed tobacco, the message was clear. Tobacco and obedience hardly complemented each other, a message learned from affairs in Virginia as much as in London. Smokers in England were described as adopting the sorts of traits that ‘savage’ Englishmen were currently exhibiting in the tenuous and rather weak English colony: their ability to undermine the English state was especially potent an accusation precisely because the colonial situation proved how dangerous degenerative behaviour could be. ‘If he desire to know what Ciuilizers of people’ Protestants were, said the Jesuit John Floyd in a withering response to a sermon by colonial promoter Richard Crashaw, ‘let him goe to *Virginia*, where he may find one of the two or three Ministers that went thither, become sauage, not any

¹²³ Withington, ‘Intoxicants and Society in Early Modern England’, p. 638.

¹²⁴ Robert Harcourt, *A relation of a voyage to Guiana* (London, 1613; STC 12754), sigs. G2v-G3r.

Sauages made Christians by their meanes'.¹²⁵ Addressing the gentlemen of the Inns of Court, many of whom endorsed colonisation, Floyd ruthlessly criticised those who could believe themselves civil when Virginia existed as a glaring example of English failings to keep savagery at bay. Not only were colonists reported to be rooting 'in the ground about Tobacco like Swine', but the practice had transferred itself to the 'curious, costly, and consuming Gallants' in London.¹²⁶

Throughout his reign, James continued to press for other goods that might eventually replace the colonists' dependence on tobacco, even as he realised the profitability of the commodity. In a dinner conversation between the king and Sir George Yeardley in 1618, as Yeardley prepared to embark to Jamestown to become its governor, one observer reported that:

His Ma[jes]tie then converted his speech to the matter of Tobacco, w[hi]ch though owte of a naturall antipathy hee hateth as much as any mortall man, yet such is his love to our plantation, as hee is content wee should make our benefit thereof upon certaine conditions: Namely that by too excessive planting of it, we doe neglect planting of corne & soe famish o[ur]selves. For, said his Ma[jes]tie, if our saviour Christ in the gospell saith man liveth not by bread alone, then I may well say, Man liveth not by smoke alone. His Ma[jes]ties other condition was, that wee should dayle indeavour o[ur] selves to raise more ritch and stable commodities...that by degrees one might growe into contempte, & soe into disuse of yt that fantasticall herbe.¹²⁷

James consistently contrasted tobacco to more legitimate industries that were understood to be more commendable foundations for a new English polity, especially silk. Yet the 'disuse of that fantasticall herbe' never occurred. It is the contention here that this is not because tobacco's prominence was inevitable, nor because fears of savagery were merely rhetorical and ultimately too flimsy to dictate policy, but because James, and members of parliament like Sir Edwin Sandys, consciously found ways to reconcile these tensions.

By 1623, significant events in Europe and America had cut short James' aspirations of promoting a colony built on silk rather than smoke. The 1622 Powhatan attack had devastated the resources that colonists had spent years cultivating, including glass-blowing and wine industries, and attitudes towards

¹²⁵ John Floyd, *Purgatories triumph ouer hell* (St-Omer, 1613; STC 11114), sig. Bb3r.

¹²⁶ Quote by John Smith in James Horn, *A Land As God Made It: Jamestown and the Birth of America* (New York: Basic Books, 2005), p. 266.

¹²⁷ A report of S[i]r George Yeardleys going Governor to Virginia, 5 December 1618, FP 93, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virginiacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 9 September 2014].

natives were harsher than previous policies had sanctioned. Partly due to the struggles within the colony, as with internal division, the Virginia Company was bankrupt and in a state of collapse. An investigation instigated by the king and privy council soon followed, leading to the company's dissolution in 1624. Patents on tobacco were expiring, leading to a renewed interest in how the state might benefit from the tobacco trade. Lastly, James' favourite, the duke of Buckingham – whom James had once told the Spanish ambassador Gondomar was 'as Spanish as you are' – had travelled to Spain with Prince Charles to negotiate a marriage, but had returned resolved to wage war on Philip IV and the Hapsburg threat.¹²⁸

In parliament, Edwin Sandys and Nicholas Ferrar advanced tobacco as a means to salvage the company while curbing Spanish power. Ferrar's speeches on the behalf of the company reminded policy-makers of the role tobacco played in the affairs of the realm:

It is generally knowen, that the West Indies are at this day almoast the onely Fountayne, and Spayne as it were the Cesterne...But since this weede of Tobacko hath growe into request, they have payde (as their Proverb is) for all our Commodities with Their Smoake; And the rayne of there silver to us...hath beene in a manner dried upp, to the loss of a Million and a halfe in mony in these fifteene yeares past.¹²⁹

This 'miserable' condition had destabilised English trade, with 'mony transformed into a Smoking weed'.¹³⁰ It was hoped that the Commons would ask James 'that the Importation of Tobacko, may be prohibited from all parts...save your Maiestys Dominions'.¹³¹ Colonists in South America also saw the need for authorities to develop the tobacco trade for the good of the commonweal, rather than its destruction: 'Tobacco, which albeit some dislike...will bring as great a benefit and profit to the vndertakers' as anything the Spanish gained through mines in the Indies.¹³² Where James had stated, in 1604, that 'idle delights' were 'the first seedes of the subuersion of all Monarchies', members of parliament now

¹²⁸ Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592 – 1628* (London: Longman, 1981), pp. 79, 168.

¹²⁹ 'The Parliamentary Papers of Nicholas Ferrar, 1624', ed. David R Ransome, in *Seventeenth-Century Political and Financial Papers, Camden Miscellany XXXIII, Camden Fifth Series Vol. 7* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 89.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

¹³² Edwin Sandys to Buckingham, 7 June 1620, in Welsey Frank Craven, *Dissolution of the Virginia Company: the Failure of a Colonial Experiment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1932), p. 144.

purposely framed tobacco as a marketable commodity under monarchical control.¹³³

In ultimately granting the Virginia Company a monopoly over tobacco in 1624, parliament and the king acknowledged that though it might be in many ways an undesirable commodity, tobacco was also less of a danger than the ‘Romish rabble’, those ‘right Canniballes’ sure to be devastating to the survival of a Protestant realm.¹³⁴ Several years before, Sir Edward Cecil had commented on the virulent Hispanophobia in England following the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ War, telling parliament he believed Spain represented England’s greatest enemy both spiritually and temporally: ‘who is the greatest enimie wee haue in respecte of our Religion, it is the Catholique king...who is the greatest enimie we haue in regard of the state, it is the Catholique kinge’.¹³⁵ In terms of Spanish designs for a universal monarchy, ‘England is the greatest Impediment in [Philip IV’s] way’, and Cecil brought home this threat by invoking recent memory, where ‘the houses of Parliament wherein we nowe sitte doe haue a Recorde against them in their vnmatchable treason, the powder plott’.¹³⁶ He meticulously catalogued the cruelty of Catholics in their various dominions, played out in the Continent’s religious wars but soon to affect England, too. The outpour of accounts of Spanish horrors in the Indies published in the 1620s further reinforced that this threat was played out on a global scale, and investment in colonisation projects – including Cecil’s own 25*l* contribution in 1620 – further connect a support for Virginia with actively combatting Spanish rule.¹³⁷

Rather than attempting to condemn tobacco as morally and politically destructive, all while allowing its importation from Spain, the Crown set increasing measures to control the trade and augment its own revenue. Following the decision to grant a monopoly on Virginian and Bermudan tobacco, an ensuing proclamation announced that banning all tobacco not grown in America served the interest of James’ loyal subjects in Virginia and ‘to the rest of our Empire’.¹³⁸

¹³³ James I, *Counterblaste to tobacco*, sig. A3v.

¹³⁴ John Nicholls, *The oration and sermon made at Rome* (London, 1581; STC 18535) sig. G6r.

¹³⁵ Speech in Parliament [Edward Cecil?], 1621, Hatfield MS, CP 130/46r.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

¹³⁷ See, for example, Thomas Scott, *An Experimentall discouerie of Spanish practices* (London, 1623; STC 22077), sig. E2r; John King, *A sermon preached at White-Hall the 5. Day of November* (London, 1608; STC 14986), sig. Dr; Gonzáles de Montes, *The full, ample, and punctuall discouery of the barbarous, bloody, and inhumane practices of the Spanish Inquisition* (London, 1625; STC 11999).

¹³⁸ *By the King. A proclamation concerning tobacco* (London, 1624; STC 8738).

The Virginia Company's exactions from customs and impositions expired in 1619, and the Crown denied the company's petition to extend its privileges.¹³⁹ In 1621, an ordinance declared that all tobacco had to come through England before being exported to the continent. Foreshadowing the Navigation Acts of 1651, this was consistent with an emerging 'economy of empire...determined by reasons of state'.¹⁴⁰

Virginia and Bermuda, James reasoned, 'are yet but in their infancie, and cannot be brought to maturitie and perfection, vnlesse We will bee pleased for a time to tolerate vnto them the planting and venting of the Tobacco'.¹⁴¹ Though James' consciously built up a language of clemency towards his loyal subjects in their time of need by allowing them full rights to a commodity he did not particularly like to encourage, his dealings with his privy council show how concerned he (and other members of the elite) were about the best means to regulate importations while also securing financial returns. Sir Robert Heath summarised this in a letter to Buckingham: 'the contract for Virginia tobacco...will be a work both hon[oura]ble & p[ro]fitable if it be well managed'.¹⁴²

The question of tobacco and fears of dissent must therefore be understood in terms of political economy. As a recent book on mercantilism has highlighted, seeing the government's support of trade purely as 'narrow economic self-interest' is to ignore the fact that 'theorists and policy-makers' approach to economic problems was inseparable from its ideological context'.¹⁴³ This included a fear of Spanish designs and a desire to check Catholic interests, but also the belief that supporting the tobacco trade would not only help create a more stable society in Jamestown, but would provide the government the financial means to govern the English more effectively, too.

Regulating tobacco was seen as a legitimate function of state power, as regulating any commodity or extracting imposts was. Further, debates over tobacco were closely related to concerns over policing behaviour, as parliamentary statutes against drunkenness and excess indicate. This was

¹³⁹ Ken Macmillan, *The Atlantic Imperial Constitution: Centre and Periphery in the English Atlantic World* (New York: Macmillan, 2011), p. 89.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

¹⁴¹ *By the King. A proclamation concerning tobacco.*

¹⁴² Solicitor General Heath to Buckingham, 2 August 1624, TNA: PRO, SP 14/171, f. 10r.

¹⁴³ 'Introduction', in *Mercantilism Reimagined: Political Economy in Early Modern Britain and its Empire*, ed. Philip J. Stern and Carl Wennerlind (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 4.

especially true of the early Stuart period, which saw ‘unprecedented levels of communal policing and prosecutions’.¹⁴⁴ The tensions between controlling behaviour and endorsing the colony were apparent in debates in the House of Commons over tobacco in April 1621. Gentlemen sensed the effects their decisions might have on the fate of Virginia, but also how affairs in the colonies affected circumstances within the realm. A substantial number of members of parliament supported suppressing tobacco altogether, but their desire to ‘banish all Tobacco’ and ‘pull it up by the Roots’ because of ‘the spoiling of the subjects Manners by it’ met John Ferrar’s reminder that ‘4,000 English there... have no Means, as yet, to live’ without it.¹⁴⁵ ‘Give it some Time’, urged the diarist and administrator John Smyth, an investor in the Virginia and Bermuda companies, ‘else we overthrow the Plantation’.¹⁴⁶ Debates in the Commons indicate the real concern with regulating manners in policy-making, but also the recognition, made by multiple members of the House, that a desire to check Spanish power was not easily separated from the strain of finding a way to keep Virginia English. A wealthier state would be in a position to exercise greater internal control, and the immediate concern of losing a presence in North America, alongside the promise of financial returns to company investments, thereby allowed tobacco to become a means of strengthening political authority.

As a result, tobacco’s benefits were increasingly emphasised by disassociating them from native practices. It became a commodity grown by enterprising English, Protestant planters whose industriousness kept the colonies alive. Tobacco was an herb ‘whose goodnesse and mine owne experience’ induced Ralph Hamor to praise the ‘pleasant, sweet, and strong’ qualities of his ‘owne planting’.¹⁴⁷ By allowing colonists to have a monopoly on the trade, the commodity ceased to be an Indian one. John Smith commented that the average English planter in Virginia was ‘applied to his labour about Tobacco and Corne’ and that colonists no longer ‘regard any food from the Salvages, nor have they any trade or conference with them’.¹⁴⁸ The intercultural exchanges between the

¹⁴⁴ Withington, ‘Introduction: Cultures of Intoxication’, p. 28.

¹⁴⁵ ‘Tobacco trade’, 18 April 1621, in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 1, 1547 – 1629* (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1802), pp. 579-82.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁷ Ralph Hamor, *A true discourse of the present state of Virginia* (London, 1615; STC 12736), sig. Fv.

¹⁴⁸ John Smith, *The true travels, adventures, and observations of Captaine Iohn Smith* (London, 1630; STC 22796), sig G2v.

English and Powhatan, often facilitated by sharing in tobacco rituals in the years until 1609, were no longer advocated by London councillors after the 1622 Powhatan coup. By the 1620s, Smith claimed, the Algonquian were completely absent from the process of growing, cultivating, and trading tobacco with the English. Having removed the plant from its biggest danger – that it was produced and smoked by ‘savages’ who exhibited behaviour unbecoming English subjects – it was possible to accept tobacco into society with more ease while continuing to advocate moderation and industry. Materially, English pipes were very different from Algonquian models, made with smaller bowls and much longer, thinner stems [Figure 6.4].

Only Robert Cotton, who arrived in Virginia in 1608, seems to have been interested in attempting to make pipes according to Algonquian methods, but these were stamped with the names of prominent investors of the Virginia Company, including the earl of Southampton and Walter Raleigh [Figure 6.5]. In some ways the practice itself was transformed and Europeanised, which also distinctly affected the pipes’ functions in rites of sociability.

Conclusion

Tobacco’s associations with irreligion and dangerous talk serve as a reminder that the seventeenth century as a whole cannot be viewed as the age that unequivocally heralded exotic luxury. Tobacco created a dilemma for Jacobean policy-makers who condemned the habit but endorsed the colony, and this problem should not be glossed over but carefully studied for what it can indicate about the state’s willingness to adapt to the consequences of colonisation. If anti-tobacco writings of the early seventeenth century seem, to modern eyes, overly moral, it is because there were no clear distinctions between social concerns and Christian didacticism, politics and finance. Sin and sedition were not easily separated, and concerns over the corruptive potential of tobacco represented larger issues about English socio-political disintegration despite what seems, at first, to be a disturbing antagonism against Amerindians specifically. The ‘reformation of manners was the most problematic of all the policy projects of early modern government precisely because the state was so deeply imbedded in the social order’, and the consequences of this can be seen in the concerns over behaviour



Figure 6.4 (above) and Figure 6.5 (below). Robert Cotton pipes, 1608-1610, Historic Jamestowne JR 2718N. (Images are author's own.)



and politics that emerged in debates around tobacco.¹⁴⁹ Sir Jerome Horsey complained in the House of Commons in 1621 that the ‘vile weed’ had hardly been an issue when he first became a member of parliament in the 1590s, and he advocated the complete eradication of the trade.¹⁵⁰ But, as Thomas Jermyn rejoined, the question of resisting Spain and the dire situation in Virginia made these the more pressing issues. Though he ‘loveth Tobacco as ill as any’, it was ‘fit to be given [to] Virginia’.¹⁵¹ Examining the tensions between fears of Amerindian savagery alongside the state’s interest in colonising America, and in capitalising upon its resources, offers one means of better understanding the way that authorities conceived of, and financed, expansion.

By associating tobacco with a rejection of authority into the 1610s and early 1620s, whether through the figure of the melancholy gentleman or the seditious prisoner, it might be surmised that tobacco’s very dangers were an inherent part of its attraction. The ‘souvereigne leafe’ smoked in prisons and on the way to Tyburn had, it was claimed, ‘more subjects than the king’, an idea that directly opposed James’ favoured image of himself as a beneficent father saving his subjects from an unhealthful practise.¹⁵² Tobacco smokers sometimes explicitly claimed this connection for themselves. To ‘breath Indian’ was to follow one’s own desires, even at the expense of what the king himself declared he wanted, an idea pursued to its most outrageous extreme in John Beaumont’s verse. The Inner Temple poet spurned the cheap tobacco of the ‘common gull’, invoking instead that drug which ‘at the *Caribes* banquet govern’st all’.¹⁵³ It was at the bower of the ‘sturdiest *Caniball*/Which at their bloodie feasts dost crowned sit’ that Beaumont wished to be found, with ‘[c]ircles of a sauage round/With iarring songs’.¹⁵⁴ But beyond the realm of poetry and creative expression, the allure of the exotic was tempered by more material concerns. Beaumont wrote his verse in 1602; by James’ death, smoking, when it came to matters of state, occupied a more complex relationship between personal pleasure and political allegiance.

¹⁴⁹ Steve Hindle, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, 1550 – 1640* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), p. 180.

¹⁵⁰ ‘Tobacco trade’, 18 April 1621, in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 1, 1547 – 1629* (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1802), pp. 579-82.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵² Thomas Walkington, *The optick glasse of humors* (London, 1607; STC 24967), sig. H6r; Sylvester, *Tobacco batterd, or pipes shatterd*, sig. Gr.

¹⁵³ Beaumont, *The Metamorphosis of tabacco* (London, 1602; STC 1695), sig. Bv.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

Chapter Seven

The Rites of Violence: Cannibalism and the Politics of Bloodshed

This chapter engages more explicitly with one of Elias' central assertions in *The Civilising Process* – that the adherence to the rules of civility exhibited by subjects 'stands in the closest relationship to the monopolisation of physical force' by the monarch.¹ While the previous chapter investigated English tobacco consumption, a commodity that held close associations with Amerindian customs into the 1620s, this chapter focuses on an aspect of native savagery that English subjects uniformly, and vehemently, repudiated. The fundamental threat of savagery that has underpinned so much of the material in this thesis manifested itself most viscerally in discussions on rites of violence and cannibalism, where native rituals in America were frequently invoked to comment on the legitimacy and necessity of monarchical authority in the preservation of order.

Beyond the world of Whitehall, and beyond James' own seeming aversion to violence, gentlemen hardly shied from the shedding of blood. One observer, describing James on the hunt in 1618, wrote admiringly that the king would stalk his prey for up to eight days at a time. After slitting the stag's throat, he would, 'with his own imbrued hands', smear the blood on the faces of his companions as a signifier of 'his sovereign's cordial good will'.² Those favoured by the king in this way were forbidden to wash away the blood until it came off naturally. Though James' violence was committed towards an animal, the rites of hunting nonetheless represented what human violence itself was about – a politics of bloodshed that served to reinforce the 'natural' and social order of human rule. Hunting deer was an aristocratic privilege that conduct books praised as preparing gentlemen for the acts of war and virtuous conduct, but it was also a statement of political legitimacy. One hunting manual in 1575 drew explicit links between

¹ Norbert Elias, *The Civilising Process*, tr. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Blackwell, 1978), p. 447; Weber: *Political Writings*, ed. Peter Lassman and Ronald Speirs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 310.

² Venice: July 1618', in *Calendar of State Papers Relating To English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Vol. 15, 1617 – 1619*, ed. Allen B. Hinds (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1909), pp. 251-266 <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-state-papers/venice/vol15/pp251-266>> [accessed 9 May 2015]. Quoted in Daniel Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence Before the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 15.

violence and cultivation in the context of subjugating other peoples. ‘Noblemen and gentlemen [who] have a desire to bring [Ireland] to be inhabited and civilly governed’ should hunt wolves, in acts that rid that landscape of ‘savage’ animals in ways that mirrored the efforts to colonise the native Irish.³

What these conceptions of violence also evoke is the very literal engagement with violent bloodshed that subjects in early seventeenth-century England would be familiar with beyond the rhetorical, whether in gathering sustenance, witnessing punishments on local levels, or engaging in acceptable – and sometimes unsanctioned – rites of bloodshed through jousting, duelling, or military exercises. This chapter considers the effect of expansion on English depictions of their own rites of violence in relation to authority. It argues that the prevalence of cannibalism as a political metaphor, almost entirely unique to the seventeenth century, was not, as many scholars maintain, merely used to justify overseas dominion. The recent scholarly emphasis on cannibalism and consumption, or cannibalism as ‘otherness’, has detracted from the fact that Jacobean writers depicted cannibalism first and foremost as an act of extreme, anarchic violence, and were relatively unconcerned with the implications of literal flesh-eating.

Exploring the Jacobean engagement with Amerindian cannibalism, informed by travel accounts and experiences in the circum-Caribbean, demonstrates that perceptions of Amerindian rituals provided a new vocabulary through which the English addressed anxieties over legitimate violence in post-Reformation society. As anthropologists note, the study of Amerindian cultural practices enable scholars to understand ‘the causes and consequences of human, not just Amerindian, conflict and ritual violence’.⁴ By integrating expansionist initiatives within fears of factionalism and political disorder, this chapter shows the process through which ‘a Christian society under stress’ drew upon ideas from America to better articulate the role of violence in legitimising monarchical authority.⁵

³ Quoted in Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence*, p. 22.

⁴ ‘Conclusion’, in *The Taking and Displaying of Human Body Parts as Trophies by Amerindians*, ed. Richard J. Chacon and David H. Dye (New York: Springer, 2007), p. 649.

⁵ Andrew Cunningham and Ole Peter Grell, *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Religion, War, Famine, and Death in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 2.

Historiography

Over the past fifteen years, scholarship has explored the more positive collaborations between ruling elites and local government in England, where power was ‘negotiated’ between classes through shared political languages.⁶ This tendency towards mediation has also guided scholarship on Anglo-Amerindian relations. Work by Edward Countryman, Richard White, and J.H. Merrell have explored the ‘contested spaces’ of early America and the scope for diplomacy and cooperation within those situations, where groups of individuals actively vied for ascendancy in ways that affected cultures on both sides.⁷ Any violence endorsed by policy-makers in London must be situated within the broad spectrum of interpersonal encounters in colonial contexts, not all of them destructive.⁸

At the same time, the extension of state power was not always a benign process, and approaching attitudes towards physical force allows historians to assess the relative successes of English civilising initiatives within the realm. The Crown’s drive to civilise its subjects, Elias argued, was an attempt to rebalance social forces within the developing state through internal pacification.⁹ This did not negate the need for violence altogether, but it did affect who might legitimately carry out acts of violence, and in what contexts. Elias argued that a consequence of the move from a feudal society to a court-centred administrative regime meant that subjects in the sixteenth century now tended to commit acts of large-scale violence in crisis points like war or colonisation.¹⁰

⁶ *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy, and Subordination in Britain and Ireland*, ed. Michael J. Braddick and John Walter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Andy Wood, *Riot, Rebellion and Popular Politics in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002); John M. Adrian, *Local Negotiations of English Nationhood, 1570 – 1680* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011).

⁷ *Contested Spaces in Early America*, ed. Juliana Barr and Edward Countryman (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014); J.H. Merrell, *The Indians’ New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbours From European Contact Through the Era of Removal* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009); *Friends and Enemies in Penn’s Woods: Indians, Colonialists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania*, ed. William Pencak and Daniel K. Richter (Philadelphia: Penn State University Press, 2004); Richard L. Haan, ‘Covenant and Consensus: Iroquois and English, 1676-1760’, in *Beyond the Covenant Chain: the Iroquois and Their Neighbours in Indian North America, 1600 – 1800*, ed. Daniel K. Richter and James H. Merrell (Philadelphia: Penn State University Press, 2003); Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650 – 1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

⁸ Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2000).

⁹ Stephen Mennell, *Norbert Elias: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), pp. 66-9.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

As Ethan Shagan has argued, maintaining stability in Tudor and Stuart England ‘required aggressive new interventions by authority’, expressly couched in the seemingly nonthreatening idea of achieving ‘moderation’ or balance, defined by invoking extremes.¹¹ Metaphors served important functions in inducing subjects to think about their own conduct through a rejection of excess, and cannibalism became used in a wide variety of contexts partly because it could be projected as an example of the worst form of unchristian and uncivil behaviour. This chapter is interested in English attitudes to cannibalism as it related to acts of violence, rather than in ‘cannibalism’ as a general term to denote any act of man-eating. In this politicised approach, recent scholarly interest in human consumption in the context of medicine and diet is largely peripheral. It is certainly true that the medicinal uses of human body parts meant that incorporation might be condoned in particular cases.¹² Pharmacopoeias in the early modern period, including the *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis* (1618), suggested powdered skull as a cure for ‘falling sickness’ or fits, and drinking human blood was sometimes believed to cure epilepsy or leprosy.¹³ As one scholar has argued, ‘the fact that early modern Europeans ate each other for therapeutic purposes is inarguable’, though this startling statement is tempered by the fact that in such cases ‘eating each other’ largely entailed making medicinal use of bodily excretions or pulverised bone, following the medical advice of Galen and Paracelsus.¹⁴

In the 1970s, the assumption that Amerindian tribes practiced cannibalism came under pointed attack, pioneered by the anthropologist William Arens’ *The Man-Eating Myth* (1979).¹⁵ Cultural, literary, and post-colonialist scholars including Peter Hulme and Stephen Greenblatt subsequently used Arens’ work to argue that cannibalism in the colonial era was nothing more than an excuse for

¹¹ Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 4; Thomas Hobbes, *De Cive: or, the Citizen* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Inc., 1949), p. 29.

¹² For an overview, see P. Kenneth Himmelman, ‘The Medicinal Body: An Analysis of Medicinal Cannibalism in Europe, 1300 - 1700’, *Dialectical Anthropology*, 22:2 (1997), pp. 183-203.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

¹⁴ Louise Noble, “‘And Make Two Pasties of Your Shameful Heads’: Medicinal Cannibalism and Healing the Body Politic in ‘Titus Andronicus’”, *English Literary History*, 70:3 (2003), pp. 677-708, p. 681; Richard Sugg, “‘Good Physic but Bad Food’: Early Modern Attitudes to Medicinal Cannibalism and its Suppliers”, *Social History of Medicine*, 19:2 (2006), pp. 225-40; Louise Noble, *Medicinal Cannibalism in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

¹⁵ William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth: Anthropology and Anthropophagy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979).

Europeans to legitimise expansion and subsume subaltern peoples.¹⁶ In the past ten years, works by Janet Whatley, Neil Whitehead, and Cătălin Avramescu have focused instead on cannibalism as it was reflected in the European cultural imagination, arguing that the actual existence of cannibalism is irrelevant to the way it was used in early modern society in the context of imperialism.¹⁷

Whitehead and Harbsmeier rightly point out that American cannibalism fascinated writers and travellers because of its relevance and parallel to European traditions and experiences: ‘control over bodies – both live and dead, imaginatively and physically – is a way of engendering political power, and of all the modes of controlling bodies the physical incorporation of body parts most vividly expresses this’.¹⁸

Although Arens rightfully questioned European depictions of bloodthirsty natives in the context of expansion, there is some danger in assuming all descriptions of cannibalism were false, or even in arguing that the historical reality of cannibalism is insignificant. In doing so, one questions the integrity of multiple ethnographic sources from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including Jean de Léry’s *History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil* (1578), Hans Staden’s *True History* (1557), English descriptions of the Amazonian Tupí, and the *Jesuit Relations*, a nineteenth-century compendium of the documents written by the French in North America and Canada from the 1630s. To Arens, the

¹⁶ Stephen Greenblatt, *Marvellous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Frank Lestringant, *Cannibals: the Discovery and Representation of the Cannibal from Columbus to Jules Verne*, tr. Rosemary Morris (Cambridge: Polity, 1997); *Cannibalism and the Colonial World*, ed. Francis Barker, Peter Hulme, Margaret Iversen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492 – 1797* (London: Methuen, 1986).

¹⁷ Cătălin Avramescu, *An Intellectual History of Cannibalism*, tr. Alistair Ian Blyth (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); Neil Whitehead, ‘Hans Staden and the Cultural Politics of Cannibalism’, *The Hispanic American Historical Review*, 80:4 (2000), pp. 721-51; Janet Whatley, ‘Savage Hierarchies: French Catholic Observers of the New World’, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 17:3 (1986), pp. 319-30; Janet Whatley, ‘Food and the Limits of Civility: The Testimony of Jean de Léry’, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 15:4 (1984), pp. 387-400; *Hans Staden’s True History*, tr. and ed. Neil L. Whitehead and Michael Harbsmeier (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008).

¹⁸ *Hans Staden’s True History*, p. lxiii. See Whatley, ‘Food and the Limits of Civility’ and C. Richard King, ‘The (Mis)uses of Cannibalism in Contemporary Cultural Critique’, *Diacritics*, 30:1 (2000), pp. 106-23. Among historians, trends towards the alimentary aspect of cannibalism and anxieties over abundance and spectacles of the carnivalesque have been the subject of several articles including Mario Klarer, ‘Cannibalism and Carnavalesque: Incorporation as Utopia in the Early Image of America’, *New Literary History*, 30:2 (1999), pp. 389-410; Rachel B. Herrmann, ‘The “tragical historie”: Cannibalism and Abundance in Colonial Jamestown’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 68:1 (2011), pp. 47-74. See also the brief discussion on the ‘sin of appetite’ and immoderate eating in Protestant ethics in Shirley Lindebaum, ‘Thinking about Cannibalism’, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 33 (2004), pp. 475-98, p. 486.

testimonies of those ‘pretending’ to be eyewitnesses lacked the ‘scientific procedure of independent verifications’ – an accusation that could be put to virtually every observational text written in the early modern period.¹⁹

Further, while arguments in this chapter do not hinge on the actuality of cannibalism, it would be a disservice to the historical reality of native customs to devote an entire chapter on the subject without at least considering the issue from an ethnographic standpoint. One of the more positive responses to Arens’ work has been to prompt more detailed fieldwork and research by archaeologists. This has yielded works like Peggy Reeves Sanday’s *Divine Hunger* (1986), which argues that cannibalism was a pervasive cultural practice among certain tribes, from the Aztec to the Iroquois, though these were highly ritualistic practices that varied widely depending on the tribe and time period.²⁰ Archaeologists have found, through the examination of human body parts, skulls, burial pits, and interaction with surviving tribes, that the taking and consuming of human body parts functioned in a range of ways, from obtaining prestige, avenging death, humiliating the enemy, legitimising political power, transferring attributes to warriors, and assisting in spiritual ceremonies.²¹

It should also be noted that contrary to their European counterparts, the English rarely purported to witness cannibal ceremonies first-hand. When they did describe natives as cannibals, these reactions were often matter-of-fact, and had seemingly little to do the immediate concern of establishing trade or commenting on local power dynamics between tribes. By reconfiguring English attitudes to cannibalism less in relation to consumption, and more in relation to the rites of bloodshed, English descriptions of human trophy-taking in the Caribbean and South America seem somewhat less fantastical. The reality of collecting and displaying dead bodies in these human societies, widely confirmed by anthropologists, became integral to why the English were compelled to use the idea of cannibalism to think about their own rituals of violence. Further, it should be noted that cannibalism may not have been a European imperial strategy alone, but one perpetuated by the Taíno themselves, who considered the Caribs their

¹⁹ Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, p. 31.

²⁰ Peggy Reeves Sanday, *Divine Hunger: Cannibalism as a Cultural System* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1986).

²¹ James B. Peterson and John G. Crock, “‘Handsome Death’: The Taking, Veneration, and Consumption of Human Remains in the Insular Caribbean and Greater Amazonia”, in *The Taking and Displaying of Human Body Parts*, pp. 632-42.

longstanding enemies.²² Ironically, attempts to debunk cannibalism as a European invention may actually have flattened the agency of indigenous groups, who may have acted with political shrewdness by themselves encouraging misunderstandings.

English Encounters with Cannibalism

The fifth-century BC Greek writer Herodotus has been cited as one of the earliest chroniclers of man-eating:

Beyond the desert the androphagi dwell... The Androphagi have the most savage customs of all men: they pay no regard to justice, nor make use of any established law. They are nomads and wear a dress like a Scythian; they speak a peculiar language; and of these nations, are the only people that eat human flesh.²³

The recurrent associations between cannibalism and savagery were ones that would appear almost universally in subsequent texts. Cannibals were described as living beyond the pale of human civilisation, lacking laws and systems of justice, speaking differently, and setting themselves apart by their taste for human flesh. Invoked in philosophical treatises, travel narratives, epic poetry, and political works by Aristotle, Pliny, Herodotus, and Juvenal, man-eating was ‘an appropriate activity to describe those who live far away from the “civilised” world as well as to those who exist on the margins of human life’, living in a sort of ‘geographical and behavioural liminality’.²⁴ In the hierarchy of cultures, cannibals occupied the lowest rung of humanity, if indeed they were human at all.

Colonisation gave cannibalism a more fixed geographical space, and this section considers English perceptions of, and encounters with, cannibalism in order to understand why it became such a widespread metaphor in Jacobean discourse. Europeans adopted the term ‘cannibal’ in specific reference to Amerindian tribes encountered in 1492. Before that, English writers used the Greek term ‘anthropophagy’, as indicated in the humanist and statesmen Sir Thomas Elyot’s *Bibliotheca Eliotae* (1542).²⁵ Columbus’ term for the warring

²² Ibid., p. 561.

²³ Quoted in Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, p. 10.

²⁴ Andrew McGowan, ‘Eating People: Accusations of Cannibalism Against Christians in the Second Century’, *Second-Century Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 2:4 (1994), pp. 413-42, p. 426.

²⁵ Sir Thomas Elyot, *Bibliotheca Eliotae Eliotis librarie* (London, 1542; STC 7659.5), sig. Dr. Elyot published an earlier version of this dictionary in 1538, where ‘anthropophagi’ specifically

Carib provided the linguistic base from which ‘canibe’ or ‘cannibal’ was likely derived.²⁶ In early cosmographies, the distinction was not clearly drawn. Sebastian Münster’s popular *A treatyse of the newe India with other new founde lands and islands*, translated by Richard Eden in 1553, described natives in Java and Guiana as ‘people called *Anthropophagi*, which are wont to eate mens fleshe’.²⁷ Such people ‘liue al naked’ and are ‘barbarous and rude’ – like the ancient Scythian, the Amerindian cannibals shared similarities with their classical forbears.²⁸

Similarly, André Thevet’s *The new found worlde*, translated into English in 1568, depicted a ‘Countrey of *Canibals, Anthropophages*, the which regions are comprehended in America, compassed with the Ocean sea’.²⁹ Thevet felt that the word ‘anthropophagy’ was enough to indicate to readers that these men ate human flesh; however, his work also located the cannibals specifically within the geographic confines of the New World, ‘compassed with the Ocean sea’. Though the terms continued to be used interchangeably by some, the distinction was nonetheless maintained by contemporaries. Richard Eden’s translation of another cosmography, Peter Martyr’s *De Novo Orbo*, described ‘the wylde and myscheuous people called *Canibales*, or *Caribes*, which were accustomed to eate mannes flesshe (and called of the olde writers *Anthropophagi*)’.³⁰ Though this was published before Thevet’s book, and the term ‘anthropophagy’ did not disappear from print after contact with Amerindian cannibals, it does show that those living in sixteenth-century England did recognise a difference between the ‘olde writers’ and the recent developments that had endowed Europe with new knowledge on the world and its peoples. These cannibals, unlike conceptions of religious deviants like Jews or witches who might eat flesh in demonic ritual within Europe, were fierce and warlike tribes who actively attacked surrounding tribes by

described peoples from Asia. Sir Thomas Elyot, *The dictionary of syr Thomas Eliot knight* (London, 1538; STC 7659), sig. Gg4v.

²⁶ *The Four Voyages of Christopher Columbus*, ed. and tr. J.M. Cohen (London: Penguin, 1969), pp.17, 215; also Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth*, p. 44. Shakespeare’s Caliban in *The Tempest* of 1611 is an anagram of this.

²⁷ Richard Eden’s translation of Sebastian Münster, *A treatyse of the newe India with other new founde lands and islandes* (London, 1553; STC 18244), sig. E7r.

²⁸ *Ibid*, sig. Piv.

²⁹ André Thevet, *The new found worlde* (London, 1568; STC 23950), sig. Piir.

³⁰ Richard Eden, *The decades of the newe worlde or west India* (London, 1555; STC 647), sig. A3r.

inuaydyng theyr country, takynge them captiue, [and] kyllyng and eatyng them...[the] more meke and humane people complayned that theyr Ilandes were no lesse vexed with the incursions of these manhuntynge *Canibales* when they go forth a rouynge to seeke theyr praye[,] then are other tame beastes, of Lyons and Tigers...suche as they eate, they first eate the intralred and extreme partes, as hands, feete, armes, necke, and heade.³¹

Jean de Léry's account of living among the Tupinambá in Brazil is remarkably sensitive towards the Tupí, but he, too, subscribed to the idea of cannibalistic ceremonies as indicators of bloodlust:

These barbarians, in order to incite their children to share their vengefulness, take them one at a time and rub their bodies, arms, thighs, and legs with the blood of their enemies...When the flesh of a prisoner, or of several...is thus cooked, all those who have been present to see the slaughter performed gather joyfully around the *boucans*, on which they gaze with a furious and covetous eye, contemplating the pieces and members of their enemies.³²

The more prolonged encounters with cannibal tribes recounted by the French, Spanish, and Portuguese does not mean that cannibalism did not feature in English travel accounts. Numerous depictions of cannibals were compiled in the compendia of Richard Hakluyt and Samuel Purchas. There were descriptions of 'many...killed in Chila, whom the Sauages flaid and eate, hanging vp their skinnes in their Temples'; the Spanish who, in 1535, 'escaped drowning' only to be 'eaten by the sauages'; unrest in Hispaniola and Cuba when 'the Sauages did rise against' Columbus and his crew.³³ Francis Drake's voyage to the Indies in 1585 included an account of the violent death and 'sauage kind of handling [of]...one of our boyes' from whom the inhabitants had 'taken his head and his heart, and had strangled the other bowels about the place, in a most brutish and beastly manner'.³⁴ Raleigh, in his voyage to Guiana, described 'those Canibals of Dominica' and the 'inhumaine Canibals' of Trinidad who navigated the islands through which 'our ships passe yearly'.³⁵ It is perhaps significant that although many explorations were described in the past tense, the cannibal remained a living, contemporary being in these sources, engaged with in the present tense:

³¹ Ibid.

³² Jean de Léry, *History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil*, tr. Janet Whatley (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), pp. 126-7.

³³ Richard Hakluyt, *The discoueries of the world from their first original* (London, 1601; STC 11543), sigs. H4v, M2r, F2v; Richard Hakluyt, *The principal nauigations, voyages, traffiques and discoueries of the English nation* (London, 1599; STC 12626a).

³⁴ Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrims* (London, 1625; STC 20509), sig. Yy3v.

³⁵ Walter Raleigh, *The discouerie of the large, rich, and bewtiful empire of Guiana* (London, 1596; STC 20634), sigs. D3v, Nv.

‘abhorrible’ men who ‘eate mans flesh’.³⁶ The parallel existence of those peoples made them a threatening reality.

In 1607, John Nicholl provided the fullest account of a direct English struggle against cannibals in his *Houre glasse of Indian Newes*. This is the nearest English equivalent to the Continental sources that described cannibal tribes in South America. It is admittedly far shorter and less ethnographically rich, and lacks the detail or illustrations included in Léry and Staden’s accounts. Nonetheless, it provides a Jacobean engagement with cannibalism outside of Hakluyt and Purchas’ bulky compendia, where Nicholl’s slim work was available to curious readers specifically drawn to the exoticism of America. Following a shipwreck in 1605, the Guiana-bound crew of the *Olive Branch* landed on St Lucia. Of the sixty-seven colonists who tried to settle on the island, most were killed by Caribs, and only nineteen men survived to leave the island. Nicholl described St Lucia as ‘an island of caniballs, or men-eaters in the West-Indyes’, inhabited ‘onely with a companie of most cruell Caniballs’.³⁷ As in many other accounts, the more peaceable tribes who offered survivors tobacco, sugar, and fruit were contrasted against the Carib that ‘did seeme most strange and vgly, by reason they are all naked, with long blacke haire hanging downe their shoulders, their bodies all painted with red...which makes them looke like diuels’.³⁸

Nicholl did not describe native rituals with any detail, nor did he claim to witness the acts first-hand. Other Englishmen who spent more time observing native customs noted that the red paint did not necessarily intend to look threatening – red earth was liberally applied so that ‘the Muskitas [mosquitoes] or Flies shall not offend them’.³⁹ Rather than actual flesh-eating, it was the disturbing nature of the chaotic and remorseless violence that Nicholl most associated with cannibals. He portrayed the natives as merciless enemies, ‘cruel and bloodye Carrebyes’ who shot poisoned arrows and preferred to massacre the crew than to provide succour to suffering human beings.⁴⁰ They were warlike in a situation that the colonists did not believe to be war, nor were they taken prisoner

³⁶ Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrims*, sig. Ooo2v.

³⁷ John Nicholl, *An houre glasse of Indian newes* (London, 1607; STC 18532), sig. B3r.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ William Davies, ‘Captain Thornton’s Expedition to the Amazon on behalf of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, 1608’, in *English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon, 1550 – 1646*, ed. Joyce Lorimer (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1989), p. 144.

⁴⁰ Nicholl, *An houre glasse of Indian newes*, sigs. C4r-C4v.

or subject to proceedings in which they might defend themselves. Instead, the crew helplessly witnessed the ‘lamentable strategems of the massacre of our fellowes and friends’.⁴¹ The spectacle of terror was augmented by the first-hand observation of disorderly violence. As Nicholls watched his shipmates die, he and his companions, he claimed, felt they were ‘seeing as in a glasse, the vtter ruine and Butcherly murthering of our owne selues, being we made most assured accompt to drinke of the same Cuppe’.⁴² The ‘edifying’ nature of lawful violence, as in public executions in England, became, in the hands of the cannibals, a senseless and terrifying thing, forcing the colonists into a situation that ‘would haue moved the heart of the cruellst Tirant in the world to compassion’.⁴³

In this way, cannibals acted beyond the behaviour even of ‘the cruellst Tirant’, who might ignore laws but who nonetheless lived within governed polities. Until the turn of the seventeenth century, accounts of cannibals were generally tended to be purely descriptive. From the seventeenth century, cannibals were not only ethnographic peoples, but any violent being who committed unsanctioned, illegal, or inhuman deeds, choosing to reject the rules of society that kept them civil. ‘The physicians who cut up the carcasses of dead men,’ wrote the anatomist Helkiah Crooke in 1615, committed profane acts, ‘sauoring of Caniball barbarisme’ and turning empirical inquiry into ‘butchery’.⁴⁴ In the same year, a ship’s master John Skinner reported from the Indonesian islands that the Dutch behaved more ‘like cannibals than Christians’ in massacring the inhabitants, including native nobility, of Macassar.⁴⁵ In both cases, the actual consumption of flesh was less a preoccupation than the motives and conduct of those who acted contrary to the established law by committing acts of unsanctioned butchery themselves.

Finally, it should be noted that the accepted use of the cannibal as an example of extreme savagery shows one of the terrible ironies of the European worldview towards Amerindian peoples. Cannibalism among the seventeenth-century Iroquois and Tupí were cultural practices meant to appease gods and

⁴¹ Ibid, sig. D2v.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid., sig. D3r.

⁴⁴ Helkiah Crooke, *Mikrokosmographia, a description of the body of man* (London, 1615; STC 6062), sig. C3v.

⁴⁵ John Skinner to Adam Denton, 12 July 1615, in *Calendar of State Papers: Colonial, Vol. I*, ed. W. Noel Sainsbury (London: Her Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1860), p. 417.

encourage active relationships with higher beings. As with the Aztecs before them, this often entailed offering a victim to the gods with the belief that those who died in this manner would be reincarnated as deities.⁴⁶ The Iroquois remorselessly tortured their victims before killing them, but the pain was considered purgative, and the elaborate rituals around these occasions enacted creation stories and elevated the prisoner to exalted positions through brave endurance. These rituals reflected the natives' attempt to situate themselves within temporal and spiritual realms, where a need to 'socialise and regulate' violence exhibited the fierce desire to survive the severe conditions of hunger, disease, and warfare that plagued their societies.⁴⁷ The Iroquois, their population vastly reduced by the end of the seventeenth century – largely because of the Dutch, French, and English disruptions of the fur trade, and in the effects of guns and disease – believed the land would 'swallow us' and 'put [us] among the dead' if they could not find a means to stop the destructive forces around them.⁴⁸

The traditions of these tribes, intent on controlling chaos, were all the more necessary *because* of European involvement in their societies. But just as accusations of cannibal behaviour were never attributed to the English state, they were equally left out of any criticisms of English colonisation. Unorthodox English subjects might be projected as worse than Amerindians – 'I wish these men would learne of the West Indias', wrote the member of parliament Francis Rous in 1622, condemning idolatry, 'whome perchance in scorne they will terme Sauages...but the worse thou callest them, the worse thou callest thy selfe' – but natives themselves were never understood in their own right.⁴⁹ In politicising cannibal violence, the moral ambiguities surrounding the incorporation of native peoples disappeared under heightened polemics and the immediate concern of maintaining a stable commonwealth.

Political Theophagy

Although it is true that 'discussions of anthropophagy, whether classical or cross-cultural...have never been neutral, but rather have unfolded as charged contexts for the production of difference', the significance of the cannibal within

⁴⁶ Sanday, *Divine Hunger*, p. 7.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 149-50.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

⁴⁹ Thomas Rous, *The diseases of the time* (London, 1622; STC 21340), sig. E5v.

English discourse gained its force from the unsettling notion of similarity rather than difference.⁵⁰ Hakluyt included a 1536 instance in Newfoundland of Englishmen eating each other out of dire hunger, and the fear of moral disintegration became especially relevant after the English experienced the hardships of colonisation first-hand. George Percy included a description of man-eating during the harrowing Starving Time in Jamestown in the winter of 1609/1610. A teenage girl's skull, recently uncovered by archaeologists at Jamestown, indicate multiple, tentative incisions that corroborate Percy's allegations [Figure 7.1]. 'And now famin beinneinge to Looke gastely and pale in every face,' Percy wrote, survivors had to 'doe those things w[hi]ch seame incredible, as to digge upp deade corpes out of graves and to eate them. And some have Licked upp the Bloode w[hi]ch hathe fallen from their weake fellowes'.⁵¹



Figure 7.1. 'Cannibalism in Jamestown', *The Atlantic* <<http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2013/05/cannibalism-in-jamestown-colonists-ate-a-14-year-old-girls-brain/275490/>> [accessed 2 September 2014].

⁵⁰ King, 'The (Mis)uses of Cannibalism in Contemporary Cultural Critique', p. 109.

⁵¹ Mark Nicholls, 'George Percy's "Trew Relacyon": A Primary Source for the Jamestown Settlement', *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 113:3 (2005), pp. 212-275, p. 249; see also Hermann, 'The "tragicall history": Cannibalism and Abundance in Colonial Jamestown'.

Vicious rumours, recounted by Percy and John Smith, that a man in Jamestown had killed his pregnant wife and eaten her, circulated in London – a stinging indictment on a Protestant enterprise that hinged on civility. Yet though the Virginia Company challenged these rumours, no author, even Percy and Smith, referred to the action as cannibalistic. This suggests that these authors considered connotations of ‘cannibal’ to be too powerful and unfitting for hunger cases. John Chamberlain, writing to Dudley Carleton in 1600, reported a story about an adventurer and his crew who were forced to land in Puerto Rico and forfeit their treasure when faced with ‘such want that they were fain to eate one another’.⁵² The deliberate omission of this term in such a case implies that the word was far more relevant in situations outside of famine, where subjects behaved in a wilfully ferocious manner. The description of casting lots to decide who might be eaten first in moments of hunger, described in Richard Hakluyt, Jean de Léry’s voyage to France from Brazil, and by Dr Valentine Dale to Lord Burghley during the siege of Sancerre in 1573, further reinforced that acts of anthropophagy committed by those suffering from intense hunger lay outside their control, and were always undertaken reluctantly.⁵³ ‘Cannibalism’, therefore, was a term specifically used by the English to convey acts of destructive violence, acts that were in no way condoned by the civilising initiatives of the state.

The harrowing accounts of English colonists eating their own countrymen were either denied or defended out of necessity, but a deep unease about the English capacity for degeneration remained. ‘Brutish *Hatred*,’ wrote the translator and sergeant Edward Grimeston in 1621, ‘is more fitting for rauening wolues’ than men, better for ‘Canniballs and those monsters which haue layd aside all humanity’ and who invite ‘euill into themselues’.⁵⁴ Religious controversialists who attacked Catholicism often accused Catholics of being cannibals, feeding on the flesh of their God. Paralleling Catholic and Amerindian behaviour provided Protestant polemicists with an extreme example of savagery, but also a chance to expand on the consequences of such behaviour, where Catholic beliefs were seen

⁵² John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 10 October 1600, TNA: PRO, SP 12/275, f. 143v.

⁵³ ‘The famine increasing... they agreed amongst themselues rather then all should perish, to cast lots who should be killed’, Hakluyt, *The principal nauigations*, sig. L4r. ‘When the bodies are weakened, and nature is failing, the senses are alienated and the wits dispersed’, so that the crew soon casts lots, Léry, *History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil*, p. 212. ‘The poor men were brought to such necessitie that they had cast lots to eate each other’, Dr Valentine Dale to Lord Burghley, 28 August 1573, TNA: PRO, SP 70/128, f. 108v.

⁵⁴ Edward Grimeston, *A table of humane passions* (London, 1621; STC 5473), sig. I12v.

to usher the breakdown of social order. Since the Lord's Supper held an important role in Protestant worship as in Catholic mass, correct doctrine was contrasted to the extremity of transubstantiation. 'The sacrament is numbred amongst the greatest benefits giuen to vs of God in this life,' wrote Christopher Sutton, author of a popular devotional, and there is no reason to doubt that many churchgoers found the experience poignant.⁵⁵

Administered at least once a year at Easter, the Lord's Supper offered a chance for individuals to come together in reconciliation, serving an important function in community life by presenting an opportunity to heal discord in a way that was both spiritually necessary and socially affirming.⁵⁶ The survival of numerous copies of popular devotionals by Christopher Sutton, Henry Smith, Thomas Tymme, and Lewis Bayly suggest that lay members of the community took an active interest in the wellbeing of their households. The Church of England highlighted the symbolism of the Lord's Supper, meant to provoke inner reflection:

The Diuine words of blessing do not *change* or *annihilate* the *substance* of the *bread* and *wine*...but it changeth them in *vse* and in *Name*. For, that which was before but common Bread and Wine to nourish mens *Bodies*; is, after the *blessing* destined [*sic*] to an holy *vse*, for the *feeding* of the *Soules* of Christians. And where before they were called but *Bread* and *Wine*; they are now called by the name of those *Holy things* which they signifie.⁵⁷

Such experiences were only considered valid within the established church, and it was precisely the significance of the Lord's Supper within a community that rendered it a key point of contention. The usefulness of cannibal imagery lay partly in the contrast between corporality and spirituality, between false imaginations and true worship. In a union 'made by faith', a healthy Christian relied on 'pure and exquisite faith...not by the corporall...with many drie & rotten members'.⁵⁸ These 'rotten members' might also represent unsound members of the Christian body who did not adhere to the Word of God, choosing to enact a sensual version of the Lord's Supper that literally involved drinking the blood of their Saviour. Tearing 'the heart, wounds, bloud, yea nayles, feete, guts, yea all the parts of Christis humanitie, as though like Cannibals', wrote Stephen Jerome

⁵⁵ Christopher Sutton, *Godly meditations vpon the most holy sacrament of the Lordes Supper* (London, 1601; STC 23491), sig. F7v.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

⁵⁷ Lewis Bayly, *The practice of pietie* (London, 1613; STC 1602), sig. Aa3r-v.

⁵⁸ Philippe de Mornay, *Fowre bookes, of the institution, vse and doctrine of the holy sacrament of the Eucharist in the old Church* (London, 1600; STC 18142), sig. Qq3r.

from Dublin in 1625, was a sort of blasphemy committed by ‘Masse Priests & Papists in a blinde devotion’, leading to ‘barking against the soveraigne Maiestie of the Almighty’.⁵⁹ Christ was present ‘not by any *Papal transubstantiation* but by a *sacramental participation*, whereby he doth truly feed the faithfull’.⁶⁰

To Protestants, transubstantiation vulgarly rendered a symbolic act into physical matter, so that Catholics became perpetrators of violence rather than reconciliation. ‘If the Canibals are to be abhorred, because they deuour and eate mans flesh, their enimies whome they take in the warres’, wrote Thomas Lupton, ‘are you then much more to be detested, that are not ashamed to eate and deuoure...the very bodie of Christ your great & high friend?’⁶¹ Faithful Christians eschewed violence in favour of love, wrote Thomas Sanderson in 1611, rejecting the ‘mysticall and spiritual kind of murder and mangling’ that came from ‘a corporall feeding...[like] brutish Cannibals’.⁶² Even Herodotus, who wrote of anthropophagy, would find that ‘this Theophagie were incredible’ – these ‘Theophages (that is, God eaters)’ were not like ‘the Reader, from whose eyes God of his goodnesse hath remoued the veile of superstition’.⁶³ Sanderson’s words implied a sense of complicity against those who acted uncivilly, where membership in Christ’s covenant entailed an inclusivity that ‘savages’ could not share.

The Church saw these ferocious ‘superstitions’ as undermining the efficacy of the Reformation. As among Amerindians, error produced a community ‘absurd in reason’, not civil and educated; by extension, the ‘foolish man, by this his Apostasie and wilfull disobedience’, would care more for rebellion than the glory of God.⁶⁴ ‘It should be a Christians shame,’ wrote the Lincolnshire preacher Henoeh Clapham in 1609, ‘to seeke vnion with Christ in such a Canibal manner’.⁶⁵ Matthew Sutcliffe, the dean of Exeter, made clear that the ‘Church of England neuer beleueed, that Christians were eaters of mans flesh, and

⁵⁹ Stephen Jerome, *Englands Iubilee, or Irelands ioyes Io-paeon* (Dublin, 1625; STC 14511.5), sig. M3v.

⁶⁰ Bayly, *The practice of pietie*, sig. Ddr.

⁶¹ Thomas Lupton, *A persuasion from papistrie written chiefly to the obstinate, determined, and dysobedient English papists* (London, 1581, STC 16950), sig. Gg3r.

⁶² Thomas Sanderson, *Of romanizing recusants, and dissembling Catholicks* (London, 1611; STC 21711), sig. G3r.

⁶³ Henri Estienne, *A world of wonders* (London, 1607; STC 10553), sig. B3r.

⁶⁴ I.D., *A confession of Christian religion* (London, 1609; STC 6172a), sig. A7v.

⁶⁵ Henoeh Clapham, *A chronological discourse* (London, 1609; STC 5336), sig. Gv.

Canibals'.⁶⁶ On the other hand, 'the modern Romish Church holdeth, that Christians take Christes flesh with their teeth, and swallow downe his flesh and bloud into their bellies'.⁶⁷ Christians must 'corporally receiue, but spiritually interpret', proving themselves 'iniuriuous and odious to christian mildnesse & maners' in doing otherwise.⁶⁸ The constant references to tearing and masticating flesh paralleled the general incivility seen to pervade the more rural areas of England, especially in the north, where Protestantism, obedience to the Crown, and the reformation of manners were all considered closely related and all too neglected.⁶⁹

Conversely, a 'correct' knowledge of the sacrament, based on civility and spiritual understanding, restored deference towards the earthly as much as the spiritual order. Catholics who chose not to participate in the services of the Church of England were spiritually imperilled, but also accused of wilful dissent since it fell to the state to penalise recusants. Persisting superstitions were therefore a matter of public as much as private disintegration. The sacrament was an earthly covenant and a spiritual one, existing as 'another Communion, twixt *Christians*' as one, whole body – 'one mysticall body vnder one head, which is Christ'.⁷⁰ Worshippers sat in church according to their social rank, so being absent from church posed 'a grave dereliction of one's duty to bolster parochial discipline and stability'.⁷¹ To authorities, those who eschewed church attendance could hardly be trusted to govern their family and dependants, where household order mirrored the deference expected to king and God. Participation in court politics also necessitated conformity, so that refusing the sacrament made an active political life nearly impossible, indicating the specific role of Protestantism in concepts of civility and access.⁷² Like James' wife Anne, Catholics may have

⁶⁶ Matthew Sutcliffe, *The subuersion of Robert Parsons his confused and worthlesse worke* (London, 1606; STC 23469), sig. G7r.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Giovanni Botero, *Relations of the most famous kingdomes and common-wealths thorowout the world* (London, 1630; STC 3404), sigs. Ccc3v, Bbb7v.

⁶⁹ Considerations delivered to the Parliament, 1559, Hatfield MS, CP 152/96; Richard [Bancroft], Bishop of London, to Sir Robert Cecil, 4 December 1599, Hatfield MS, CP 75/15.

⁷⁰ Bayly, *The practice of piety*, sig. A10r.

⁷¹ Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993), p. 84.

⁷² This is not to say that Catholics could not participate in politics at all, but that a level of conformity was required. William Byrd, composer at Chapel Royal, practised recusancy at home but 'unqualified conformity at court', Walsham, *Church Papists*, p. 82. Even at local levels, 'there were apparently many Catholics who failed to see any conflict between theological adherence to

dutifully attended church publicly while observing their religious rites in private, though Protestant writers showed mistrust towards the ‘church papists’ whom they perceived to harbour secret idolatry.⁷³

Despite James’ attempts to appease the various religious groups who appealed to him for toleration, the Gunpowder Treason of 1605 ruptured James’ hopes of keeping his subjects’ private conscience separate from political conformity. Following the Main and Bye Plots of 1603, the Gunpowder Treason seemed to confirm what Elizabeth had often claimed, that religion was a mask under which traitors plotted malicious designs. The ‘Romish rabble’ were ‘right Cannibales, lyke to the barbarous people of Armenica [America]’ for dividing the church and undermining civil society through violence.⁷⁴ Reformers attacked lax church attendance as representative of Catholic subversion, especially in the north where Guy Fawkes, Thomas Percy, and other conspirators were raised. The convergence between religion and politics meant that issues around the sacraments and acting out one’s faith necessarily became matters of state.

The breakdown of hierarchical order meant that the prospect of a Catholic regime became no better than one under the ‘idolatrous’ natives of the New World. Catholics displayed ‘savage, irreligious, and inhumane behaviour’ when they delighted in the ‘devouring of mans flesh’.⁷⁵ Catholics, like cannibals, invited a warlike mode of life. ‘The naturall and carnall body of Cryst so to be eatin...so that his flesch is torn and his bones broken’ was exactly the way ‘the barbarus Bresilians...eate men and wemen’.⁷⁶ Here, the arrogant preference of a carnal sacrament turned Catholic subjects into wilful rebels, exercising unsanctioned violence against a sacred body. Catholics seemed ‘worse than the Canibals & Indies that eat their enimies’ because they sought to perpetuate discord.⁷⁷ The act of theophagy was therefore reflective of the more general violence that Protestants

the Church of Rome and the exercise of political responsibility for the preservation of civil law and order’, Walsham, *Church Papists*, p. 83.

⁷³ Priests, too, might refuse to minister the sacraments to church papists for conforming, putting them in difficult situations with both religions. Arnold Hunt, ‘The Lord’s Supper in Early Modern England’, *Past & Present*, 161 (1998), pp. 39–83, p. 70; Walsham, *Church Papists*, p. 83. James’ speech to parliament in 1610 acknowledged that ‘if they bee good and quiet Subiects, I hate not their persons’, but asked that ‘[p]apists be no longer concealed’, in James I, *The workes of the most high and mightie prince, Iames by the grace of God* (London, 1616; STC 14344), sig. ZZ3r.

⁷⁴ John Nicholls, *The oration and sermon made at Rome* (London, 1581; STC 18535) sig. G6r; ‘And doost though cruell Canniball, conceiue & eate nought else, but the flesh of Christe?’ sig. M8r.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. Vv4r.

⁷⁶ John Colville, *The paraenese of admonition of Jo: Coluille* (Paris, 1602; STC 5589), sig. L3r.

⁷⁷ William Attersoll, *The badges of Christianity* (London, 1606; STC 889), sig. Y6r.

believed their Catholic neighbours guilty of, where the torn and broken body of Christ, ripped apart by Christians living in error, symbolised a more general willingness to commit acts of violence that threatened the stability of the Protestant state.

This extremity seemed to play out most fully in the religious wars in France, where religious bloodshed tore apart communities and turned neighbours against each other. Monks were accused of unleashing ‘cannibal-like cruelties’ against any who ‘wold not embrace the Romane religion’.⁷⁸ In the 1580s, John Foxe deemed the pope ‘a cruell Caniball’ for encouraging ‘troublesome commotions and disordered factions...wherewith the peace and concorde of Christians is so lamentably shaken and rent asunder’.⁷⁹ Forty years later, George Goodwin’s Catholic satires made the same associations. Goodwin called ‘this powder age’ the age of the Catholic ‘*Flesh-feeder*’, teeming with ‘Popish *Caniball[s]*’ intent on subverting the laws of state.⁸⁰ Acting the cannibal became a direct threat against the power of the monarch over his subjects, usurping his authority through illegitimate violence, since these ‘bloudy butchers’ assumed ‘almost a soueraigne power and princely authority’ over their own countrymen.⁸¹ As Andrew Marotti notes, the pope’s ‘politically intrusive...vision of international order directly conflicted with the kind of political autonomy’ that the centrally-governed state sought for itself.⁸²

The cannibal nature of the Eucharist became incorporated into a broader mistrust of Jesuit radicalism, centring on the question of secular authority and expressed not only in print but in countless letters and reports exchanged between statesmen and monarchs throughout Europe. The climate of mistrust towards Jesuits in the 1580s and 1590s was no less prominent under James despite his promises of tolerance. Not all Catholics supported the pope’s ordinance that Elizabeth be ‘bereved or deprived of hir...kingdom, and also of all and whatever dominions’, but evidence suggests that the crown’s attempts to locate seditions

⁷⁸ Estienne, *A world of wonders*, sig. S4r.

⁷⁹ John Foxe, *The Pope confuted* (London, 1580; STC 11241), sig. Pr.

⁸⁰ George Goodwin, *Babels balm: or The honey-combe of Romes religion* (London, 1624; STC 12030), sig. Lr; ‘That Feast’s a Fact, not of the Mouth, but Minde’, sig. Lv.

⁸¹ *Ibid*, sig. S4r.

⁸² Arthur F. Marotti, *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), p. 9.

were more than mere paranoia.⁸³ Catholic families sent their sons to the Jesuit Colleges in France and Spain, where impressionable members of the nobility encountered the uncompromising attitudes of their Jesuit tutors.⁸⁴ ‘Many Jesuits come into England disguised to meet the King of Spain’s ambassador there’, wrote John Hammond to his brother in 1604, and John Chamberlain reported in 1607 that ‘there be at least two or three hundred Iesuites priests and friers lately come ouer, and grow so bold that they go up and downe in some places in their habits’.⁸⁵ These correspondences paint an ambiguous picture of the realities of Jesuit influence in England, but it does reinforce the scale of reports and rumours of unrest.

The most dangerous threat posed by the Jesuits was their support of papal deposition, preached openly in the English colleges in Douai, Rome, Valladolid, and St Omer (established 1561, 1579, 1589, and 1593 respectively) and published in books that were smuggled into the realm.⁸⁶ The threat of papal deposition lay in the notion that subjects possessed the right to take state matters into their own hands, committing acts of violence against their king if the pope declared them heretical. William Barlowe’s sermon at Paul’s Cross in 1601 rested on the assumption that his London public recognised the figure of the English Jesuit Robert Parsons, and of reports of Jesuit seditions more generally: ‘The law of God is straight in this case, it bridels the mouth that it speake not euill of the King, it bindes the hart not to imagine euil against him, and the ciuil law punisheth with death’.⁸⁷ It is unsurprising to find such beliefs equated with cannibals. Thomas Wilson, master at King’s School in Canterbury, wrote in 1614 that

Our degenerate and new Romanes take a readier way and shorter cut to quit them of their enemies...by seditions, rebellions, murthers, treasons, stabbing of Princes, blowing vp of English parliament-houses, and other such monstrous vnnatural courses...How far be they from Antichrist, who delight so in the blood of Gods

⁸³ Notes by Burghley relative to the Bull of Pope Pius V, declaring Queen Elizabeth to be a heretic, and deposing her from her regal authority, May 1582, TNA: PRO, SP 12/153, f. 147r. On the real threat posed by Catholics despite their ultimate failure in subverting the regime, see Michael C. Questier, ‘Elizabeth and the Catholics’ in *Catholics and the ‘Protestant Nation’: Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*, ed. Ethan Shagan (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), pp. 69-94.

⁸⁴ Hugh Lee to the Earl of Salisbury, 15 October 1607, Hatfield MS, CP 122/129.

⁸⁵ John Hammond to his brother, 28 December 1603, Hatfield MS, CP 48/71v; John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 4 August 1620, SP 14/116, f. 88.

⁸⁶ Alexandra Walsham, ‘“Domme Preachers”?: Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print’, *Past and Present*, 168 (2000), pp. 72-123, p. 81.

⁸⁷ William Barlowe, *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse* (London, 1601; STC 1454), sigs. B5v-B6r.

people, [and] in barbarous sauage cruelty, such as amongst Scythians & Cannibals is not to be heard of?⁸⁸

Wilson urged his readers to turn to prayer as a sanctioned method of political participation. Although Catholics caused discord, God might be moved by the appeals of his people to manifest his will through his heavenly powers. Conversely, any who raised earthly sedition presumed a power they did not rightfully possess. ‘This is a thing simply euil, that religious men should so much intermingle with matters of State,’ wrote Sir Henry Wotton’s chaplain Isaac Bargrave in 1619, ‘it being their dutie rather to attend the sauing of their owne and other mens soules.’⁸⁹ The crux of the matter lay not in religion but in legitimacy, where James expected his subject to succumb to his authority even in the midst of contention.

Although Catholics should never depose lawful princes, Parsons admitted that excommunication provided grounds for deposition. Hardly surprisingly, James expressed his contempt of this view, defending his oath on the basis that ‘no excommunication of the Popes can warrant my Subiects to practise against my Person or State... as indeed I take such temporall violence to be farre without the limits of such a Spirituall censure as excommunication is’.⁹⁰ James used the figure of the cannibal in 1616 to combat the Jesuits’ claims that Catholic subjects could lawfully depose their monarchy if the pope had deemed him or her a heretic.⁹¹ ‘A most detestable sentence,’ James wrote; ‘all the barbarous cruelty that euer was among the Canibals... may passe henceforth in the Christian world for pure clemencie and humanity’.⁹² In his rhetorical outrage, James turned to the cannibal and other ‘infidels’ to express the illicitness of such presumptions, defending himself against those who opposed a king’s temporal authority by equating disloyal subjects to ‘savages’.

Taking the factions under Elizabeth as an example, Matthew Sutcliffe boldly urged James not to allow sedition to escalate as it had under his predecessor, but to secure civil harmony against the influence of Jesuits:

⁸⁸ Thomas Wilson, *A commentarie vpon the most diuine Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes* (London, 1614; STC 25791), sig. Kkkk4v.

⁸⁹ Isaac Bargrave, *An exact and sound discovery of the chiefe mysteries of iesuiticall iniquity* (London, 1619; STC 14529), sig. B3r.

⁹⁰ James I, *An apologie for the oath of allegiance* (London, 1609; STC 14401.5), sig. B3r.

⁹¹ James I, *A remonstrance of the most gracious King James I* (Cambridge, 1616; STC 14369), sig. Hh4v.

⁹² *Ibid.*, sig. iiv.

He must not suffer them to escape vnpunished, that maliciously seeke the bringing in of strangers, and the subuersion of the State...how willing I haue bene and am, to spend more then ordinarie for resistance both of common enemies, and such Caniball traitors.⁹³

Just as cannibals were considered the ‘enemies of mankind’, Catholics were ‘common enemies’ who threatened the body politic. Disobedience was articulated in terms of choosing uncivil behaviour, reinforcing the relationship between hierarchical reverence and stable government. Those who dissented therefore took on the traits of wild or unreasonable men, rendering it ‘absurd and unseemlie’ for ‘Christians to be *Caniballs*’.⁹⁴ The man who ‘[c]anniball-like feede upon man’ became more brutish, Stephen Jerome wrote in 1625, ‘then the most savage and sylvan of brutes, that’s disobedient to God’.⁹⁵ Jerome saw little distinction between disobeying authority and descending into savagery; even the lowest beasts felt natural subjection to their superiors.

The relationship between Catholics and Protestants under James was on some levels less benign than sometimes assumed. At the heart of the suspicion of Catholicism lay its challenge to civil order, and beliefs that the pope unrightfully claimed that ‘the Ciuill power is subiect to the Spirituall’.⁹⁶ The consequences of living under what Protestants saw as a tyrannical ‘popish’ regime found a cautionary tale in the French wars of religion, but also the Bohemian revolt, where James’ daughter Elizabeth and her husband Frederick V resisted the Catholic Holy League, led by the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand I and supported by his nephew, Philip IV of Spain. The Protestants princes justified their actions by insisting on their longstanding rights: ‘The sayd Estates doe further complaine of the most barbarous cruelties w[hi]ch are exercised in theyr countreyes against women & children, and against very dead bodyes’.⁹⁷ The abuse of a citizen’s body under the tyranny of a foreign king was ‘contrarye to theyr privileges’, and it was the ‘seditious spiritts of the Jesuittes & by the ministers of Rome & Spain’ that allowed the Protestants in Bohemia to rely on the validity of ‘a principall &

⁹³ Matthew Sutcliffe, *The blessings on Mount Gerizzim, and the curses on Mount Ebal* (London, 1625; STC 23466), sigs. A4r-C2v.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. Q4v.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. P3r.

⁹⁶ Peter Gosselin, *The state-mysteriies of the Iesuites* (London, 1623; STC 12092), sig. D3r.

⁹⁷ A defence of the Bohemian proceedings, September 1619, Hatfield MS, CP 129/158v-159r.

soueraigne Law, acknowledged vniversally before all others, by all men'.⁹⁸ The description of broken bodies in the context of illegitimate rites of violence allowed writers to navigate the relationship between the symbolic and the carnal, here a distaste of the physicality of transubstantiation extended to a revulsion of the physicality of crimes committed by those who supported the Catholic cause.

The various metaphorical uses of the cannibal within these struggles imply strong and conflicting attitudes about the ethics and accountability of faith and political involvement. Theodore Herring's thunderous sermon at Blackfriars in 1625 brought these strands together:

No marvaile if they who crash their Saviour between their teeth, make no bones to crush their Soueraigne. No marvaile if those...GOD-eaters...proue...MAN-eaters (worse then Cannibals), STATE-devourers. What may they not doe to advance the Catholike Cause?

*I shall not need to aggravate their Crueltie, Treacherie, their owne Acts proclaime it to the world...New projects are daily forged on the Anvills of the Iesuites braines...: so iust is it...that their owne tongues and hands, should be the chiefe Heralds to blazon the barbarous and savage disposition of these Blood-suckers to the whole world.*⁹⁹

The references to the encroachment of a universal Catholic monarchy beyond the bounds of Europe made cannibalism an especially relevant example precisely because the extension of power was a global affair. Commissioned to preach on the twentieth anniversary of the Gunpowder Treason, Herring showed that memories of Catholic plots within the realm had not faded under James. He explicitly drew a connection between Catholic subversion and 'the *slaughter* of the *Indies*', a reference to the popular writings of the Spanish friar Bartholomé de las Casas, which featured often in the English Black Legend.¹⁰⁰ In an inversion of the usual assumptions about cannibalism, proponents of the Black Legend depicted the Spanish as more brutal than the Amerindians because of their wilful rejection of human justice. The Spanish camp, not native encampments, took on the harrowing semblance of a butcher's shop, where leaders kept 'an ordinarie shambles of mans flesh' as a terror tactic to subjugate the indigenous

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Theodore Herring, *The triumph of the Church over water and fire* (London, 1625; STC 13204), sig. A5v.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., sig. Fv.

population.¹⁰¹ In 1626, preaching at Paul's Cross, William Hampton depicted the Spanish as a legion of cannibals: 'Whole Armies of them liuing sometime like Cannibals, eating nothing but the flesh of Indians'.¹⁰² His use of the word 'shambles' revealed his debt to English translations of Las Casas, but the word also evoked the illegitimacy of a regime based on unlawful uses of force.

Fears of a Spanish invasion of England, which might conceivably be effected through Catholic Ireland, appeared obsessively in English discourse in the 1620s. William Hampton's appropriation of the Spanish as cannibals, running butchers' camps with body parts as delicacies, sought to impart the frightening possibility of Spanish rule in a realm already prone to faction. 'We haue within vs, many home-bred and domesticall enemies, who will betray vs', Hampton pressed; they will 'ioyne hands with this foreign foe, in working our confusion'.¹⁰³ The native children who were starved and killed, the families dashed from mountains and forced into mines, the men whipped and maimed and driven to anthropophagy, were all very real manifestations of the 'dreadfull doing of these capitall enemies of mankind' – enemies who were at that very moment warring with fellow Protestants in Europe.¹⁰⁴ John King, preaching to James and the court in 1608, reminded his audience that the bloody-mindedness of the Spanish extended from the Amerindians to Christian Europe, fracturing the peace of former times. 'Cruelty is the ensigne and badge of that church', King announced, and 'the diet of the Cannibals'.¹⁰⁵ Generations of cruelty, refined in the theatres of conquest in South America, seemed to render these men capable of atrocities even in civil Europe. Translators of Spanish atrocities actively encouraged their readers to form opinions on the destructive nature of illegitimate violence: it seemed better to be among the 'savages' themselves than to suffer under Spanish, and Catholic, dominion.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰¹ Bartholomew de las Casas, *The Spanish colonie, or Briefe chronicle of the acts and gestes of the Spaniardes in the West Indies* (London, 1583; STC 4739), sig. E4v.

¹⁰² William Hampton, *A proclamation of warre from the Lord of Hosts* (London, 1627; STC 12741), sig. Er.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, sig. D4v.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ John King, *A sermon preached at White-Hall the 5. Day of November* (London, 1608; STC 14986), sig. Dr.

¹⁰⁶ Gonzáles de Montes, *The full, ample, and punctuall discouery of the barbarous, bloody, and inhumane practices of the Spanish Inquisition* (London, 1625; STC 11999), sig. K4v.

Cruelty and Factionalism

At the same time, the uses of cannibalism in articulating legitimate and illegitimate forms of violence went beyond confessional divides. In the Fatal Vesper of 1623, in which a roof collapsed over a group of Catholic worshippers, John Chamberlain criticised London Protestants for having ‘growne so sauage’ that they did not assist the injured, but stood by and taunted them instead.¹⁰⁷ As in cases of Spanish brutality, English savagery was a marker of illegitimate forms of violence, often irrespective of religion. In this way, Herring could deem Jesuits ‘cannibals’ and yet also term the domestic enemies who disobeyed their king ‘cruel, barbarous, [and] savage enemies’.¹⁰⁸ Such ‘savage enemies’ were everywhere, since ‘every willfull *Sinner* is a *Traytor* to God, *his king*, and *Countrey*’.¹⁰⁹

Since ‘political authority was projected and sustained’ through social modes, various individuals employed notions of cannibalism to critique their peers and promote political stability.¹¹⁰ The ‘godly form of magistracy’ that characterised office-holding in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century sought to combat society’s subversive underbelly, where factionalism threatened community harmony.¹¹¹ Subjects were active in condemning the wrongs that came from a disordered society. They held up the horrors of exocannibalism – of the voracious and cruel eating of humans outside one’s kin-group or community – to reflect on an especially unnatural form of *endocannibalism* – not the internal consumption of community members out of love, as one might conceivably categorise a practice like transubstantiation, but out of cruel ill-will and disobedience.

The cultural practices associated with cannibals signified their utter removal from a Christian ethnographic framework, and were used to describe any who wilfully disassociated themselves from civil life. William Vaughan placed temperance high on his list of virtues precisely because it provided the means in

¹⁰⁷ ‘Venice. November 1623’, in *Calendar of State Papers: Relating to the English Affairs in the Archives of Venice Vol. 18*, ed. Allen B. Hinds (London: His Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1912), p. 147; John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 8 November 1623, TNA: PRO, SP 14/154, f. 20r. This happened ‘in cheapside where they shold be more ciuill’, f. 20v.

¹⁰⁸ Herring, *The triumph of the Church over water and fire*, sig. G2r.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, sig. Gr.

¹¹⁰ Braddick, ‘Civility and Authority’, in *British Atlantic World, 1500 – 1800*, ed. David Armitage and Michael Braddick (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 113-132, p. 114.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

which one controlled behaviour and impulse. He directly contrasted ‘canniballe’ tendencies against ‘clemencie and courtesy’, emphasising that compassion and civility were indicators of a good subject.¹¹² An anonymous Catholic author used the cannibal metaphor not to describe Protestants or any blatantly oppressive force in society, but neighbours and friends who acted according to their own desires. The ‘civil monster’ was one who ‘through disorder, and inordinate desires...become unreasonable’.¹¹³ Such intemperance showed ingratitude and excess, inducing the perpetrator to live as if he ‘deuoures in some sort, them of his owne species, society, and bloud. All which the Anthropophages do not. For though they feed on their species...yet they hunt after straungers...obseruing still some law of society among themselues’.¹¹⁴ This idea that English cannibals consumed their kin, rather than their enemies, out of hatred and a lack of charity displayed a unique adoption of an Amerindian trope in ways that challenge assumptions that cannibals were used entirely to ‘mark the boundary between one community and its other’.¹¹⁵

Peter Lake’s study of murder pamphlets indicate that the godly often directly linked the failure of household authority figures to promulgate deference with social chaos, where an individual’s behaviour within their social contexts paralleled larger political anxieties over legitimate rule and the execution of law.¹¹⁶ In fact, the cannibal enters the discourse of these murder pamphlets too [Figure 7.2]. Upon the discovery of the murdered merchant John Sanders, his servant lamented, ‘Men haue no mercy...they be Canniballes’, and it is only after the privy council indicted the murderer that peace could be restored.¹¹⁷ In using his past service in Ireland and his connections at court for ill, wooing Sanders’ wife Anne in the process, the murderer Brown forfeited his right to civil life. The narrator of a 1616 pamphlet commented in an increasingly common trope that ‘the Caniballs that eate one another will spare the fruites of their owne babies, and Sauages will doe the like’, rendering it all the more shocking that the infanticide

¹¹² Vaughan, *The golden-groue* (London, 1600; STC 24610), sig. I2r.

¹¹³ *The yonger brother his apology by it selfe* (St Omer, 1618; STC 715), sig. H2v.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, sigs. H3v-r.

¹¹⁵ Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492 – 1797* (London: Methuen, 1986), p. 86.

¹¹⁶ Peter Lake with Michael Questier, *The Antichrist’s Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 79.

¹¹⁷ *A warning for fair women* (London, 1599; STC 25059), sig. F2v.




Figure 7.2. *The crying Murther* (London, 1624; STC 24900), frontispiece.

Margaret Vincent, ‘a Christian woman, Gods owne Image’, would be ‘more vnnaturall then Pagan, Caniball, Sauage, Beast’.¹¹⁸ In another text, society’s patriarchal order, headed by the king, was contrasted against ‘the very Canibals and men-eating Tartars, people deuouide of all Christianity and humanity’.¹¹⁹ The accompanying woodcut displayed two men in the process of dismembering their murdered victim. One held the victim’s head in one hand while yet another man

¹¹⁸ *A pittillesse mother* (London, 1616; STC 24757), sig. Bv.

¹¹⁹ *The crying Murther* (London, 1624; STC 24900), sig. A3r.

pulled out his entrails, drawing unsettling parallels between the cannibalistic rituals of South America with the acts of those who spurned authority. The author appealed to the authority of the law-makers who, as ‘his Maiesties Deputies and Viceregents’, must combat the ‘horrid and bloody’ behaviour of those who resisted the king’s ordinances.¹²⁰ The mechanisms of authority and maintaining order therefore relied on civil obedience and a Christian consciousness, where political roles were embedded in a sense of social order and civility.¹²¹

The use of cannibal imagery within this framework of belief shows the flipside of ideal harmony, not in a way that glorified the ‘festive yet forbidden pleasures of the world turned upside down’, as Lake found in the topsy-turvy inversions of society in murder pamphlets, but by introducing a new paradigm through which to view and uphold norms and values.¹²² The presence of the Amerindian introduced the possibility of degeneration, of a disorder that did not signal a perfect inversion of cultural tropes but an entirely different dimension to corruption. Unlike the devil, who lurked behind evildoers in woodcuts, enticing them to sin, the dissident who adopted native behaviour often *became* the cannibal.

Though sources frequently drew on cannibalism as an extreme form of excess that should not be imitated, others directly associated disorderly members of society with Amerindians. Those who sought to subvert ‘his Maiesties authentically power’ were but ‘blind Cannibals’ sinning ‘before God in their conscience’.¹²³ In doing so, the English ‘cannibal’ rejected shared cultural values, choosing to act in accordance with a people who, in the world order explained by cosmographers and churchmen, existed outside God’s covenant. Acts of oppression and disobedience showed a cruelty ‘beseeming rather the sauage Cannibals, then any sound hearted Christians’, a statement that reinforced the belief that cannibals were not saved but damned.¹²⁴ ‘Let vs, who are reformed Christians,’ William Vaughan urged, ‘follow the traces of Gentlemen, & not like vnto heathenish Canniballes, or Irish karnes’.¹²⁵ The evocative language of savagery attacked behaviour that was, in essence, both extremely violent and contrary to Christianity, and therefore with English monarchical sovereignty.

¹²⁰ Ibid., sigs. A2v-A3r.

¹²¹ Braddick, ‘Civility and Authority’, p. 120.

¹²² Lake, *Antichrist’s Lewd Hat*, p. 129.

¹²³ John Deacon, *Tobacco tortured* (London, 1616; STC 6436), sig. Z3v.

¹²⁴ Ibid., sig. R4v.

¹²⁵ Vaughan, *The golden-groue*, sig. I3r.

In the world of the court, the cannibal represented the courtier who acted only for himself. Christianity, with its emphasis on self-control and forgiveness, was ‘incompatible with a culture of revenge’.¹²⁶ Humanists attacked the lack of trust that caused the rifts and betrayals of fellow humans against each other, turning the atmosphere of the court into one of backbiting and obsessive self-advancement. These ‘shifting’ men, constantly changing their allegiances for their own benefit, were seen to set a poor example for the realm. They ‘waxe lawlesse and [are] licentious libertines’; better to dwell among ‘the strangest country among the Cannibals, then to sojourne among such cursed’ men.¹²⁷ John Ford, a member of the Middle Temple, criticised the desperate ‘court-apes’ who debased themselves for the hope of some kernel of profit, who through ‘incessant approbations’ descended into becoming ‘Anthropophagi, these men-eaters...monstrous as in effect they are’.¹²⁸

The juxtaposition between virtue and cannibal callousness found further relevance in the problem of enclosure. While proponents of enclosure understood the practice as ‘a civilising project...reforming a landscape as well as a people’, churchmen like the widely-published Thomas Draxe attacked the system that continued to plague tenants throughout the realm.¹²⁹ ‘The Kingdome is weakened’, Draxe proclaimed in 1613, by ‘these cannibal enclosers...of ill-gotten goods’.¹³⁰ This lack of charity applied to general usurers and callous citizens. In the earliest appropriation of the cannibal metaphor, Bernard Gilpin preached to the court in 1581:

Histories make mention of a people called Anthropophagi, eaters of men, which al mens harts abhorre to hereof: And yet alas by Saint Paules rule, Englande is full of such Anthropophagies. Euery man enuieth others, euery man biteth and knoweth vpon others...And whereon commeth it? Couetousnesse is the roote of all.¹³¹

Gilpin’s sermon was an impassioned plea to social justice. The ruthless behaviour of devouring one’s own kinsmen was not only cruel but hypocritical. Subjects

¹²⁶ *Cultures of Violence: Interpersonal Violence in Historical Perspective*, ed. Stuart Carroll (New York: Palgrave, 2007), p. 125.

¹²⁷ William Vaughan, *The arraignment of slander periury blasphemy* (London, 1630; STC 24623), sig. Q3v.

¹²⁸ John Ford, *A line of life* (London, 1620; STC 11162), sigs. D11r-v.

¹²⁹ Andy Wood, *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 343.

¹³⁰ Thomas Draxe, *The earnest of our inheritance* (London, 1613; STC 7184), sig. Er.

¹³¹ Bernard Gilpin, *A godly sermon preached in the court at Greenwich* (London, 1581; STC 11897), sig. Er.

revered their prince and made vows of faithfulness in church while ‘the pore liuely Images of Christ perish in the streats through hunger & cold’.¹³² The cartographer and surveyor John Norden, though his work facilitated enclosure, employed the popular language of cannibalism in his devotional works. Those who threatened to hurt those already suffering ‘were as good to say, hee would eate his flesh like a Canniball’, wrote Norden in 1626; ‘what lesse doe they, that enforce a poore debter to perish in prison, there to leaue his bones, and flesh too, for the satisfaction of his Creditor...Alas, what will a poore mans carkasse profit you?’¹³³

The aptness of the cannibal in these situations is better understood within the social relations of credit and economy. The ‘early modern economy was a system of cultural, as well as material, exchanges in which the central mediating factor was credit or trust’.¹³⁴ Christian charity and a rejection of open self-interest characterised the ethics of local agreements and contracts. Despite, or perhaps because of, the interpersonal relationships that grounded sixteenth and seventeenth-century economy, litigations against individuals who failed to keep their contracts or fulfil their obligations reached a peak between 1580 and 1640, contributing to a sense of fracturing and deceit as well as a significant growth of debt and downward mobility.¹³⁵ The growth of competition and the monopolisation of commodities led to expressions of mistrust and betrayal, and this often manifested itself in depictions of ruthlessness. To live without respecting others, wrote Thomas Wilson, destroyed society: ‘the earth woulde soone be voide for want of men, one woulde be so greedie to eate vp another’.¹³⁶ The echoed Paul’s letter to the Galatians, that ‘if yee bite and deuoure one another, take heed ye be not consumed one of another’ (Galatians 5:15, KJV). Ben Jonson’s plays, scathingly critical of money-grabbers and hypocrites, included one in which the miser Jaques cried to his daughter, ‘Wher’s my gold?...O thou theeuish Canibal,/Thou eatest my flesh in stealing of my gold’.¹³⁷ Thomas Peyton,

¹³² *Ibid.*, sig. Ev.

¹³³ John Norden, *A pathway to patience* (London, 1626; STC 18615), sig. L7v.

¹³⁴ Craig Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: the Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1998), p. 4.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹³⁶ Thomas Wilson, *The arte of rhetorique* (London, 1553; STC 25799), sig. D2r. Wilson revisited this idea in *A discourse vpon vsurye by waye of dialogue and oracions* (London, 1572; STC 25807), sig. Y2v.

¹³⁷ Ben Jonson, *Ben Ionson, his Case is alterd* (London, 1609; STC 14757), sig. H3r.

a student in Lincoln's Inn, noted in a 1620 poem that the prideful and the godless did nothing but 'tare/Mans flesh in peeces, gnawe his bones all bare/And tyrانىse'.¹³⁸ Perhaps most colourfully of all, one anonymous pamphlet catalogued the 'miraculous' death of a usurer devoured by rats in France in 1606. 'The very sauage and brutish Americanes', the author expounded, 'would be ashamed to plot and practise such horrible and accursed means, for the spoyling...of poore Christians, as is daily practised among vs, who make profession to haue been trained in Christ his schoole'.¹³⁹

Images of the money-hungry and remorseless citizen, licking up the carnage left in his wake, evoked a powerful picture of betrayal and ungraciousness, and it is unsurprisingly to find this expressed in the merchant Gerard Malynes' tract on economics and foreign exchange. The uncivil monster 'gnaweth the poore artificer to the bones, and sucketh out the bloud and marrow from him,' he wrote, 'feeding on him most greedily'.¹⁴⁰ Since 'credit relations were interpersonal and emotive', the breaches of trust in matters of community economy were expressed through violent and uncivil behaviour.¹⁴¹ No one but tyrants, preached John Scull in 1624, including 'Canibals that eate one another', would treat their neighbours in such a manner, with 'the lesser always becomming food to the greater, and the stronger preuailing against the weaker'.¹⁴² Scull called for forgiveness as the only possible way to heal faction, a thing that seemed increasingly lacking in a society where a single vision of Christianity no longer unified the realm.

To most policy-makers, factionalism displayed a lawlessness bordering on anarchy. A 1604 proclamation against disorders within the Church associated uncertainty and superstition with political disorder: 'nonconformitie brings with it a popular confusion and a neere Anarchie into the com[m]onwelth'.¹⁴³ The need for civility was therefore not only a positive or ideal force in society but a preventative one, an instrument to suppress the violence and associated fragmentation that threatened good government. 'Nurture', wrote one author in

¹³⁸ Thomas Peyton, *The glasse of time* (London, 1620; STC 19824), sig. V3v.

¹³⁹ *A Spectacle for vsurers* (London, 1606; STC 23030.3), sig. A2r.

¹⁴⁰ Gerard Malynes, *Saint George for England* (London, 1601; STC 17226a), sig. D6v.

¹⁴¹ Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation*, p. 3.

¹⁴² John Scull, *Two sermons* (London, 1624; STC 22123), sig. D3r.

¹⁴³ Notes of my Lord of Lo[ndon] for a proclamation about the disorders of the Church, 14 July 1604, TNA: PRO, SP 15/36, f. 121v.

1616, is ‘a iewell in a nation’, while countries that did not practice good manners ‘eate one another in necessitie, or rather wantonly or wilfully in sauage inhumanitie, without necessitie’.¹⁴⁴ A sense of the real possibility of disintegration made these discourses all the more urgent. ‘If wee should ordinarily deuoure raw flesh’, wrote the dean of Canterbury in 1610, ‘it would ingender in vs a certaine crueltie, so that at length we should eate one another’, breaking ‘all hedges of nurture and nature’.¹⁴⁵ The frameworks of civility that provided the cultivation necessary for an obedient and ordered life relied on consent and self-regulation. Steve Hindle notes that the reformation of manners reached a new intensity in the early Stuart period, where ‘personal morality was now a legitimate public issue’ tied up with a concern for maintaining state authority, but these ideals were not merely imposed by the state but actively engaged with and appropriated by community members themselves.¹⁴⁶ The appropriation of cannibal behaviour was specifically adopted to attack anxieties over a range of contemporary issues that genuinely affected the lives of individuals in their localities, where such conduct opposed the effectiveness of local government, but also proved destructive to interpersonal relationships between fellow citizens.

There is also evidence that cannibal language pervaded everyday interactions beyond sermons and written discourse. Accused of being a Catholic and facing a deprivation of arms, the soldier Gervase Markham protested in court that ‘he was no more a papist than an atheist or cannibal’, explicitly placing the cannibal outside accepted societal values while reinforcing his own place in the commonwealth.¹⁴⁷ A Middlesex deposition included the colourful case of one woman who slandered another by calling her a ‘Cannibal whore’.¹⁴⁸ In these instances, those who transgressed social (and perhaps sexual) norms were described as voracious and self-seeking. Though this description did not, presumably, have anything to do with physical violence, it nonetheless continued cannibalism’s association between excess and revenge. Perhaps most intriguingly,

¹⁴⁴ T.G., *The rich cabinet* (London, 1616; STC 11522), sig. O4v. Here again, the distinction is drawn between hunger and enjoyment.

¹⁴⁵ John Boys, *An exposition of the dominical epistles and gospels used in our English liturgie* (London, 1610; STC 3458), sig. Cr.

¹⁴⁶ Steve Hindle, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, 1550-1640* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), p. 177.

¹⁴⁷ ‘Defense of Gervase Markham’, *Calendar of State Papers: Domestic, Charles I: 1629 – 1631*, ed. John Bruce (London: Her Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1860), pp. 5-29.

¹⁴⁸ ‘Introduction’, in *London Consistory Court Depositions, 1586 – 1611: List and Indexes*, ed. Loreen L. Giese (London: London Record Society, 1995), pp. 7-28.

these cases suggest that ‘cannibal’ was a familiar enough frame of reference that it appeared outside textual modes of discourse, invoked by men and women alike in situations of anger or stress, whether in one’s vehement defence of Protestantism, or in slandering another member of one’s community.

Savagery and the State

When Francis Bacon expounded on the reasons why man did not eat fellow man, he highlighted that men who died naturally should not be consumed, as even ‘Ca[nnibals] (themselves) eat no Mans-flesh that Dye of Themselves, but of such as are Slaine’.¹⁴⁹ This raises the final aspect of cannibalism discussed in this chapter. Moving away from religious and community factionalism, it considers how cannibalism invoked treasonous behaviour on a state level. As Bacon voiced, cannibals, in eating only those they killed, were automatically murderers, too. Cannibalism therefore entailed more than one crime against the body, and policy-makers were generally far more concerned with cannibalism as a political crime than with moral issues of physical incorporation. As James told assize judges in 1616, his subjects’ vices ‘must be severely punished, for that is trew government’, a sentiment that contrasted with the anarchical quality of cannibal violence, which represented subjects who assumed the power to execute justice themselves.¹⁵⁰

The German prisoner Hans Staden portrayed cannibalistic ceremonies as highly ritualised, involving specific dialogues between the fierce ‘jaguar’ warrior and the victim about to be subsumed:

Then the one, who is going to kill him, takes back the club and says: Well, here I am. I will kill you, since your friends have also killed and eaten many of my friends. He answers: When I am dead, I will still have many friends, who are certainly going to avenge me. The executioner then strikes him on the back and beats out his brains.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. Even in the twenty-first century, cannibalism in the United States and some European countries is not strictly against the law; however, it is recognised that the act of cannibalism likely to involve the violation of others laws such as murder and the desecration of corpses. Cannibalism was outlawed in Britain in the early nineteenth century. ‘International Criminal Law: Cannibalism’, *Legal Information Institute*, Cornell University Law School <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/cannibalism>> [accessed 4 July 2013].

¹⁵⁰ Quoted in Hindle, *The State and Social Change*, p. 178.

¹⁵¹ *Hans Staden’s True History*, pp. 132-37.

The carefully prescribed modes within which members of these societies participated in the narratives of their executions initially seems to resemble the denouements on English scaffolds, and even the impaled skulls and the drinking of an executed man's blood carried resonances with state executions and martyrdoms [Figure 7.3]. Like cannibal rituals, the 'scripted dialogue between martyrdom and persecution' adopted by those sentenced to death allowed them some agency to defend their actions, profess their loyalty, or subvert the ceremonies around their deaths.¹⁵²



Figure 7.3. Detail of engraving of the Gunpowder Plot conspirators, 1606, NPG D19881 (above) and Theodore de Bry woodcut from the 1590s, after Jacques de Moyne de Morgues' now-destroyed sixteenth-century watercolours, *Images of the New World* <<http://www.floridahistory.com/de-bry-plates/>> [accessed 29 April 2015] (below).



¹⁵² Peter Lake and Michael Questier, 'Agency, Appropriation and Rhetoric Under the Gallows: Puritans, Romanists and the State in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 153 (1996), pp. 64-107, p. 69.

However, the state's exertion of physical power over an individual differed from the seeming excess and revenge killings committed by natives, depicted as engaged in persistent and frenzied bloodshed: 'the sauages generally for the most part, are at continuall warres with their next adioyning neighbours...and haue teeth like dogges, and doe pursue them with rauenuous minds to eate their flesh'.¹⁵³ The condemned on English scaffolds, on the other hand, generally died verbally reaffirming social and political norms and praying for the preservation of the state, choosing to re-enter the confined of civil life by submitting deferentially to authority and thereby restoring the relationships they broke in their acts of sin or resistance.

Michael Foucault addressed the early modern state's publicised control over a subject's body in his *Discipline and Punish* (1975), a text that has been applied by some historians to describe a Tudor 'theatre of state' that used violence to reinforce governing ideologies.¹⁵⁴ What is perhaps more useful is Foucault's exploration of 'the power exercised on the body...as a strategy', since this enables historians to explore contemporary attitudes towards the significance of violence, both morally and politically, where the state's display of bodily punishment was often intended to represent the inversion of the intended harm committed against the sovereign.¹⁵⁵ This supports Elias' contention that what changed in the sixteenth century was not the presence of violence, but the recognition, on the part of subjects, that it lay within the state's authority to punish those who took justice into their own hands. The prolonged debates in parliament over fitting punishments for state crimes indicate the didactic element of state-endorsed bloodshed. The House of Commons remained divided over how best to punish the Inner Temple lawyer Edward Floyd in 1621 for his slanders against the princess Elizabeth Stuart and her husband Frederick of Bohemia, considering a wide spectrum of possibilities including imprisonment in the Tower and the Little Ease, whipping, fines, the pillory, branding, and public humiliation. The punishment was carefully calculated to reflect on the nature of the transgression, with members suggesting 'as many lashes...as [rosary] beads' or 'as many lashes...as

¹⁵³ George Peckham, *A true reporte, of the late discoveries* (London, 1583; STC 19523), sig. C3v.

¹⁵⁴ Michael Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, tr. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1979); Lake and Questier, 'Agency, Appropriation and Rhetoric under the Gallows', p. 64; Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

¹⁵⁵ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, p. 26.

the Prince and Princess old', for Floyd to swallow his rosary beads, and for his crucifixes to be pinned visibly to his body.¹⁵⁶

The lengthy debates in parliament and the Star Chamber over appropriate punishments provide the context for Sir Thomas Egerton's extraordinary suggestion in 1605 that the libeller and courtier Lewis Pickering be punished in the manner of 'the Indians by drawing blood out of the tongue and ears, to be offered in sacrifice'.¹⁵⁷ Whether meant in earnest or offered as dry humour after intense debate, Egerton's statement offers a rare glimpse of how Amerindian customs might function in dialogue beyond written discourse. Invoked in the law chamber, the notion of sacrificial violence not only indicated Egerton's awareness of America as a cultural referent, but provided a very real means through which the habits of American natives were adapted and engaged with, becoming part of the process through which policy-makers conceptualised their role in prescribing order. At the same time, Egerton's reference to 'Indians', rather than 'savages' or 'cannibals', is significant, since it implicitly differentiated between native rites, however crude, and the extreme and anarchical practices of cannibals.

The legitimacy of the monarch as one who acted in the interest of his subjects, his responsibility to govern granted him by God, was heavily propagated by James, but it also filtered down to the pages of popular devotionals, conduct books, and letters of appeal. The Aristotelian praise of temperance stood in stark contrast to cannibal vengeance, which might immediately serve the individual, but detracted from the authority of the king. Law and civility were inherently connected; in 1606, the poet and soldier Barnabe Barnes likewise considered incivility a matter of public order, attacking the enemies of the realm who 'disturbe or diabolically roote vp the publike State' through a thirst for civil blood, inducing them like 'canniballes to feed vpon the flesh, and to drinke the blood of such noble persons'.¹⁵⁸ The impulsive behaviour that accompanied uncontrolled rage perpetuated sedition, so that he who 'hates the light of gouernment...eates like a cannibal'.¹⁵⁹ Laws were the 'internal moderation of the commonwealth's

¹⁵⁶ 'House of Commons Journal Volume 1: 1 May 1621', in *Journal of the House of Commons: Volume 1, 1547-1629* <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/commons-jrnl/vol1/pp598-600>> [accessed 10 May 2015].

¹⁵⁷ Quoted in Louis A. Knafla, *Law and Politics in Jacobean England: The Tracts of Lord Chancellor Ellesmere* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 63.

¹⁵⁸ Barnes, *Four bookes of offices*, sig. P2r.

¹⁵⁹ Guillaume de Salluste du Bartas, tr. William L'Isle, *Babilon, a part of the Seconde weeke* (London, 1595; STC 21662), sig. Cr.

passions through its collective reason', meaning that 'the rigorous enforcement of the law, or the use of the law to strengthen authority', was not seen as excessively harsh, but completely necessary.¹⁶⁰

The proceedings following the Gunpowder Treason of 1605 provides one example of the clear moral significance ascribed to kingly authority and James' right to regulate the body politic. William Smith's sermon to the king and court following the event described the plotters as cannibals:

These men were not content with dagger...and poison for their priuie plots...[but] a store-house of powder, to the which if all the fire of hell and Purgatorie could haue lent & sent but one spark, we had all been consumed...praised by to the Lord, who hath not giuen ouer for a praye to the teeth of those cursed Cannibals, who seeing they cannot satiat their mawes with the blood of *Christ*, in their vnbloody Sacrament, haue sought to ingorge & imbrew themselves with the blood of Seruants.¹⁶¹

The reference to cannibalism through transubstantiation allied confessional disputes with political avarice. Those who were hungry enough for 'the blood of *Christ*' would just as happily 'ingorge & imbrew' themselves with the blood of kings. The physician Francis Herring drew similar themes in his poem against the plot in 1617: 'They glut themselues, like Anthropophagi/With blood of men holy and innocent;/Our state to make a wofull Anarchy'.¹⁶² The horror of unbridled violence, coupled with false religious justification, contaminated the Lord's Supper by bringing vengeance to a sacred meal. As in his plague writings, Herring emphasised human agency within God's world order. Acts of treason were committed wilfully and were therefore inexcusable, surpassing the savagery of 'ignorant' Amerindians. The frequently-published work of Samuel Garey deemed Robert Catesby a cannibal for his actions, denouncing Rome's role in 'animating people to commit such villanies, which all Ethnickes (except sauages or Cannibals) abhorre, and condemne'.¹⁶³ The plotters had targeted the 'whole body of the Parliament house (the head, hart, eyes, braines, and vitall spirits of the politicke body of the Kingdome)' in an explosion that threatened to leave the realm headless.¹⁶⁴ In attempting 'the murder of Gods Anointed King', Catholics

¹⁶⁰ Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation*, p. 143.

¹⁶¹ William Smith, *The black-smith: a sermon preached at White-Hall before the Kings most excellent Maiesty* (London, 1606; STC 22881), sigs. D7r-D7v.

¹⁶² Francis Herring, *Mischeefes mysterie: or, Treasons master-peece, the Powder-Plot* (London, 1617; STC 13247), sig. E3v.

¹⁶³ Samuel Garey, *Great Britains little calendar* (London, 1618; STC 11597), sigs. Ddv, Gg3v.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. Gg4r.

proved that ‘the very Cannibals are not more thirsty of bloud’ that the realm’s own dissidents.¹⁶⁵

Civility, as a process of colonising the body, involved choosing to live in a way that dignified the human form. Both savage and seditious behaviour were described as a reversion to the feral, where a lack of reverence for the body of the individuals and the state promoted only disintegration, but also validated forcible restraint. In deeming those who wished evil on the king ‘Romish Cannibals’, Oliver Ormerod appealed to the constraining hand of the law through highly aggressive language:

Who would euer imagine, that the sonnes of men, could be thus sauage...thus I leaue them, wishing that they might be drawne on hurdles from the prison to the execution, to shew how they haue beene drawne by brutish affections: that their priuities might be cut off, & thrown into the fire, to shewe that they were vnworthie to be begotte[n], or to beget others: that their bellies might be ripped vp, & there harts torne out, & throwne into the same fire as being the fountain of such an vnheard treacherie; that their bodies, hauing harboured such wicked harts might be cut off from their heads and diuided into many quartars, as they were in the bodie politique diuided by treason, from the head and other sound moments: and that their quarters might be fixed vppon the gates of our Cities, and exposed to the eyes of men: that as their nefarious attempts were an euil example to others, so their quartered limmes might be a heedfull caueat.¹⁶⁶

While a sound body acted in accordance to the wishes of the king, the rebellious body opened itself to brutal correction. Though the hanging of dead bodies in public places might seem rather like the practices of human trophy-taking among the Tupinambá, the act was expressed as calculated – not an act of passion but of justice. In cases of treason, these writers articulated the need for law and violence to be used together. One without the other was weakness or tyranny; the essence of civility lay in balance and control. The strategy of violence, letting only the ‘corrupt blood’ from the body of the state, differed fundamentally from ‘cruell and bloodye Carrebyes’ warring in the Indies.¹⁶⁷

This was further seen in James’ vehement displeasure towards feuding and duelling. These acts, since they involved a subject’s handling of violence rather than the monarch’s, were described in language that paralleled cannibal actions. They involved a ‘bloodthirsty and reuenging appetite’ that depended on one’s

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., sig. Ir.

¹⁶⁶ Oliver Ormerod, *The picture of a papist* (London, 1606; STC 18850), sig. Tv.

¹⁶⁷ Nicholl, *An houre glasse of Indian newes*, sig. C4v.

‘owne vindictiue and bloody humour vpon so vniust a ground’.¹⁶⁸ Duels turned ‘courage barbarous’, and duellers into ‘enemies of humane society’, meddling in ‘an imaginary Honour’ that usurped the power of the sovereign prince.¹⁶⁹

Attacking the ‘arrogant conceits’ of his noblemen, James declared in 1613 that ‘no quarrell of any Subjects can be lawfull, except in defence of their Prince or their Countrey, the reuenging of all priuate wrongs onely belonging to Us’.¹⁷⁰ James stressed that any behaviour contrary to his wishes sprang from a self-serving attitude that proved destructive to the realm and which undermined his desire for domestic peace. Styling himself as shepherd and *rex pacificus* to his people, James deemed duels and the family feuds that generally preceded these as ‘dishonourable to God, disgracefull to the government, and dangerous to the p[er]sons’.¹⁷¹

This sentiment was also apparent in Thomas Middleton’s *The peace-maker* (1618), a tract that bore the king’s arms on the frontispiece, and which explicitly framed a vision of manful behaviour that rejected physical violence.¹⁷² The tract evocatively compared duellers to the bulls and bears in Southwark, chained in battle but equally destined for the slaughterhouse.¹⁷³ ‘We stand disobedient and repugnant to our owne iust punishment’, Middleton wrote, but ‘Vengeance is God’s alone; which no man ought to take in hand, but as deliuered from his hand; norso to imitate his Maiestie and Greatnesse, that does it not but by Authoritie’.¹⁷⁴ While the tract did not explicitly mention cannibalism, it drew a connection between behavioural degeneration and American influences. Violence, like tobacco, enchanted young men: ‘I thinke the Vapour of the one, and the

¹⁶⁸ *By the King. A proclamation prohibiting the publishing of any reports or writings of duels* (London, 1613; STC 8490), single sheet.

¹⁶⁹ Thomas Heigham’s translation of Guillaume de Chevalier, *The ghosts of the deceased sieurs* (Cambridge, 1624; STC 5129), sig. D5v.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ ‘An act to prevent duels and private combats’, 28 February 1621, TNA: PRO, SP 14/119, f. 263r; Proceedings of the Star Chamber, 13 February 1617, TNA: PRO, SP 13/90, f. 117; Chamberlain to Carleton, 22 February 1617, TNA: PRO, SP 14/90, f. 151. See also Richard Cust and Andrew Hopper, ‘Duelling and the Court of Chivalry in Early Stuart England’, *Cultures of Violence*, p. 157; Markku Peltonen, ‘Francis Bacon, the Earl of Northampton, and the Jacobean Anti-Duelling Campaign’, *The Historical Journal*, 44:1 (2001), pp. 1-28.

¹⁷² Thomas Middleton, *The peace-maker* (London, 1618; STC 14387); Gary Taylor, ‘Thomas Middleton (1580-1627)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <www.oxforddnb.com> [accessed 5 July 2015]. The tract was so aligned with James’ vision of peace that some historians have ascribed it to the king, though he likely commissioned it rather than penned it himself.

¹⁷³ Middleton, *The peace-maker*, sig. Dr.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, sigs. C2r, Dr.

vaine-glorie of the other, came into *England* much vpon a voyage, and hath kept as close together'.¹⁷⁵

Middleton, like James, consciously moulded a conception of honour that deferred to the authority of the sovereign. Here was a strain of honour, as identified by Richard Cust in his case studies on gentry litigation, that appealed to Protestant activism through public service.¹⁷⁶ To those who condemned violence beyond the reaches of the state, the persistence of slander and backbiting was endemic of behaving like 'savages'. James himself, but also counsellors, churchmen, and merchants, increasingly identified cannibal violence with the unofficial and therefore unlawful bloodshed of any who took violence into their own hands. Subjects, not the state, caused disorder:

They are more sauage then the sauages of America. They eate men, but they are either strangers, or their enemies: these kill themselues among themselues, kindred, neighbours, friends, conversing together...They doe it, not knowing the mischief; these doe it, knowing.¹⁷⁷

The general public's capacity for savagery was attacked in the aftermath of the Fatal Vespers, but also at the height of the Spanish Match crisis and in libels following the death of the Duke of Buckingham in 1628, where the rage and violence of the mob transformed them into cannibals: 'When hee was dead they would not let him rest/But did (like Anthropophagi) entreat/His very corps as if they kill'd to eate'.¹⁷⁸ The 'knowing' nature of disobedience, especially in widespread acts of disorder, confirmed the rightness of monarchical rule. The civil lawyer John Hayward denounced all those who believed the 'wil of the people' could ever maintain stability. 'Are you of ciuil either nature or education?' he asked. 'Who vnder the name of Ciuilian do open the way for all manner of deceits...? What are you? For you shewe you selfe more prophane then Infidels; more barbarous then Caniballs'.¹⁷⁹ Those who abandoned religion and fell into hate, spurning the Christian and civic values of an ordered society, fell into miserable conditions without a prince to govern them. 'You acknowledge no

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. D2v.

¹⁷⁶ Richard Cust, 'Honour and Politics in Early Stuart England: The Case of Beaumont v. Hastings', *Past and Present*, 149 (1995), pp. 57-94, p. 70.

¹⁷⁷ de Chevalier, *The ghosts of the deceased sieurs*, sig. C6v.

¹⁷⁸ 'On the death of the Duke of Buckingham', Huntington MS, HM 904, in *Early Stuart Libels* <www.earlystuartlibels.net> [accessed 28 March 2014]. Also Thomas Locke to Carleton, 14 September 1623, TNA: PRO, SP 14/152, f. 51.

¹⁷⁹ John Hayward, *An answer to the first part of certain conference, concerning succession* (London, 1603; STC 12988), sig. Tr.

religion but your will,' Hayward wrote, 'no law but your power: all lies, treacheries, and frauds'.¹⁸⁰

Hayward's beliefs, supported by James who granted him a knighthood in 1619, brought together the importance of a civil and religious realm propounded not only by the king but by the submission of his obedient subjects. Recent work on litigations in the Star Chamber and in country courts suggests that 'there is every indication that messages about the need for non-violent behaviour, which the crown had been drumming into its subjects for years, were getting through'.¹⁸¹ Appeals to the king and to local authorities in cases of duels and slander indicate the 'growing strength of respect for the law and the public service ethos in England', and the fact that gentlemen could and did appeal to justices of peace to settle matters of personal honour 'demonstrated the extent to which orderliness and restraint had become part of accepted standards of behaviour'.¹⁸² The value that many subjects placed on the law provided a contrast to the cultures of vengeance seen to dominate Amerindian tribes, but also countries like France where duels and religious persecution evaded the execution of justice.

The extremity of cannibal violence in discourse underlines the complexities of the Protestant vision of political participation in this period. Native customs were frequently brought to bear on ideas of civility, but they were done so to various purposes by James and his subjects, and these did not always align with each other. On one level, the vehement use of violent language in political discourse might indicate a submission to the king's wishes, supplanting the physicality of violence by channelling conflict through rhetoric and slander instead. As Cust found, members of the gentry involved in duels and litigation in early Stuart England understood 'that honour had to be defended within a framework of respect for the law and higher authority', suggesting that men's conduct was effectively 'shaped by the precepts of the classical moralists and their humanist interpreters', and the invectives against extreme violence may have served to underscore and codify these ideas.¹⁸³

On the other hand, many of James' subjects resisted his vision of a masculinity that eschewed violence altogether. Satirists and lawyers often

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, sig. V5v.

¹⁸¹ *Cultures of Violence*, p. 163.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

attributed court corruption and effeminising luxury to a weak monarchical government that sprang from peace.¹⁸⁴ Here, cannibal language served a different function. It enabled English subjects to reconcile James' views with their own, by professing their loyalty to the king and deferring to his royal will as supreme arbiter of temporal justice, while nevertheless promoting conflict in issues of state expansion and defence. The policy-makers and writers who endorsed the English imperial impulse rejected the exercise of violence as a communal affair by condemning the practices of South American tribes whose rituals were performed by men and women alike. This allowed them to depict the infliction of violence as the privilege of men who might exercise their aggression under the rhetoric of protecting the commonwealth and effacing 'savage' disorders.¹⁸⁵ This strain of cannibal rhetoric in discourses of state thereby became a means for subjects to uphold the language of serving the state, set in the context of combatting those who threatened to disturb the peace of the English commonwealth. Cannibal violence was consequently associated with almost every aspect of political and social transgression in the first two decades of the seventeenth century – murder, promiscuity, usury, enclosure, duelling, feuding, libelling, slander, papal deposition, transubstantiation, Irish resistance, Spanish domination, and the violation of international law through torture in the Amboyna affair of 1623.¹⁸⁶

Conclusion

Under James, cannibalism – not a staid re-emergence of an ancient idea, but a recognition of the practice as a historical reality existing concurrently to the European political situation, and distinct from hunger anthropophagy – began to take on a much more varied role in the expression of contemporary attitudes. Cannibals were consistently depicted as 'the enemies of mankind', embodying extreme savagery in a way that allowed policy-makers and writers to engage with the destructive consequences of rejecting the authority of the Crown and the

¹⁸⁴ Michelle O'Callaghan, *The Shepherds Nation: Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612 – 1625* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), p. 20.

¹⁸⁵ *Violent Masculinities: Male Aggression in Early Modern Texts and Culture*, ed. Jennifer Feather and Catherine E. Thomas (New York: Palgrave, 2013), p. 5.

¹⁸⁶ For the English reference to the Dutch as cannibals for their acts of violence in Amboyna, see Thomas Brockedon, Henrie Hawley, and John Goninge to the East Indie Company, 14 December 1623, in *Calendar of State Papers: Colonial, East Indies, China and Persia, Vol. 6, 1625-1629*, ed. W. Noel Sainsbury (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1884), p. 190.

orthodoxy of the Protestant Church.¹⁸⁷ This metaphor was used by James himself on at least two occasions to criticise subjects who put obstacles in the way of his royal prerogative. ‘I think you will ill liue like Cannibals vpon raw flesh’, James teasingly told his parliament in 1610, in response to their restrictions on his bill on forestry, ‘for the education of *this* people is farre from that’.¹⁸⁸ As in his written attack on Jesuit radicalism, James’ chosen metaphor pitted the flattering image of his obedient, mannerly subjects against the destructive potential of self-seeking behaviour.

Fears of unorthodoxy would never intersect so blatantly, and so frequently, with the figure of the cannibal. Why was this the case? Firstly, the influx of the cannibal metaphor was a response to a particular historical moment, one that was informed by contemporary English experiences in the Atlantic. This suggests that what contemporaries deemed this ‘Powder age’ – the years in which the Gunpowder conspiracy lingered powerfully in popular memory – was distinctly framed within a global vision of authority that was partly expressed through a Protestant imperial impulse that used ideas of savagery for political ends. There was a politics to bloodshed that the state increasingly sought to manage, and the pervasive choice of cannibalism as a fitting contrast to legitimate authority *within* England indicates the contemporary role of exploration on this process.

Secondly, the frequent invocation of Amerindian incivility in religious and political discourse emphasises the interconnection between the civilising and colonising initiatives explored in this thesis, as well as the creative adaptation through which subjects engaged with ideas of civility in relation to America. James, a self-styled peacemaker, was a king who much believed in the relationship between monarchical power and curbing aristocratic violence as well as subduing ‘savages’ on the fringes of his authority. He deployed ideas of savagery to appeal to his subjects’ obedience, which included a definition of civil manhood that disdained physical violence. The cannibal metaphor, as the final section suggested, allowed subjects to use ideas of extreme savagery in ways that both appealed to James’ concept of civility while also using the practice as a

¹⁸⁷ Pierre d’Avity, *The states, empires, & principalities of the world* (London, 1615; STC 988), sig. Aa2v.

¹⁸⁸ James I, ‘A speach at Whitehall’, in *The works of the most high and mightie prince* (London, 1616; STC 14344), sig. Zz3v (emphasis mine).

visceral, literal example of the threat to civil society that came from eschewing the exercise of legitimate violence.

James' subjects, however, never referred to the English state as cannibal, and this suggests that whatever their particular uses might indicate, metaphors of extreme violence perpetrated by antichristian 'savages' allowed for shared values between the Crown and its subjects. Whereas Spain's universal monarchy was consistently depicted as ravenous and insatiably destructive, James' subjects, no matter how resistant of his policies, never employed cannibalism as a metaphor for the king himself. Consistently portrayed as working for the common good, the state was in all ways opposite to the chaotic violence of illegitimate bloodshed, an idea subjects appeared to have accepted and subscribed to.¹⁸⁹ John Florio's 1613 translation of Montaigne's essays came closest to attacking state measures, but such views do not seem to have been shared by the majority. Montaigne believed that 'the Canibales and savage people' who consumed dead bodies were less savage than those who inflicted torture – 'even in matters of justice, whatsoever is beyond a simple death, I deeme it to be meere crueltie'.¹⁹⁰

Yet English writers never denied the state its right to practice violence through the execution of the law. The Frenchman Guillaume de Chevalier wrote that it was false to claim 'that there is no hurt to draw blood from a body full of euill humours', but this 'most caniball and bleeding maxime' was dangerous insofar as it encouraged subjects to take the law into their own hands.¹⁹¹ The state assertion of authority, the English maintained, operated differently: the 'mortall plague of Rebellion... is a sicknesse not to bee cured but by letting blood'.¹⁹² The many sources that contrasted English practices to Amerindian customs communicated the clear stance that in the politics of bloodshed, unchristian and uncivil values were equally invalid expressions of Englishness, in views that were appropriated in spaces as wide-ranging as the council chamber and Paul's Cross. Those who continued to act in stubborn error, whether native or dissident, subverted 'his Maiesties authentically power' with 'rebellious minds', transforming

¹⁸⁹ For a discussion on the disappearance of the cannibal metaphor under eighteenth-century views of the cruelty of an absolutist state, see Avramsecu, *An Intellectual History of Cannibalism*.

¹⁹⁰ 'Of Crueltie' in John Florio, *Essays written in French by Michael Lord of Montaigne* (London, 1613; STC 18042), sig. X5v.

¹⁹¹ Chevalier, *The ghosts of the deceased sieurs*, sig. Er. See also Patricia Palmer, 'At the Sign of the Head: The Currency of Beheading in Early Modern Ireland', in *Cultures of Violence*, p. 135.

¹⁹² Quoted in Palmer, 'At the Sign of the Head' in *Cultures of Violence*, p. 135.

into 'blind Cannibals in before God [and] their conscience'.¹⁹³ To English subjects, the literal, palpable sense that they waged constant warfare against the forces of sin and savagery made cannibals more real; but it also acknowledged the need for a government that could restrain those who failed to cultivate obedience in themselves.

¹⁹³ Deacon, *Tobacco tortured*, sigs. Z3v-Z4r.

Chapter Eight

Conclusion

In 1602, John Brereton encountered natives on the eastern shores of North America, and what he saw delighted him. ‘These peoples,’ he wrote, ‘are exceeding courteous’, taller than the English and possessing well-proportioned bodies.¹ Moreover, his new companions, Brereton acknowledged, had a pleasing aptitude for the English language. When he spoke to them, one responded with near-perfect imitation: ‘*How now (sirrha) are you so saucie with my Tobacco?*’² ‘We became very great friends,’ Brereton wrote, and ‘gaue them such meats as we had then readie dressed, whereof they misliked nothing but our mustard.’³

Brereton’s playful sense of companionship is poignant because it reflects a brief window of time in which intercultural harmony still seemed possible. But the Reformation had given England ‘effective sovereignty from all outside authorities for the first time’, and this self-conscious declaration of political legitimacy necessitated more vigorous campaigns to instil conformity at the same time as the state began to look beyond its borders, first in Ireland and then America.⁴ Beyond actions in the colonies themselves, this meant, as the sociologist Michael Hechter has argued, that ‘salient features of the colonial situation have persisted within the very boundaries of the developing metropolitan state’.⁵ The consequences of attempting to civilise others, regardless of its failures, marked English society and politics in unexpected ways.

The way that historians conceive of social and political change in this period owe much to Norbert Elias’ work on civility and state formation, a connection he believed fundamental to explaining modern European society.⁶ It has become commonplace to criticise Elias’ confidence in the progression of civilisation, but modifying Elias’ claims do not make them less useful. The aim here has not been to eviscerate his insights on state formation in the sixteenth and

¹ John Brereton, *A briefe and true relation of the discoverie of the north part of Virginia* (London, 1602; STC 3611), sig. Bv.

² *Ibid.*, sig. B2v.

³ *Ibid.*, sig. Br.

⁴ Michael Hechter, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development*, 2nd ed. (London: Transaction Publishers, 1999), p. 66.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

⁶ Norbert Elias, *The Civilising Process*, tr. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Blackwell, 1978), p. xvi; Stephen Mennell, *Norbert Elias: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), p. 31.

seventeenth centuries, but to frame civility less as a process than as a deeply-held conviction, a tool employed by various agents of the state in their attempt to consolidate their authority within the realm while looking to extend its bounds. This thesis focused on an element that Elias did not consider in any detail – how the English policy of civilising others contributed to how they understood and categorised themselves, particularly as participants of a political realm.

How, in other words, did intercultural encounters and expansion affect the English ‘process of becoming’?⁷ The absence of America and its peoples in scholarly discussions on civility, notably Anna Bryson’s *From Courtesy to Civility*, means that colonisation remains unconnected to changes within the metropolis itself, not least in developments of English urbanity and sociability. This thesis addressed this gap by exploring how the establishment of the first English colonies, and encounters with indigenous peoples, influenced the culture and politics of London in novel ways. It found that the Jacobean imperial impulse, with its civilising emphasis, did not just affix ideas of savagery to its expansionist rhetoric, but that savagery and its relation to the state formed a crucial part of how colonisation was conceived, articulated, and enacted at this time. Further, the experience of colonisation under James I contributed significantly to changing modes of civility and political participation in London, where colonial councils offered opportunities to contribute to the political life of the realm, and where Amerindian tropes were creatively adapted to comment on English behaviour. The unique presence of Amerindian customs, and the language of savagery, sun-worship, tobacco-smoking, and cannibalism in Jacobean political discourse, not only served distinct purposes to those who employed them, but can be used to assess some of the larger, broader processes that developed in England as a result of its earliest colonising initiatives in the Atlantic.

‘It is very easy,’ wrote the captive Frances Slocum in the eighteenth century, ‘to make an Indian out of a white man’.⁸ This was a sentiment most Jacobean Englishmen and women would have agreed with; the difference was that to Slocum, such a transformation was a matter of happiness and inclusion rather than disaster. Those who travelled up the James River or the Amazon might modify their opinion about native peoples, but the majority of Londoners in the

⁷ Elias, *The Civilising Process*, p. 303.

⁸ Quoted in James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 302.

early decades of the seventeenth century continuously portrayed them as misguided and uncivil, or, less indulgently, as recalcitrant hindrances to English cultivation. Before ‘race and colonialism, as well as race and slavery, became intimately co-dependent’, the belief that human beings were constantly capable of improvement and degeneration rendered behaviour an important factor in maintaining political order.⁹ This was especially true in the early seventeenth century, where the English colonial presence was by no means secure, and where the frail foundations of authority at Jamestown might at any moment be subsumed by ‘savages’.

This invited frequent comparisons between Amerindians and English subjects. Contrary to what might be expected, these comparisons were less often employed to highlight English superiority than to criticise English misbehaviour. This was visually rendered in a series of engraved plates from the early 1620s, in which couples from various nations represented the different months of the year. Accompanying poems perpetuated common assumptions about the ‘swilling German’ or the ‘fiery’ Spanish.¹⁰ Amongst lavishly-clad, turbaned Ottomans and fur-lined Laplanders, a pair of American natives appeared for August, wearing a mix of accessories from both North and South America, including skins, pearls, and a feathered headdress [Figure 8.1]. The following month depicted a fashionable, elite English couple strolling through a cultivated deer park [Figure 8.2]. Reinforcing the contrast between the two successive plates were the poems that accompanied them. The English virtue celebrated in September was temperance, but this also came with a warning – that ‘the well-temper’d English Nation’ should avoid, like the weather, to ‘begin decline’.¹¹ This complimented the inscription for August, which specifically alluded to the degeneration that might accompany a lapse in perfect civility: ‘were it not for shame/Our selues like them would naked shun the flame’.¹² The self-restraint seen to define Englishness was therefore contingent on a control of impulse, explicitly and uniquely contrasted against the behaviour of native Americans. James’ own *Counterblaste*

⁹ Rozann Wheeler, *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), p. 10.

¹⁰ The XII Mounthes of the Yeaere in the Habits of Severall Nations, c. 1620-1623, BM 1870, 0514.

¹¹ Ibid, BM 1870, 0514.1152r.

¹² Ibid, BM 1870, 0514.1153r.



Figure 8.1. The XII Mounthes of the Yeare in the Habits of Severall Nations, c. 1620-1623, BM 1870, 0514.1152r.



Figure 8.2. The XII Mounthes of the Yeare in the Habits of Severall Nations, c. 1620-1623, BM 1870, 0514.1153r.

to tobacco (1604), the first work he published after ascending the English throne, is a highly-politicised example of this tendency towards Anglo-Amerindian comparison, where the king conjured a realm in which American incivility seduced his subjects and undermined his sovereign authority.

The six main chapters in this thesis all addressed aspects of this tension between political civility and perceptions of native savagery. Chapter Two established the extent to which subjects invested in the colonial ideal, from courtiers to members of parliament to parishioners in the localities, and explored how the language of cultivation and planting lent itself to parallels between expansion and internal order. Land, wrote the Irish colonist and Inns of Court lawyer John Davies in 1612, must be thoroughly razed before it could be planted, and would soon grow wild again without constant cultivation: ‘So a barbarous Country must first be broken by a warre...and when it is fully subdued and conquered, if it bee not well planted and gouerned...it wil est-soones often return to the former Barbarisme’.¹³ The civilising initiatives already underway in England, the product of the Protestant state’s concern with moral reform and discipline through education, encouraged behavioural comparisons between Englishmen and other peoples who were perceived to have strayed from the model of perfect cultivation. The planting metaphor, like the plantation system, acknowledged the need for violence and force in subjugating savagery.

The chapters on Ireland and Jamestown explored the connection between English colonial experiences, and the articulation of incivility in London in relation to these prolonged engagements, and conflicts, with indigenous peoples. Highlighting the connection between colonial agents and policy-makers in the metropolis, these chapters argued that patronage networks, and the relatively contained number of colonists in the plantations, made the struggle for English political ascendancy an important element of the state’s own conception of savagery and political disorder. Rather than remote actions on the peripheries of government, events in the colonies prior to mass migration were intimately connected to the attitudes of those who governed the state and localities in England. One result was that the inability to fully eradicate local customs among the Gaelic Irish and Algonquian, whether in abolishing native clothing or in

¹³ John Davies, *A discoverie of the true causes why Ireland was neuer entirely subdued* (London, 1612; STC 6348), sig. Bv.

educating and converting native children, prompted the English to address their own deficiencies in governing effectively in response to these failures. What James had envisaged in his *Counterblaste*, however exaggerated, seemed confirmed in the unstable first decades of settlement. The massacre in Virginia in 1622, in the eyes of Londoners, proved in a real sense the danger of cultural compromise. ‘Do your hearts,’ the lawyer Christopher Brooke scathingly inquired after the attack, echoing James’ own words eighteen years before, ‘performe in Manners, Life, and Act,/Those parts that really confirme you?’¹⁴ Rejecting civility became tantamount to betrayal, and the English insistence on their cultural superiority was an important strategy precisely because their ‘imperial structure [was] weak’.¹⁵

At the same time, this moment of political weakness in America was precisely what made vehement policies against ‘savages’ so recurrent in Jacobean discourse, before any real sense of empire had been achieved. Accusations of savage behaviour and dissent were imbued with contemporary meanings that must be understood in the context of colonisation. As the Iroquois and Tupí understood in a more physical sense, to incorporate something was to transfer some of its qualities into themselves. Chapters Three, Four, Six, and Seven explored the use of Amerindian metaphors and imagery in Jacobean London in relation to performance, civility, tobacco-smoking, and violence. The mistrust of non-Protestant rituals made the Powhatan a threat to civil order, but it also lent itself to conceiving Catholics to be *like* the Powhatan. Comparisons between Englishmen and ‘savage Indians’ appeared in everything from anti-tobacco polemic to tracts about the Gunpowder Treason, manuscript poems by Inns of Court students to treatises against transubstantiation. The level of cultural refraction suggests a collective engagement with expansion, and a widespread subscription to ideas of civility and savagery within the realm that encouraged subjects to think about themselves within this framework of expansion and historical progression.

These chapters further considered how the presence of Amerindian culture in London inevitably affected the topography of the city, where ‘civilising centres’ like Whitehall, parliament, and the Inns espoused the ideals of planting, increasingly viewing colonisation as a legitimate component to political

¹⁴ Christopher Brooke, ‘A Poem on the Late Massacre in Virginia’, in *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 72:3 (1964), pp. 259-292, p. 279.

¹⁵ Hechter, *Internal Colonialism*, p. 64.

participation. These gentlemen and policy-makers not only contributed significant funds to the voyages, but became involved with the governing of the companies' affairs. 'I have heard some of them-selves saye [of the London council],' wrote Nathaniel Butler in 1620, 'that they have every daye spent twelve houres in the studying the courses that concerne the Plantations'.¹⁶ Others, like the Gray's Inn member Francis Wyatt, felt impelled to become governors themselves.

Ideas of civility and savagery were not always imposed top-down by an absolutist-minded James, but invoked by a range of subjects, to different ends. This suggests a broad spectrum of status interaction through which codes of behaviour were expressed and sometimes subverted, from the instance of a woman calling a fellow parishioner a 'cannibal whore', to law students criticising the religious or political opinions of their peers by mocking their proclivity for tobacco and 'common discourse'. In other cases, associations with savagery served to undermine the authority of the state, seen, for example, in condemned prisoners smoking on their way to the scaffold, or members of the Gaelic nobility choosing to wear their mantles during their visits to parliament in Dublin. 'Even acts of rigorous prohibition', therefore, might produce 'alternative, displaced versions of the proscribed behaviours, when performers test the limits of the law, incorporating innovations that would not have existed otherwise'.¹⁷

Tobacco-smoking, but also the adoption of long hair, and court performances that enabled courtiers and young men to dress up as Virginian natives or 'Amazonians', provoked policy-makers to consider the extent to which appearance and visual expressions of incivility might be indulged or condemned. For the first time, definitions of urbanity acknowledged the presence of savagery in a controlled way. Gentlemen might smoke tobacco and play at Virginians, prancing before James in feathers and body paint, but they also sat on colonial councils that sought to increase the state's control over exotic goods. Similarly, though poets might praise the seductive notion of an un-possessed America, comparing bodies and landscapes in the fantasies of submission, they also sought preferment by involving themselves in Virginia Company affairs, and devoted

¹⁶ Governor Nathaniel Butler to the Earl of Warwick, 9 October 1620, in *The Rich Papers: Letters from Bermuda, 1615 – 1646*, ed. Vernon A. Ives (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), p. 187.

¹⁷ Joseph Roach, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), p. 56.

significant amounts of time to sitting on colonial councils or representing joint-stock companies in the embittered litigation disputes of the 1620s.

On an ideological level, it is possible to see a cross-over between expansion and the post-Reformation process of more invasive centralisation. This led to a unique element in discourses of state authority, where the perceived savagery of Amerindians was used to condemn politically-transgressive behaviour through appearance, norms, and customs. The attention to civility and state formation must therefore consider the role of incivility in this process, where the Stuart concern with wilful corruption made the rhetoric of savagery particularly relevant to a king who had already initiated the subjugation of Gaelic populations in Scotland and Ireland. Given the moral edge to politics at this time, the difficulties that arose from reconciling exoticism and cultural compromise, smoking and civil behaviour, were important to how English subjects viewed themselves and articulated their values. The introduction of luxury goods like tobacco might be seen as a precursor to coffee house culture, while the tensions between 'going native' and expressing cultural superiority through habits like smoking brought more sophisticated expressions of political economy and sociability. In the concern with visual displays of conformity, including clothing and gesture, stereotypes of exoticism and savagery from Ireland and America played a role in how hierarchy was articulated with increasing detail in relation to other peoples.

In these ways, the 'act' of Jamestown – of establishing a colony in the name of the king in 1607, and of investing thousands of subscribers' own pounds and resources to assure its survival – changed the way Jacobean policy-makers envisaged the realm, committing the Crown and parliament to colonial rule beyond the British Isles for the first time. Encounters with native practices, and attempts to find new sources of revenue, created points of tension that effected real change in social attitudes towards consumption and self-presentation. This was seen most blatantly in debates over tobacco and its relationship to civility. By the late 1620s, the state had modified its policies towards tobacco as a result of events in Virginia and on the continent. Tobacco lost its primary association with savagery, replaced by the image of smoking as a sign of support for the royal colony and a condemnation of Catholic Spain's aggressive assertion of universal monarchy. This continued under Charles I, where smoking became a marker of

cultural sophistication and political allegiance among members of the elite who supported the Crown.

This may have contributed to the development of more stratified forms of status distinction, identified by both Anna Bryson and Alexandra Shepard, which emerged partly from the unstable social milieu of a city whose population was growing, and diversifying, on an unprecedented level. While the Virginia enterprises were mocked in Ben Jonson, George Chapman, and John Marston's play *Eastward Ho!* (1605), scholars often ignore the networks of information and involvement that underpinned even the most satiric of views. Criticisms were less often the result of vague hearsay than expressions of disappointment in the failure to achieve the goals of plantation. Jonson and Chapman frequented the Mermaid Tavern, where prominent backers of the Virginia Company also met, and Marston was a student at the Middle Temple; these poets and playwrights also praised Raleigh's Guiana ventures, included Amerindians in court entertainments and city pageants, and depicted tobacco-smokers on the stage. What was emerging were complex attitudes towards colonisation and uncivil behaviour. These both confirmed English confidence in their own cultural superiority while challenging, and shaping, pre-existing notions of urbanity, introducing new practices and standards of expected behaviour. Shepard argued that civility became increasingly socially distinctive, where larger amounts of the male population sought to find alternative forms of asserting status. As this thesis has suggested, ideas of status interaction can be enhanced by considering the culture of project participation and gentlemanly endorsement of expansion on this process.

More specifically, the role of colonial involvement, and the promulgation of civility in relation to new patterns of consumption, can be incorporated into scholarship on early modern sociability, masculinity, and political friendships. The networks of colonial promotion at the Inns suggests a generational dynamic that was crucial to the advancement of the English colonial projects at this time. Young men, often sons or brothers to those who first sought to colonise Ireland under Elizabeth, were heirs to their family's interests in plantation. Most prominently, this included the secretary of state William Cecil and his son Robert, but also Humphrey Gilbert and his half-brother Walter Raleigh, Francis Wyatt and his brother Hawte, Sir Henry Sidney and his son Philip, Sir Edwin Sandys and his brother George, Nicholas Ferrar and his sons Nicholas and John, and Nathaniel

Rich and his brother Robert. Scholars who highlight the similarities between the Irish and American plantation schemes might also consider the differences that developed from this generational shift. The friendships, as well as rivalries, apparent in company networks were crucial to how colonisation was conceived and implemented. As Wesley Craven noted, the ‘widely divergent interests and opinions...made it impossible for these men to view and question [affairs in the colonies] dispassionately’.¹⁸

The absence of colonisation in recent literature on the culture of the Inns of Court is one area of study that has suffered by ignoring the impact of colonial networks on English society. The repercussions of this are significant, since the Inns, and the sometimes radical literary communities within them that intersected with parliamentary politics, have been seen as a locus for political innovation and change in the seventeenth century.¹⁹ Young, politically-engaged gentlemen read the compendia by Hakluyt and Purchas, wrote treatises endorsing plantation, and smoked tobacco in their chambers. The Molyneux Globes, acquired and perhaps commissioned by the Middle Temple in 1592, were updated into the early 1600s to show increased English activity in Virginia and Guiana. The bold claims to ownership, penned over the American landscape on these globes, serve as a remarkable comment on English pretensions to territorial acquisition at this time, but also indicate the active engagement students and lawyers had with colonising projects during a formative time in their education. Work remains to be undertaken on the relationship between the ideals and rhetoric of colonisation and the interpersonal nature of political access characteristic of the early seventeenth century, where friendships were articulated in terms of obligation, service, and conquest. ‘Went you to conquer?’ Donne complained to his friend, Henry Wotton, who had accompanied the earl of Essex to Ireland in 1599, ‘And have so much lost/Yourself?...Let not the soul...Itself unto the Irish negligence submit.’²⁰

Donne also shared a chamber at Lincoln’s Inn with Christopher Brooke, himself heavily involved with the Virginia Company, and the friendships fostered at the Inns offer insight into how colonisation was legitimised and actualised at in

¹⁸ Wesley Frank Craven, *Dissolution of the Virginia Company: the Failure of a Colonial Experiment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1932), p. 141.

¹⁹ Michelle O’Callaghan, *The Shepherds Nation: Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612 – 1625* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000).

²⁰ ‘Henrico Wotton in Hibernia Belligeranti’, in *The Poems of John Donne: Volume I*, ed. Robin Robbins (New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 89.

the early seventeenth century. This also points to the study of spaces like the Inns, and London more generally, as useful sites for analysis, where westward projects were debated and promoted in various but converging ways. The intersecting spheres of the Inns, royal court, and parliament brought ideas from America to the City and Westminster, where colonial projects manifested themselves in the embodiment of Amerindians in court masques, processions, and the popular stage. Absent from scholarship on early modern London, including J.F. Merritt's edited collection, are considerations of how London itself became a colonising space. This might be from an intellectual or cultural perspective, where acts of submission to English royal authority were played out and sometimes subverted, but also in the establishment of colonial courts and as a centre of expansionist activity that converged with politics at Westminster. Sensitive to the peculiarities of the English political and legal system, and fearing these procedures might destabilise his authority as king, James kept the profession of law one of the most closely-regulated professions of his reign.²¹ The fashion for colonisation at the Inns, and members' promotion of it at Whitehall, likely served to advance plantation more immediately in the royal sphere as a result.

While scholars increasingly seek to situate the Atlantic within English history, including Ken Macmillan's *The Atlantic Imperial Constitution*, such works have tended to keep concepts of mercantilism, law, and territorial acquisition as their focus.²² When they consider the 'imperial, sovereign, and prerogative force' of overseas charters, it is usually to catalogue the development of an imperial system, one that downplays the role of experiences in Ireland in the sixteenth century, as well as the enduring concepts of civility and savagery that accompanied early modern colonisation.²³ These works also tend to adopt a *longue durée* approach to plantation. This thesis has chosen to provide a close study of the initial policies and ideas that underpinned colonisation, in order to

²¹ Christopher W. Brooks, *Pettyfoggers and Vipers of the Commonwealth: The 'Lower Branch' of the Legal Profession in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 161. See also Colin Kidd, 'Royal Panic Attack', *London Review of Books* <www.lrb.co.uk> [accessed 1 June 2015].

²² Ken Macmillan, *The Atlantic Imperial Constitution: Centre and Periphery in the English Atlantic World* (New York: Palgrave, 2011); L.H. Roper, *The English Empire in America, 1602-1658: Beyond Jamestown* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009); Andrew Fitzmaurice, *Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonisation, 1500 – 1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

²³ Macmillan, *The Atlantic Imperial Constitution*, p. 24.

detect the particular ways that they affected the metropolis in the aftermath of the establishment of the first settlements. Throughout, it has catalogued an imperial impulse that must not be assumed to be a full-fledged manifestation of any ‘Atlantic imperial constitution’ or colonial system. Instead, this thesis has instead sought to show how an engagement with America and its inhabitants in the Jacobean period can contribute particularly to the history of London in the 1610s and 1620s.

These findings contain several implications for the study of James’ reign. First, it calls for a reassessment of James’ own relationship to Virginia and to his subjects’ expansionist initiatives. While historians have assumed James remained relatively uninterested in colonisation, this seems to result from attempts to locate empire in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Looking backwards from the vantage point of more developed articulations of empire, the absence of economic success beyond the beginnings of a tobacco monopoly, alongside James’ own dislike of smoking, have blinded historians to the ways in which subjects, as well as the king, intellectually engaged with Amerindian customs. By locating America as a frame of reference in political tracts, satire, speeches, conduct manuals, and performances, this thesis has argued that outward-looking expansionist initiatives played a role in James’ articulation of politics and conformity, as it did in the language and attitudes exhibited by the networks of state more widely.

Second, reactions to savage behaviour, drawing on pre-existing conceptions but amplified by the precariousness of the English presence in America, exhibited a distinct way of looking at the world that should be situated within an understanding of the Jacobean period more widely. The various uses of savagery and civility do not undermine, but heighten, their significance as a prism through which subjects thought about politics and their own place in the world. However peace-loving James was, his subjects, on the whole, did not share his sensibilities, and expressed frustration at James’ unwillingness to declare war to protect the values of his Protestant nation. The Middle Templar Simonds d’Ewes expressed shame at how callously ‘men generally slight and disregard the loss of so mild and gentle a Prince’ following James’ death in March 1625, where coroners reportedly commented on the king’s ‘considerate’ but ‘extraordinarily

fearful' heart.²⁴ Authors and policy-makers developed rhetorical strategies that pandered to James' peaceful vision of *imperium* through planting that nonetheless articulated the right to subjugate those they considered a threat to their civil polity. James' desire to unite Scotland and England under one crown after 1603, and the Virginia project of 1607, both required the king to navigate strong English assertions of cultural superiority, and an 'imperialistic vision [that] favoured the subjugation of vassal nations through conflict rather than amity'.²⁵ The state-sanctioned language of eradicating 'savages' while promoting cultivated behaviour encouraged outward displays of refinement while justifying harsh measures against those who behaved outside the bounds of an increasingly stratified society. Accusations of the English adopting types of Amerindian incivility pointed to a keen awareness of the ways in which subjects were expected to conduct themselves in order to gain political access or social acceptance. These notions were tied to an informed realm that processed, and responded to, the news and reports they received from places like Virginia, Ireland, and the Caribbean.

At the same time, the concern with English behaviour points to the real presence of native peoples behind representations through discourse, attire, performance, and consumptive practices. Here, too, a focus on the Jacobean is important, since the mass migration to North America under Charles removed the immediate threat of failure that had caused such hysteria in discourses under James. The Algonquian attacks in Virginia show how much had changed between 1622 and 1644. The same Powhatan leader, Opechancanough, staged both attacks, but only the first seriously threatened to eliminate the English presence. Survivors in 1622 articulated the Amerindian threat as a matter of political urgency:

This deadly stroake being given to the great amazment and Ru[i]ne of o[u]r state, caused our Governo[u]r and Counsell w[i]th all seed for safety of the rest (lest the Indians should tak corage to pursue what they had begun) to recollect the straglinge and woefull inhabitants so dismembred into stronger bodies and more secure places...the Savadges likewise from whom we hoped to haue helpe by trade, prooued o[u]r most trecherous enemies, cunningly circumventinge and cruelly Murdering such as were employed abroad to get relief from them.²⁶

²⁴ *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds d'Ewes, Vol. 1*, ed. James Orchard Halliwell (London: Richard Bentley, 1845), p. 265.

²⁵ Jannis Jane Darvill Mills, 'Early Modern Legal Poetics and Morality, 1560 – 1625' (University of Sussex, unpublished PhD thesis, 2011), p. 162.

²⁶ Copy of a Brief Declaration of Virginia in the first 12 years', 1624, FP 353, *Virginia Company Archives* <<http://www.virgionacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>> [accessed 18 September 2014].

Both sides seeking to undermine the other, factions in the London council used relations with the Algonquian to express the varying failures of the enterprise, framing this in the context of James' authority. 'We never perceived that the natives of the country did voluntarily yield themselves as subjects to our gracious sovereign', accused the general assembly, reflecting on the years of Smith-Warwick ascendancy, 'neither that they took pride in that title, nor...could [we] at any time keep them in such good respect of correspondency'.²⁷ Virginia therefore became a critical microcosm for discussions of state and monarchical sovereignty, in ways that influenced James' own conception of imperial control. Amerindians would never be more present, or relevant, in English discourse than they were in the 1610s and 1620s. They embodied, in a physical, contemporary way, the real possibilities, in the eyes of the English, of degeneration through both sin and wilful error, and were invoked precisely because they occupied the English imagination beyond the abstract. For a king who used civility to encourage obedience among his subjects, the reality of Virginia's political disorder and weakness in the face of 'savages' seemed to highlight the real possibility that the civilising and colonising ideals that underpinned each other might fail without royal intervention. Though the reality of native interactions with colonists can seem elusive, therefore, the indigenous peoples of America played a small but important role in how the Crown conceived of its authority at this time.

Finally, the sheer amount of creative refraction of Amerindian tropes in a range of discourse suggests that English colonisation in the early seventeenth century deserves more than a footnote in early Stuart scholarship. While joint-stock companies existed under Elizabeth, the westward companies were crucially different in that they invited questions over settlement and the governance of other peoples. A recent article on statecraft in early Stuart England argued that the humanist emphasis on conversation, travel, and reading offered a 'political interpretive frame' through which subjects engaged with the affairs of the realm under James and Charles.²⁸ In researching the interplay between concepts of

²⁷ 'The answer of the General Assembly in Virginia', 20 February 1624, in *Jamestown Narratives: Eyewitness Accounts of the Virginia Colony: the First Decade: 1607 – 1617*, ed. Edward Wright Haile (Virginia: Roundhouse, 1998), p. 915.

²⁸ Noah Millstone, 'Seeing Like a Statesman in Early Stuart England', *Past and Present*, 223:1 (2014), pp. 77-127, at p. 82.

incivility and America, savagery and the state, this thesis contends that changing modes of civility through expansion offered an additional way through which subjects engaged with political culture, putting into practice what Elizabethan authorities had conceived of, but failed to achieve, by expanding the bounds of the English state.

A review of the House of Commons database from 1604 to 1629 similarly neglected to see colonisation as containing any real relevance to English history. Noting a few of the Atlantic peregrinations made by members of parliament, it lamented the unfortunate demise of George Thorpe: ‘the Powhatans slaughtered him’.²⁹ The vague recognition of a political realm, whether at court or in parliament, involved with colonisation therefore creeps into historiography but rarely figures in discussions of seventeenth-century politics or discourse. Projecting Thorpe as dying senselessly as a result of native brutality in a faraway corner of the world does little to elucidate Thorpe’s commitment to Protestant expansion – enough to induce him to migrate himself – or to the escalating Anglo-Amerindian conflicts that informed the vehement debates in parliament and London councils at this time. Acknowledging the role of expansion and company conflict on the process of political participation, and on the growing ambitions of members of the ruling elite in relation to government, allows historians to gain a more comprehensive view of the development of English culture and political practice in the seventeenth century.

This frame of reference contributed to the self-perception of a realm that increasingly understood itself by looking outward. In the Kentish countryside, George Wyatt, proud father of the governor Francis, corresponded with his son on Algonquian stratagems of war, and collected verses written by the local vicar that lauded Francis’ virtuous duty abroad. Employing the metaphor of the beehive so popular to Elizabethan and Jacobean notions of the perfect commonwealth, the elder Wyatt now included a new emphasis in this English model of governance. For good or ill, those armed to defend the realm and protect its orthodoxies – ‘skild and resolvd to fight’ – now faced new directions, and this was reflected in the closing lines of Wyatt’s poem: ‘To gather wax and Hony to their Hiue...To

²⁹ Thomas Cogswell, ‘The Human Comedy in Westminster: *The House of Commons, 1604–1629*’, *Journal of British Studies*, 52:2 (2013), pp. 370–89, p. 376.

drink thos Nectars gladdinge God and men...Their young broode, they in colonise [colonies] out send.³⁰ The dissolving bounds between cultures that occurred as a result transformed the Jacobean realm far more than it succeeded in its aim of 'civilising' the peoples beyond it.

³⁰ George Wyatt, untitled and undated [early seventeenth century], BL: Add MS 62135 (II), f. 331r. See also the altered title between Charles Butler's first edition of *The feminine monarchie, or the historie of bees* (1609), and the second edition in 1623, whose title page now included 'Their Generation, and Colonies' (London, 1623; STC 4193).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPTS

British Library, London

Add MS 12496, Papers of Sir Julius Caesar, Master of the Rolls

Add MS 22176, Commonplace book of John Mallacke

Add MS 25303, Miscellaneous English poems of the seventeenth century

Add MS 27278, Memorandum book of Sir Francis Bacon

Add MS 29598, Miscellaneous letters of Sir Walter Raleigh

Add MS 34599, Correspondence and papers of Sir Henry Spelman

Add MS 38823, Sir Edward Hoby's commonplace book

Add MS 61683, Blenheim Papers

Add MS 62135 (I & II), Wyatt Family Papers

Add MS 73085, Sir Walter Raleigh: documents and letters, 1558 – 1603

Cotton MS Otho E VIII, Papers relating to the Admiralty

Egerton MS 2978, Miscellaneous state papers, 1603 – 1659

Lansdowne MS 112, Burghley Papers

Royal MS 17 B XIII, 'The way to weldoeing', Robert Bradshaw

Royal MS 18 A XI, 'A true relation of the state of Virginia', John Rolfe

Sloane MS 1622, 'The historie of travaile into Virginia', William Strachey

Sloane MS B 3272, Papers relating to Sir Walter Raleigh's voyages to Guiana

Edinburgh University Library

De.3.76

MS.La.III.283

Hatfield House, Hertfordshire

CP Petitions 721, 1186

Cecil Papers 41, 42, 48, 67, 75, 81, 87, 102 112, 120, 122, 124, 129, 130, 139, 152, 177, 186, 189, 192, 196

Middle Temple, London

MT 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 15

The National Archives, Kew

CO 1, State Papers Colonial

E 215, Exchequer, Records of the Commissions on Fees

PC 2, Privy Council Registers

SP 12, State Papers Domestic, 1558 – 1603

SP 13, State Papers Domestic: Large Documents, 1558 – 1603

SP 14, State Papers Domestic, 1603 – 1640

SP 15, State Papers Addenda, Edward VI – James

SP 54, State Papers Scotland (II)

SP 59, State Papers Scotland, Borders, 1558 – 1603

SP 62, State Papers Ireland, 1553 - 1558

SP 63, State Papers Ireland, 1558 – 1782

SP 70, State Papers Foreign, 1558 – 1577

PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

Contemporary Printed Sources

Acosta, José de, *The naturall and morall historie of the East and West Indies* (London, 1604; STC 94)

Adams, Thomas, *The blacke devil* (London, 1615; STC 107)

Alexander, William, *An Encouragement to Colonies* (London, 1624; STC 341)

The arraignment and conviction of Sr Walter Rawleigh (London, 1628; Wing A3744)

Attersoll, William, *The badges of Christianity* (London, 1606; STC 889)

d'Avity, Pierre, *The estates, empires, & principalities of the world* (London, 1615; STC 988)

Bacon's Essays: With Annotations, ed. Richard Whately (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1858)

Barclay, William, *Nepenthes, or, The vertues of tabacoo* (Edinburgh, 1614; STC 1406)

Bargrave, Isaac, *An exact and sound discovery of the chiefe mysteries of iesuiticall iniquity* (London, 1619; STC 14529)

Barlowe, William, *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse* (London, 1601; STC 1454)

Barnes, Barnes, *Foure bookes of offices* (London, 1606; STC 1468)

Bartas, Guillaume de Salluste du, *Babilon, a part of the Seconde weeke* (London, 1595; STC 21662)

Bayly, Lewis, *The practice of pietie* (London, 1613; STC 1602)

Beaumont, Francis, *The knight of the burning pestle* (London, 1613; STC 1674)

Beaumont, John, *The metamorphosis of tabacco* (London, 1602; STC 1695)

Becon, Richard, *Solon his follie* (London, 1594; STC 1653)

Bennett, Edward, *A treatise deuided into three parts* (London, 1620; STC 1883)

Boys, John, *An exposition of the dominical epistles and gospels used in our English liturgie* (London, 1610; STC 3458)

Bonoeil, John, *His Maiesties gracious letter to the Earle of South-Hampton* (London, 1622; STC 14378)

Botero, Giovanni, *Relations of the most famous kingdomes and commonwealths thorowout the world* (London, 1630; STC 3404)

Brathwaite, Richard, *A solemne ioviall disputation* (London, 1617; STC 3585)

--- *Whimzies: or, a new cast of characters* (London, 1631; STC 3591)

Brereton, John, *A briefe and true relation of the discoverie of the north part of Virginia* (London, 1602; STC 3611)

Brinsley, John, *A consolation for our grammar schooles* (London, 1622; STC 3767)

Brooke, Christopher, 'A Poem on the Late Massacre of Virginia (1622)', *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 72:3 (1964), pp. 259-92

Bullock, William, *Virginia impartially examined, and left to publick view* (London, 1649; Wing B5428)

Burton, Henry, *The baiting of the Pope's bull* (London, 1627; STC 4137.3)

Burton, Robert, *The anatomie of melancholy* (Oxford, 1621; STC 4159)

Burton, William, *The rowsing of the sluggard* (London, 1595; STC 4176)

Butler, Charles, *The feminine monarchie, or the historie of bees* (London, 1623; STC 4193)

Butts, Henry, *Dyets dry dinner* (London, 1599; STC 4207)

By the King. A proclamation against making of starch (London, 1620; STC 8633)

By the King. A proclamation concerning ale-houses (London, 1618; STC 8588)

By the King. A proclamation concerning tobacco (London, 1624; STC 8738)

By the King. A proclamation concerning wyer, threed, and other manufactures made of gold and siluer (London, 1623; STC 8711)

By the King. A proclamation prohibiting the publishing of any reports or writings of duels (London, 1613; STC 8490)

By the king. A proclamation for suppressing insolent abuses committed by base people against persons of qualitie (London, 1621; STC 8666)

By the King. A proclamation to restraine the planting of tobacco in England and Wales (London, 1619; STC 8622)

By the King. Whereas at the humble suit and request of sundry our louing and well disposed subiects... (London, 1621; STC 8660)

By the Lords Deputie and Councell whereas for preuention of such disorder, ryots, and rebellions within this realme (Dublin, 1625; STC 14190.5)

By the Maior. A proclamation for the reformation of abuses, in the Gaole of New-gate (London, 1617; STC 16727.1)

By the Queene. The excess of apparel, and the superfluitie of unnecessary forreyne wares therto belongyng (London, 1574; STC 8066)

By the Queene. The Queenes Maiestie considering to what extremeties a great number of her subiectes are growen, by excesse in apparel...(London, 1566; STC 7995)

C.T., *An advice how to plant tobacco in England and how to bring it to colour and perfection* (London, 1615; STC 23612)

Camden, William, *Annales of the true and royall history of the famous emperesse Elizabeth* (London, 1625; STC 4497)

--- *Britain* (London, 1637; STC 4510.8)

Certaine acts particularlie recommended by our most gracious and sacred soveraine to the Estates of Parliament of the Kingdome of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1609; STC 21892.7)

Chapman, George, *The memorable masque of the two honourable Houses or Innes of Court* (London, 1614; STC 4982)

--- *Monsieur D'Oliue* (London, 1606; STC 4983)

Clapham, Henoeh, *A chronological discourse* (London, 1609; STC 5336)

Colville, John, *The paraenese of admonition of Jo: Coluille* (Paris, 1602; STC 5589)

Coperario, John, *The maske of flowers* (London, 1614; STC 17625)

Copland, Patrick, *A declaration how the monies...were disposed* (London, 1622; STC 5726)

Cotta, John, *A short discoverie of the vnobserved dangers of seuerall sorts of ignorant and vnconsiderate practisers of physicke in England* (London, 1612; STC 5833)

Crakanthorpe, Richard, *A sermon at the solemnizing of the happie inauguration* (London, 1609; STC 5979)

Crashaw, William, *A sermon preached in London before the right honorable the Lord Lawarre* (London, 1610; STC 6029)

Cresswell, Joseph, *A proclamation published vnder the name of Iames King of Great Brittainy, St Omer*, 1611; STC 8448)

Crooke, Helkiah, *Mikrokosmographia, a description of the body of man* (London, 1615; STC 6062)

The crying Murther (London, 1624; STC 24900)

Cushman, Robert, *A sermon preached at Plimmonth in New-England* (London, 1622; STC 6149)

Davies, Sir John, *A discourse of the true causes why Ireland was neuer entirely subdued* (London, 1612; STC 6348)

Deacon, John, *Tobacco tortured, or, the filthie fume of tobacco refined* (London, 1616; STC 6436)

Dekker, Thomas, *The guls horne-booke* (London, 1609; STC 6500)

--- *The shoemakers holiday* (London, 1600; STC 6523)

Dekker, Thomas and Thomas Middleton, *The roaring girle* (London, 1611; STC 17908)

Derrick, John, *The image of Irelande* (London, 1581; STC 6734)

Dickenson, John, *Aristotles politiques* (London, 1598; STC 760)

Digges, Thomas, *Foure paradoxes, or politique discourses concerning militarie discipline* (London, 1604; STC 6872)

Ditchfield, Edward, *Considerations touching the new contract for tobacco* (London, 1625; STC 6918)

Donne, John, *Foure sermons vpon special occasions* (London, 1625; STC 7042)

--- *Poems, by J.D. With elegies on the authors death* (London, 1633; STC 7045)

Draxe, Thomas, *The earnest of our inheritance together with a description of the new heauen and the new earth* (London, 1613; STC 7184)

Duncon, Eleazar, *The copy of a letter* (London, 1606; STC 6164)

Earle, John, *Micro-cosmographie* (London, 1628; STC 7440.2)

Eburne, Richard, *A plaine path-way to plantations* (London, 1624; STC 7471)

Eden, Richard, *The decades of the newe worlde or west India* (London, 1555; STC 647)

Egerton, Thomas, *The speech of the Lord Chancellor of England, in the Eschequer Chamber, touching the post-nati* (London, 1609; STC 7540.5)

Elyot, Thomas, *Bibliotheca Eliotae Eliotis librarie* (London, 1542; STC 7659.5)

--- *The dictionary of syr Thomas Eliot knight* (London, 1538; STC 7659)

Estienne, Henri, *A world of wonders* (London, 1607; STC 10553)

- Finch, Henry, *Law, or a discourse thereof* (London, 1627; STC 10871)
- Floyd, John, *The ouerthrow of the Protestants pulpit-Babels* (St-Omer, 1612; STC 11111)
- *Purgatories triumph ouer hell* (St-Omer, 1613; STC 11114)
- Floyd, Thomas, *The picture of a perfit common wealth describing aswell the offices of princes* (London, 1600; STC 11119)
- Ford, John, *A line of life* (London, 1620; STC 11162)
- Foxe, John, *The Pope confuted* (London, 1580; STC 11241)
- Gainsford, Thomas, *The glory of England* (London, 1618; STC 11517)
- Gallobelgicus, *Wine, beere, ale, and tobacco. Contending for superiority* (London, 1630; STC 11542)
- Gardiner, Edmund, *Physicall and approved medicines* (London, 1611; STC 11564.5)
- Garey, Samuel, *Great Brittans little calendar* (London, 1618; STC 11597)
- Gataker, Thomas, *Maskil le-David* (London, 1620; STC 11655)
- Gee, John, *The foot out of the snare* (London, 1624; STC 11701)
- Gilpin, Bernard, *A godly sermon preached in the court at Greenwich* (London, 1581; STC 11897)
- Goodwin, George, *Babels balm: or The honey-combe of Romes religion* (London, 1624; STC 12030)
- Gosselin, Peter, *The state-mysterries of the Iesuites* (London, 1623; STC 12092)
- Grahame, Simion, *The anatomie of humors* (Edinburgh, 1609; STC 12168)
- Granger, Thomas, *A familiar exposition or commentarie on Ecclesiastes* (London, 1621; 12178)
- Grant, Edward, *A president for parentes* (London, 1571; STC 20057.5)
- Gray, Robert, *A good speed to Virginia* (London, 1609; STC 12204)
- Grimeston, Edward, *A table of humane passions* (London, 1621; STC 5473)
- Haec-Vir: or, the womanish-man* (London, 1620; STC 12599)
- Hagthorpe, John, *Englands-exchequer* (London, 1625; STC 12603)
- *Visiones rerum* (London, 1623; STC 12604)

Hakluyt, Richard, *The discoveries of the world from their first original* (London, 1601; STC 11543)

--- *The principal nauigations, voyages, traffiques and discoveries of the English nation* (London, 1599; STC 12626a)

Hall, Joseph, *Virgidemiarum* (London, 1598; STC 12717)

Hamor, Ralph, *A true discourse of the present state of Virginia* (London, 1615; STC 12736)

Hampton, William, *A proclamation of warre from the Lord of Hosts* (London, 1627; STC 12741)

Harcourt, Robert, *A relation of a voyage to Guiana* (London, 1613; STC 12754)

Hariot, Thomas, *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia* (London, 1588; STC 12785)

--- *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia* (London, 1590; STC 12786)

Hart, James, *Klinike, or The diet of the diseased* (London, 1633; STC 12888)

Heigham, Thomas, *The ghosts of the deceased sieurs* (London, 1624; STC 5129)

Herring, Francis, *Mischeefes mysterie: or, Treasons master-peece, the Powder-Plot* (London, 1617; STC 13247)

Herring, Theodore, *The triumph of the Church over water and fire* (London, 1625; STC 13204)

Hic mulier: or, the man-woman (London, 1620; STC 13375.5)

Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan* (London, 1651; Wing H2246)

Hoby, Edward, *A counter-snarle for Ishmael Rabshacheh* (London, 1613; STC 13539)

Holinshed, Raphael, *The firste volume of the chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande* (London, 1577; STC 13568b)

Holyday, Barten, *Technogamia: or The marriages of the arts* (London, 1618; STC 13617)

Hurault, Jacques, *Politicke, moral, and martial discourses* (London, 1595; STC 14000)

Hutton, Henry, *Follie's anatomie* (London, 1619; STC 14028)

- I.D., *A confession of Christian religion* (London, 1609; STC 6172a)
- Innes, William, *A bundle of myrrhe: or Three meditations of teares* (London 1620; STC 14091)
- James I, *An apologie for the oath of allegiance* (London, 1609; STC 14401.5)
- *A counterblaste to tobacco* (London, 1604; STC 14363)
- *Meditation vpon the Lord's Prayer* (London, 1619; STC 14384)
- *A remonstrance of the most gracious King James I* (Cambridge, 1616; STC 14369)
- *The workes of the most high and mightie prince, Iames by the grace of God* (London, 1616; STC 14344)
- Jerome, Stephen, *Englands Iubilee, or Irelands ioyes Io-paeen* (Dublin, 1625; STC 14511.5)
- *Moses his sight of Canaan* (London, 1614; STC 14512)
- Johnson, Richard, *Noua Britannia* (London, 1609; STC 14699.3)
- Jonson, Ben, *The alchemist* (London, 1612; STC 14755)
- *The comical satyre of every man out of his humor* (London, 1600; STC 14768)
- *Ben Ionson, his Case is alterd* (London, 1609; STC 14757)
- Kemys, Lawrence, *A relation of the second voyage to Guiana* (London, 1596; STC 14947)
- King, John, *A sermon preached at White-Hall the 5. Day of November* (London, 1608; STC 14986)
- Know all men by these presents, that wee Thomas Walsingham, William Wythiness, and Henry Sneglar, knight...* (London, 1620; STC 9175)
- Moore, John, *A mappe of mans mortalitie* (London, 1617; STC 18057)
- Las Casas, Bartholomew de, *The Spanish colonie, or Briefe chronicle of the acts and gestes of the Spaniardes in the West Indies* (London, 1583; STC 4739)
- Leigh, Dorothy, *The mothers blessing* (London, 1616; STC 15402)
- Leighton, Alexander, *Speculum belli sacri* (Amsterdam, 1624; STC 15432)
- Loe, William, *Vox clamantis* (London, 1621; STC 16691)

Lupton, Thomas, *A persuasion from papistrise written chiefly to the obstinate, determined, and dysobedient English papists* (London, 1581, STC 16950)

Lyte, Henry, *Rams little Dodeon, a briefe epitome of the new herbal* (London, 1606; STC 6988)

Malynes, Gerard, *Saint George for England* (London, 1601; STC 17226a)

Marlowe, Christopher, *Ouid's elegies three books* (London, 1603; STC 18931)

Melton, John, *Astrolgaster, or, the figure-caster* (London, 1620; STC 17804)

--- *A sixe-folde politician* (London, 1609; STC 17805)

Monardes, Nicolás, *Ioyfull newes out of the newe founde worlde* (London, 1580; STC 18006)

Montes, Gonzáles de, *The full, ample, and punctuall discouery of the barbarous, bloody, and inhumane practices of the Spanish Inquisition* (London, 1625; STC 11999)

Moore, John, *A target for tillage* (London, 1612; STC 18058)

Mornay, Philippe de, *Fowre bookes, of the institution, vse and doctrine of the holy sacrament of the Eucharist in the old Church* (London, 1600; STC 18142)

--- *A woorke concerning the trewnesse of the Christian religion* (London, 1587; STC 18149)

Morton, Thomas, *New English Canaan* (London, 1637; STC 18203)

Moryson, Fynes, *An Itinerary* (London, 1625; STC 18205)

Munday, Anthony, *The admirable deliuerance of 266. Christians by Iohn Raynard Englishman from the captiuitie of the Turkes* (London, 1608; STC 18258)

Münster, Sebastian, *A treatyse of the newe India with other new founde lands and islandes* (London, 1553; STC 18244)

A new and short defense of tabacco, with effects of the same, and of the right vse thereof (London, 1602; STC 6468.5)

Nicholl, John, *An houre glasse of Indian newes* (London, 1607; STC 18532)

Nicholls, John, *The oration and sermon made at Rome* (London, 1581; STC 18535)

Norden, John, *A pathway to patience* (London, 1626; STC 18615)

--- *Speculum Britanniae* (London, 1593; STC 18625)

- Ormerod, Oliver, *The picture of a papist* (London, 1606; STC 18850)
- Parrot, Henry, *Laquei ridiculosi: or Springes for woodcocks Caueat emptor* (London, 1613; STC 19332)
- Peacham, Henry, *The compleat gentleman* (London, 1622; STC 19502)
- *The garden of eloquence* (London, 1577; STC 19497)
- *The garden of eloquence*, 2nd ed. (London, 1593; STC 19498)
- Peckham, George, *A true reporte, of the late discoueries* (London, 1583; STC 19523)
- Peyton, Thomas, *The glasse of time* (London, 1620; STC 19824)
- Philaretus, *Work for chimney-sweepers* (London, 1602; STC 12571)
- A pittillesse mother* (London, 1616; STC 24757)
- Price, Daniel, *Sauls prohibition staide...with a reproofe of those that traduce the honourable plantation of Virginia* (London, 1609; STC 20302)
- Prynne, William, *The vnclouelinesse, of loue-lockes* (London, 1628; STC 20477)
- Purchas, Samuel, *Purchas his pilgrimes* (London, 1613; STC 20505)
- *The kings towre* (London, 1623; STC 20502)
- *Purchas his pilgrimes* (London, 1625; STC 20509)
- Raleigh, Walter, *The discouerie of the large, rich, and bewtiful empire of Guiana* (London, 1596; STC 20634)
- *The history of the world* (London, 1614; STC 20637)
- *Remains of Sir Walter Raleigh* (London, 1657; Wing R180)
- The Red-Crosse, or, Englands Lord haue mercy vpon vs* (London, 1625; STC 20823)
- Reynolds, John, *Vox Coeli* (London, 1624; STC 20946.8)
- Rich, Barnabe, *Allarme to England* (London, 1578; STC 20979)
- *Faultes faults, and nothing else but faultes* (London, 1606; STC 20983)
- *The honestie of this age* (London, 1614; STC 20986)
- *My ladies looking-glasse* (London, 1616; STC 20991.7)

--- *A new description of Ireland* (London, 1610; STC 20992)

--- *A short suruey of Ireland* (London, 1609; STC 20992)

Rous, Francis, *The diseases of the time* (London, 1622; STC 21340)

Rowlands, Samuel, *The letting of humors blood in the head-vaine* (London, 1613; STC 21397)

Sanderson, Thomas, *Of romanizing recusants, and dissembling Catholicks* (London, 1611; STC 21711)

Scot, Thomas (polemicist), *An Experimentall discoverie of Spanish practices* (London, 1623; STC 22077)

--- *Vox populi* (London, 1620; STC 22100.2)

Scot, Thomas (poet), *Philomythie* (London, 1622; STC 21871)

Scull, John, *Two sermons* (London, 1624; STC 22123)

Shakespeare, William, *Comedies, histories, & tragedies* (London, 1623; STC 22273)

Skelton, John, *Elynour Rummin, the famous ale-wife of England* (London, 1624; STC 22614)

Smith, John, *The generall historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles* (London, 1624; STC 22790)

--- *A map of Virginia* (Oxford, 1612; STC 22791)

--- *The true travels, adventures, and observations of Captaine Iohn Smith* (London, 1630; STC 22796)

Smith, William, *The black-smith: a sermon preached at White-Hall before the Kings most excellent Maiesty* (London, 1606; STC 22881)

A Spectacle for vsurers (London, 1606; STC 23030.3)

Speed, John, *The history of Great Britaine under the conquests of the Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans* (London, 1611; STC 23045)

--- *The theatre of the empire of Great Britaine* (London, 1612; STC 23041)

Stafforde, Robert, *Geographicall and Anthological descriptions of all the empire and kingdoms* (London, 1607; STC 23135)

Stoneham, Matthew, *Two sermons of direction for iudges and magistrates* (London, 1608; STC 23290)

Strachey, William, *For the colony in Virginea Brittania. Lawes diuine, morall and martiall* (London, 1612; STC 23350)

Sutcliffe, Matthew, *The blessings on Mount Gerizzim, and the curses on Movnt Ebal* (London, 1625; STC 23466)

--- *The subuersion of Robert Parsons his confused and worthlesse worke* (London, 1606; STC 23469)

Sutton, Christopher, *Godly meditations vpon the most holy sacrament of the Lordes Supper* (London, 1601; STC 23491)

Sutton, Edward, *Anthropophagus: the man-eater* (London, 1624; STC 23496).

Sylvester, Josuah, *Tobacco batterd, or pipes shatterd* (London, 1621; STC 23582a)

Symonds, Williams, *Virginia. A sermon preached at White-chappel* (London, 1609; STC 23594)

T.C., *A short discourse of the New-found-land* (Dublin, 1623; STC 4311)

T.G., *The rich cabinet* (London, 1616; STC 11522)

T.W., *The arraignment and execution of the late traytors* (London, 1606; STC 24916)

Table-oberuations (London, 1615; STC 23634.7)

Taylor, John, *All the workes of Iohn Taylor the water-poet* (London, 1630; STC 23725)

Thevet, André, *The new found worlde* (London, 1568; STC 23950)

Tomkins, Thomas, *Lingua: or, The combat of the tongue* (London, 1607; STC 24104)

Vaughan, William, *Approved directions for health, both naturall and artificiall* (London, 1612; STC 24615)

--- *The arraignment of slander periury blasphemy, and other malicious sinnes* (London, 1630; STC 24623)

--- *The golden-groue* (London, 1600; STC 24610)

Venner, Tobias, *A briefe and accurate treatise, concerning, the taking of the fume of tobacco* (London, 1621; STC 24642)

Virginia Company, *Londons lotterie* (London, 1612; STC 16756.5)

--- *A declaration for the certaine time of drawing the great standing lottery* (London, 1616; STC 24833.8)

Walkington, Thomas, *The optick glasse of humors* (London, 1607; STC 24967)

Ward, Samuel, *Woe to drunkards* (London, 1622; STC 25055)

A warning for fair women (London, 1599; STC 25059)

Whitaker, Alexander, *Good newes from Virginia* (London, 1613; STC 25354)

Williams, John, *A sermon of apparell* (London, 1620; STC 25728.5)

Wilson, Thomas (clergyman), *A commentarie vpon the most diuine Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes* (London, 1614; STC 25791)

Wilson, Thomas (privy councillor), *The arte of rhetorique* (London, 1553; STC 25799)

--- *A discourse vppon vsurye by waye of dialogue and oracions* (London, 1572; STC 25807)

Wood, William, *New Englands prospect* (London, 1634; STC 25957)

Yates, John, *A modell of divinitie* (London, 1622; STC 26085)

The yonger brother his apology by it selfe (St Omer, 1618; STC 715)

Manuscript Sources in Printed Editions

Aristotle, *Politics*, tr. Ernest Baker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds d'Ewes, Vol. 1, ed. James Orchard Halliwell (London: Richard Bentley, 1845)

Aristotle, *Politics*, tr. Ernest Baker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds d'Ewes, Vol. 1, ed. James Orchard Halliwell (London: Richard Bentley, 1845)

Bradford, William, *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620 – 1647: The Complete Text*, ed. Samuel Eliot Morison (New York: Knopf, 1952)

Calendar of Carew Papers in the Lambeth Library, 1598 – 1600, Vol. 3, ed. J.S. Brewer and William Bullen (London: Kraus, 1974)

Calendar of State Papers: Colonial, East Indies, China and Persia, Vol. 6, 1625 – 1629, ed. W. Noel Sainsbury (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1884)

Calendar of State Papers: Colonial, Vol. I, 1574 – 1660, ed. W. Noel Sainsbury (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1860)

Calendar of State Papers: Colonial, Vol. 9: 1675-1676, and Addenda 1574 – 1674, ed. W. Noel Sainsbury (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1893)

Calendar of State Papers: Domestic, Charles I: 1629 – 1631, ed. John Bruce (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1860)

Calendar of State Papers: Domestic, James I: 1619 – 1623, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1858)

Calendar of State Papers: Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Vol. 15, 1617 – 1619, ed. Allen B. Hinds (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1909)

Calendar of State Papers: Relating to the English Affairs in the Archives of Venice Vol. 18, 1623 – 1625, ed. Allen B. Hinds (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1912)

A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts: With Indexes of Persons, Places, and Matters: Vol. I, ed. Robert Nares *et al.* (London: Record Commission, 1808)

Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *Tusculan Disputations*, tr. A.E. Douglas (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1990)

Colonising Expeditions to the West Indies and Guiana, 1623 – 1667, ed. V.T. Harlow (London: Hakluyt Society, 1925)

Criminal Trials, Vol. I, ed. David Jardine (London: M.A. Nattali, 1846)

'Documents of Sir Francis Wyatt, Governor: 1621 – 1626', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 7:1 (1927), pp. 42-7

--- *William and Mary Quarterly*, 7:2 (1927), pp. 125-31

--- *William and Mary Quarterly*, 7:3 (1927), pp. 204-14

--- *William and Mary Quarterly*, 8:3 (1928), pp. 157-67

Donne, John, *The Major Works*, ed. John Carey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)

--- *The Poems of John Donne: Volume I*, ed. Robin Robbins (New York: Routledge, 2008)

An Elizabethan in 1582: The Diary of Richard Madox, Fellow of All Souls, ed. Elizabeth Story Donno (London: Hakluyt Society, 1976)

- English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon, 1550 – 1646*, ed. Joyce Lorimer (London: Hakluyt Society, 1989)
- The Four Voyages of Christopher Columbus*, ed. and tr. J.M. Cohen (London: Penguin, 1969)
- The Genesis of the United States: A Narrative of the Movement in England, 1605 – 1615: Vol. I*, ed. Alexander Brown (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1890)
- ‘George Percy’s “Trewe Relacyon”: A Primary Source for the Jamestown Settlement’, ed. Mark Nicholls, *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 113:3 (2005), pp. 212-75
- ‘Good newes from Virginia, 1623’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 5:3 (1948), pp. 351-58
- Hans Staden’s True History*, tr. and ed. Neil L. Whitehead and Michael Harbsmeier (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008)
- Hobbes, Thomas, *De Cive: or, the Citizen* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Inc., 1949)
- Jamestown Narratives: Eyewitness Accounts of the Virginia Colony: the First Decade: 1607 – 1617*, ed. Edward Wright Haile (Virginia: Roundhouse, 1998)
- The Jamestown Voyages Under the First Charter, 1607 – 1609, Vol. I*, ed. Philip L. Barbour (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969)
- The Jamestown Voyages Under the First Charter, 1606 – 1609: Vol. II*, ed. Philip L. Barbour (London: Hakluyt Society, 1969)
- Journal of the House of Commons: Vol. 1, 1547 – 1629* (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1802)
- Léry, Jean de, *History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil*, tr. Janet Whatley (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992)
- ‘A Letter of Advice to the Governor of Virginia, 1624’, ed. J. Frederick Fausz and John Kukla, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 34:1 (1977), pp. 104-29
- ‘Letter of Sir Francis Wyatt, Governor of Virginia, 1621 – 1626’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 6:2 (1926), pp. 114-21
- London Consistory Court Depositions, 1586 – 1611: List and Indexes*, ed. Loreen L. Giese (London: London Record Society, 1995)
- Masques of Difference: Four Court Masques by Ben Jonson*, ed. Kristen McDermott (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007)

Memoir of Reverend Patrick Copland: Rector Elect of the First Projected College in the United States, ed. Edward N. Neill (New York: Charles Scribner & Co, 1871)

The Middle Temple Documents Relating to George Chapman's Memorable Masque, ed. Tucker Orbison (Oxford: Malone Society, 1983)

The Middle Temple Records, Vol. I: 1501 – 1603, ed. Charles Henry Hopwood (London: Butterworth & Co, 1904)

Newfoundland Discovered: English Attempts at Colonisation, 1610 – 1630, ed. Gillian T. Cell (London: Hakluyt Society, 1982)

'Notes', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 68:1 (1960), pp. 107-8

Records of Early English Drama: Cambridge, Volume I, ed. Alan H. Nelson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989)

Records of the Virginia Company, Vol. I, ed. Susan Myra Kingsbury (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1906)

Records of the Virginia Company, Vol. II, ed. Susan Myra Kingsbury (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1906)

Records of the Virginia Company, Vol. III, ed. Susan Myra Kingsbury (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1933)

Records of the Virginia Company, Vol. IV, ed. Susan Myra Kingsbury (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1935)

The Rich Papers: Letters from Bermuda, 1615-1646, ed. Vernon A. Ives (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984)

Seventeenth-Century Political and Financial Papers: Camden Miscellany XXXIII, ed. David R. Ransome (London: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society, 1996)

Sir Ferdinando Gorges and His Province of Maine, ed. James Phinney Baxter (Boston: Prince Society, 1890)

Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603 -1625, ed. James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973)

Spenser, Edmund, *A View of the State of Ireland*, ed. Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997)

Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol. I, ed. James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973)

Tudor Royal Proclamations Vols. II & III, ed. P.L. Hughes and J.F. Larkin (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969)

The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, Vol. IX, ed. A. R. Waller (New York: Octagon Books, 1969)

The Works of Michael Drayton: Vol. II, ed. William J Hebel (Oxford: Blackwell, 1932)

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adrian, John M., *Local Negotiations of English Nationhood, 1570 – 1680* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011)

Amussen, Susan Dwyer, ‘Punishment, Discipline, and Power: the Social Meanings of Violence in Early Modern England’, *Journal of British Studies*, 34:1 (1995), pp. 1-34

Anderson, Susan Campbell, ‘A Matter of Authority: James I and the Tobacco War’, *Comitatus*, 29 (1998), pp. 136-63

Andrews, K. R., ‘Beyond the Equinoctial: England and South America in the Sixteenth Century’, *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 10:1 (1981), pp. 4-24

Arens, William, *The Man-Eating Myth: Anthropology and Anthropophagy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979)

Arlidge, Anthony, *Shakespeare and the Prince of Love: The Feast of Misrule in the Middle Temple* (London: Giles de la Mare, 2000)

Armitage, David, ‘Greater Britain: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis?’, *The American Historical Review*, 104:2 (1999), pp. 427-45

--- *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Aston, Margaret, *The King’s Bedpost: Reformation and Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)

Avramescu, Cătălin, *An Intellectual History of Cannibalism*, tr. Alistair Ian Blyth (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009)

Axtell, James, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985)

Bailyn, Bernard, *The Barbarous Years: The Peopling of British North America: The Conflict of Civilizations, 1600 – 1675* (New York: Knopf, 2012)

Baker, Ernest, *The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle*, 2nd ed. (New York: Dover, 2009)

Beaver, Daniel, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence Before the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Bellany, Alastair, 'Mistress Turner's Deadly Sins: Sartorial Transgression, Court Scandal, and Politics in Early Stuart England', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 58:2 (1995), pp. 179-210

Beyond the Covenant Chain: the Iroquois and Their Neighbours in Indian North America, 1600 – 1800, eds. Daniel K. Richter and James H. Merrell (Philadelphia: Penn State University Press, 2003)

Bourke, Richard, 'Pocock and the Presuppositions of the New British History', *The Historical Journal*, 53:3 (2010), pp. 747-70

Braddick, Michael, 'Introduction: the Politics of Gesture', *Past and Present*, 203 (2009), pp. 9-35

--- 'Cranfield, Lionel, first earl of Middlesex (1575-1645)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <www.oxforddnb.com>

--- *State formation in Early Modern England, 1550 – 1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Breen, T.H., *Tobacco Culture: the Mentality of the Great Tidewater Planters on the Eve of the Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985)

The British Atlantic World, 1500 – 1800, eds. David Armitage and Michael Braddick (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002)

British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland, eds. Ciaran Brady and Jane H. Ohlmeyer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Brooks, Christopher W., *Pettyfoggers and Vipers of the Commonwealth: The 'Lower Branch' of the Legal Profession in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)

Bryson, Anna, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Burke, Peter, *Varieties of Cultural History* (Cambridge: Polity, 1997)

Bushnell, Rebecca, *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996)

--- *Green Desire: Imagining Early Modern English Gardens* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003)

The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism, ed. Jill Kraye
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Cannibalism and the Colonial World, eds. Francis Barker, Peter Hulme and Margaret Iversen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Canny, Nicholas, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established*
(Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1976)

--- 'The Ideology of English Colonisation: From Ireland to America',
The William and Mary Quarterly, 30:4 (1973), pp. 575-98

--- *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560 – 1800*
(Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1988)

--- *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University
Press, 2001)

--- 'O'Neill, Hugh, second earl of Tyrone (1550-1616)', *Oxford
Dictionary of National Biography* <www.oxforddnb.com>

--- 'Writing Early Modern History: Ireland, Britain, and the Wider
World', *The Historical Journal*, 46:3 (2003), pp. 723-47

Carlos, Ann M. and Stephen Nicholas, 'Theory and History: Seventeenth-
Century Joint-Stock Chartered Trading Companies', *Journal of Economic
History*, 56:4 (1996), pp. 916-24

Carroll, Stuart, *Blood and Violence in Early Modern France* (Oxford: Oxford
University Press, 2006)

*Catholics and the 'Protestant Nation': Religious Politics and Identity in Early
Modern England*, ed. Ethan Shagan (Manchester: Manchester University Press,
2005)

Cell, Gillian T., 'The Newfoundland Company: A Study of Subscribers to a
Colonising Venture', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 22:4 (1965), pp. 611-
25

Chaudhuri, K.N., *The English East India Company: The Study of an Early
Joint-Stock Company, 1600 – 1640* (London: Routledge, 1999)

Chaplin, Joyce, *Subject Matter: Technology, the Body, and Science on the
Anglo-American Frontier, 1500 – 1676* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
Press, 2001)

Civil Histories, eds. Peter Burke, Brian Harrison and Paul Slack (Oxford:
Oxford University Press, 2000)

Clothing Culture, 1350-1650, ed. Catherine Richardson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004)

Cogswell, Thomas, 'The Human Comedy in Westminster: *The House of Commons, 1604 – 1629*', *Journal of British Studies*, 52:2 (2013), pp. 370-89

--- 'Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 60:3 (1997), pp. 303-26

Colley, Linda, *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600 – 1850* (London: Pimlico, 2003)

Collins, Stephen L., *From Divine Cosmos to Sovereign State: An Intellectual History of Consciousness and the Idea of Order in Renaissance England* (Oxford University Press, 1989)

Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485 – 172, eds. Steven G. Ellis and Sarah Barber (London: Longman, 1995)

Contested Spaces in Early America, eds. Juliana Barr and Edward Countryman (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014)

Cowan, Brian, *The Social Life of Coffee: The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005)

Cramsie, John, 'Commercial Projects and the Fiscal Policy of James VI and I', *The Historical Journal*, 43:2 (2000), pp. 345-64

--- *Kingship and Crown Finance Under James VI and I, 1603 – 1625* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002)

Craven, Wesley Frank, *Dissolution of the Virginia Company: the Failure of a Colonial Experiment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1932)

--- 'An Introduction to the History of Bermuda', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 17:3 (1937), pp. 317-62

Croft, Pauline, *King James* (New York: Palgrave, 2003)

--- 'Cecil, Robert, earl of Salisbury (1563-1612)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<http://oxforddnb.com>>

Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe, ed. Herman Roodenburg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Cultures of Violence: Interpersonal Violence in Historical Perspective, ed. Stuart Carroll (New York: Palgrave, 2007)

- Cunningham, Andrew and Ole Peter Grell, *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Religion, War, Famine, and Death in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Cust, Richard, 'Honour and Politics in Early Stuart England: The Case of Beaumont v. Hastings', *Past and Present*, 149 (1995), pp. 57-94
- Davis, Natalie Zemon, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France: Eight Essays* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975)
- Dickason, Olive P., *The Myth of the Savage and the Beginnings of French Colonialism in the Americas* (Alberta: University of Alberta Press, 1984)
- Dimmock, Matthew, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005)
- Doan, James E., "'An Island in the Virginia Sea': Native Americans and the Irish in English Discourse, 1585-1640", *New Hibernia Review*, 1:1 (1997), pp. 79-99
- Donegan, Kathleen, *Seasons of Misery: Catastrophe and Colonial Settlement in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014)
- Dunlevy, Mairead, *Dress in Ireland* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1989)
- Elias, Norbert, *The Civilising Process*, tr. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Blackwell, 1978)
- Elliott, J.H., *The Old World and the New, 1492 – 1650*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)
- Ellis, Steven G., *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447 – 1603: English Expansion and the End of Gaelic Rule* (London: Longman, 1998)
- *Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power: The Making of the English State* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995)
- Fausz, J. Frederick, 'An "Abundance of Blood Shed on Both Sides": England's First Indian War, 1609-1614', *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 98 (1990), pp. 3-56
- 'The Invasion of Virginia: Indians, Colonialism, and the Conquest of Cant: A Review Essay on Anglo-Indian Relations in the Chesapeake', *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 95:2 (1987), pp. 133-56
- Festa, Thomas, 'The Metaphysics of Labour in John Donne's Sermon to the Virginia Company', *Studies in Philology*, 106:1 (2009), pp. 76-99
- Fitzmaurice, Andrew, 'The Civil Solution to the Crisis of English Colonisation, 1609-1625', *The Historical Journal*, 42:1 (1999), pp. 25-51

--- ‘The Commercial Ideology of Colonization in Jacobean England: Robert Johnson, Giovanni Botero, and the Pursuit of Greatness’, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 64:4 (2007), pp. 791-820

--- *Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonisation, 1500 – 1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Flavin, Susan, ‘Consumption and Material Culture in Sixteenth-Century Ireland’, *Economic History Review* 64:4 (2011), pp. 1144-74

Foucault, Michael, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, tr. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1979)

Friedman, Ellen G., ‘Christian Captives at “Hard Labor” in Algiers, 16th –18th Centuries’, *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 13:4 (1980), pp. 616-32

Friends and Enemies in Penn’s Woods: Indians, Colonialists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania, eds. William Pencak and Daniel K. Richter (Philadelphia: Penn State University Press, 2004)

Fryer, Peter, *Staying Power: the History of Black People in Britain* (London: Pluto, 1984)

Games, Alison, ‘The English Atlantic World: A View from London’, *Pennsylvania History*, 64 (1997), pp. 46-72

--- *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560 – 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Gaskill, Malcolm, *Between Two Worlds: How the English Became Americans* (New York: Basic Books, 2014)

Goodman, Jordan, *Tobacco in History: The Cultures of Dependence* (London: Routledge, 1993)

--- *Tobacco in History and Culture: an Encyclopaedia* (Michigan: Thomson Gale, 2005)

Graves, R.B., ‘Review of *The Rose and the Globe – Play-Houses of Shakespeare’s Bank-Side, Southwark: Excavations 1988-90* by Julian Bowsher and Pat Miller for the Museum of London Archaeology’, *Theatre Journal*, 63 (2011), pp. 146-7

Greenblatt, Stephen, *Marvellous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991)

--- *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980)

- Gurr, Andrew, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Hall, Catherine, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830 – 1867* (Cambridge: Polity, 2002)
- Hämäläinen, Pekka, 'Lost in Transitions: Suffering, Survival, and Belonging in the Early Modern Atlantic World', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 68:2 (2011), pp. 219-23
- Handley, Stuart, 'Spelman, Sir Henry (1564-1641)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <www.oxforddnb.com>
- Harkness, Deborah and Jean E. Howard, 'Introduction: The Great World of Early Modern London', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 71:1 (2008), pp. 1-9
- Healy, Margaret, *Fictions of Disease in Early Modern England: Bodies, Plagues and Politics* (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001)
- Hechter, Michael, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development*, 2nd ed. (London: Transaction Publishers, 1999)
- Henshall, Audrey S. *et al.*, 'The Dungiven Costume', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology* 24/25 (1961/1962)
- Herrmann, Rachel B., 'The "tragical historie": Cannibalism and Abundance in Colonial Jamestown', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 68:1 (2011), pp. 47-74
- Himmelman, P. Kenneth, 'The Medicinal Body: An Analysis of Medicinal Cannibalism in Europe, 1300 - 1700', *Dialectical Anthropology*, 22:2 (1997), pp. 183-203
- Hindle, Steve, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, 1550-1640* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000)
- A History of the University in Europe, Vol. 2*, ed. Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Hodgen, Margaret T., *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964)
- Hollis, Daniel W., 'The Crown Lands and the Financial Dilemma in Stuart England', *Albion*, 26:3 (1994), pp. 419-442
- Hollis, Gavin, "'He would not goe naked like the *Indians*, but cloathed just like our selves": Disguise and "the Naked Indian" in Massinger's *The City Madam*', *Renaissance Drama*, 39 (2011), pp. 129-62
- Horn, James, *Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994)

--- *A Land As God Made It: Jamestown and the Birth of America* (New York: Basic Books, 2005)

Horning, Audrey, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013)

Howard, Jean, *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1994)

Hulme, Peter, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492 – 1797* (London: Methuen, 1986)

Hunt, Alan, *Governance of the Consuming Passions: A History of Sumptuary Law* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996)

Hunt, Arnold, 'The Lord's Supper in Early Modern England', *Past & Present*, 161 (1998), pp. 39-83

Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stowe to Strype, 1598 – 1720, ed. J.F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Inns of Court, ed. Alan H. Nelson and John R. Elliott (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2010)

The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court, eds. Jayne Elizabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011)

Irwin, Lee, *Coming Down From Above: Prophecy, Resistance, and Renewal in Native American Religion* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008)

James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government, ed. Ralph Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)

Jaster, Margaret Rose, "'Out of all frame and good fashion": Sartorial Resistance as Political Spectacle', *The Irish Review* 34 (2006), pp. 44-57

--- 'Staging a Stereotype in Gaelic Garb: Ben Jonson's "Irish Masque", 1613', *New Hibernia Review*, 2:4 (1998), pp. 86-98

Jowitt, Claire, *Voyage Drama and Gender Politics, 1589 – 1642: Real and Imagined Worlds* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003)

Kelsey, Sean, 'Rich, Robert, second earl of Warwick (1587-1658)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<http://oxforddnb.com>>

Kidd, Colin, *British Identities Before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600 – 1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

--- 'Royal Panic Attack', *London Review of Books* <www.lrb.co.uk>

King, C. Richard, 'The (Mis)uses of Cannibalism in Contemporary Cultural Critique', *Diacritics*, 30:1 (2000), pp. 106-23

Kishlanksy, Mark, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603 – 1714* (London: Penguin, 1996)

Klarer, Mario, 'Cannibalism and Carnavalesque: Incorporation as Utopia in the Early Image of America', *New Literary History*, 30:2 (1999), pp. 389-410

Knafla, Louis A., *Law and Politics in Jacobean England: The Tracts of Lord Chancellor Ellesmere* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977)

Knapp, Jeffrey, *An Empire Nowhere: England, America, and Literature from Utopia to the Tempest* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992)

--- 'Elizabethan Tobacco', *Representations*, 21 (1988), pp. 26-66

Kupperman, Karen Ordahl, 'The Founding Years of Virginia – and the United States', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 104 (1996), pp. 103-12

--- *Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000)

--- *The Jamestown Project* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007)

--- 'Presentment of Civility: English Reading of American Self-Presentation in the Early Years of Colonisation', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 54:1 (1997), pp. 193-228

Lake, Peter and Michael Questier, 'Agency, Appropriation and Rhetoric Under the Gallows: Puritans, Romanists and the State in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 153 (1996), pp. 64-107

--- *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002)

Lake, Peter and Stephen Pincus, *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007)

Land, Robert Hunt, 'Henrico and its College', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 18:4 (1938), pp. 453-98

Lee, Maurice, *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990)

Lemmings, David, *Gentlemen and Barristers: The Inns of Court and the English Bar, 1680 – 1730* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990)

- Lennon, Colm, 'Stanihurst, Richard (1547 – 1618)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<http://oxforddnb.com>>
- Leslie, Michael and Timothy Raylor, *Culture and Cultivation in Early Modern England: Writing and the Land* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992)
- Lestringant, Frank, *Cannibals: the Discovery and Representation of the Cannibal from Columbus to Jules Verne*, tr. Rosemary Morris (Cambridge: Polity, 1997)
- Levack, Brian P., *The Civil Lawyers of England, 1603 – 1641: A Political Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973)
- Levine, Laura, *Men in Women's Clothing: Anti-theatricality and Effeminisation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Levine, Philippa, 'States of Undress: Nakedness and the Colonial Imagination', *Victorian Studies*, 50:2 (2008), pp. 189-219
- Liebaert, Alexis and Alain Maya, *The Illustrated History of the Pipe* (Suffolk: Harold Starke Publishers, 1994)
- Lindebaum, Shirley, 'Thinking about Cannibalism', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 33 (2004), pp. 475-98
- Lockyer, Roger, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592 – 1628* (London: Longman, 1981)
- *James VI and I* (London: Longman, 1998)
- *Tudor and Stuart Britain, 1485 – 1714*, 3rd ed. (Harlow: Pearson, 2005)
- London, 1500 – 1700: The Making of the Metropolis*, eds. A.L. Beier and Roger Finlay (London: Longman, 1986)
- Lorimer, Joyce, 'The Failure of the English Guiana Ventures 1595-1667 and James I's Foreign Policy', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 21:1 (1993), pp. 1-30
- Lyttleton, James, *The Jacobean Plantations of Seventeenth-Century Offaly: An Archaeology of a Changing World* (Portland: Four Courts Press, 2013)
- McGowan, Andrew, 'Eating People: Accusations of Cannibalism Against Christians in the Second Century', *Second-Century Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 2:4 (1994), pp. 413-42
- McRae, Andrew, 'Reading Libels: An Introduction', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 69:1 (2006), pp. 1-13

Macmillan, Ken, *The Atlantic Imperial Constitution: Centre and Periphery in the English Atlantic World* (New York: Palgrave, 2011)

Mancall, Peter, 'Tales Tobacco Told in Sixteenth-Century Europe', *Environmental History*, 9:4 (2004), pp. 648-78

Marenbon, John, *Pagans and Philosophers: The Problem of Paganism from Augustine to Leibniz* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015)

Marotti, Arthur F., *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005)

Material London, c. 1600, ed. Lena Cowen Orlin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000)

Mears, Natalie, *Queenship and Political Discourse in the Elizabethan Realms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Mennell, Stephen, *Norbert Elias: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992)

The Mental World of the Jacobean Court, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Mercantilism Reimagined: Political Economy in Early Modern Britain and its Empire, eds. Philip Stern and Carl Wennerlind (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

Merrell, J.H., *The Indians' New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbours From European Contact Through the Era of Removal* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009)

Merritt, J.F., *The Social World of Early Modern Westminster: Abbey, Court, and Community, 1525 – 1640* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005)

Millstone, Noah, 'Seeing Like a Statesman in Early Stuart England', *Past and Present*, 223:1 (2014), pp. 77-127

Minchinton, Walter, *The Growth of English Overseas Trade in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London: Methuen, 1969)

Molineux, Catherine, 'Pleasures of the Smoke: "Black Virginians" in Georgian London's Tobacco Shops', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 64:2 (2007), pp. 327-76

Morgan, Edmund S., *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1975)

Morgan, Hiram, *Tyrone's Rebellion: The Outbreak of the Nine Years War in Tudor Ireland* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993)

Morrissey, Mary, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons, 1558 – 1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

Muldrew, Craig, *The Economy of Obligation: the Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1998)

Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy, and Subordination in Britain and Ireland, eds. Michael Braddick and John Walter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Noble, Louise, “‘And Make Two Pasties of Your Shameful Heads’: Medicinal Cannibalism and Healing the Body Politic in ‘Titus Andronicus’”, *English Literary History*, 70:3 (2003), pp. 677-708

--- *Medicinal Cannibalism in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)

The Norbert Elias Reader: A Biographical Selection, ed. Johan Goudsblom and Stephen Mennell (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998)

Nicholls, Mark, *Investigating Gunpowder Plot* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991)

--- and Penry Williams, *Sir Walter Raleigh: in Life and Legend* (London: Continuum, 2011)

O’Callaghan, Michelle, ‘Brooke, Christopher (1570-1628)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <www.oxforddnb.com>

--- *The English Wits: Literature and Sociability in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

--- *The Shepherds Nation: Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612 – 1625* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000)

--- “‘Talking Politics’: Tyranny, Parliament, and Christopher’s Brooke’s The Ghost of Richard the Third (1614)”, *Historical Journal*, 41:1 (1998), pp. 97-120

O’Malley, Michelle, ‘A Pair of Little Gilded Shoes: Commission, Cost, and Meaning in Renaissance Footwear’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 63:1 (2010), pp. 45-83

Ohlmeyer, Jane, *Making Ireland English: The Irish Aristocracy in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012)

--- 'Seventeenth-Century Ireland and the New British and Atlantic Histories', *The American Historical Review*, 104:2 (1999), pp. 446-62

Ostovich, Helen, Mary V. Silcox and Graham Roebuck, *The Mysterious and the Foreign in Early Modern England* (New Jersey: Associated University Press, 2008)

Oswald, Adrian, *English Clay Tobacco Pipes* (London: British Archaeological Association, 1976)

The Oxford History of the British Empire, Vol. 1, ed. Nicholas Canny (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)

Pagden, Anthony, *European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993)

--- *The Fall of Natural Man: the American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)

--- *Lords of all the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain, and France, 1500 – 1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995)

Parry, Graham, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

Peacey, Jason, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Peck, Linda Levy, *Consuming Splendour: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

--- "“For a King not to be bountiful were a fault”: Perspectives on Court Patronage in Early Stuart England", *Journal of British Studies*, 25:1 (1986), pp. 31-61

Peltonen, Markku, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570 – 1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

--- 'Francis Bacon, the Earl of Northampton, and the Jacobean Anti-Duelling Campaign', *The Historical Journal*, 44:1 (2001), pp. 1-28

A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England, ed. Adam Smyth (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004)

Pluymers, Keith, 'Taming the Wilderness in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Ireland and Virginia', *Environmental History*, 16:4 (2011), pp. 610-32

Pocock, J.G.A., 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject', *The Journal of Modern History*, 47:4 (1975), pp. 601-21

--- 'British History: A Plea for a New Subject: Reply', *The Journal of Modern History*, 47:4 (1975), pp. 626-8

--- 'The New British History in Atlantic Perspective: An Antipodean Commentary', *The American Historical Review*, 104:2 (1999), pp. 490-500

Political Innovation and Conceptual Change, eds. Terence Ball *et al.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Political Spaces in Pre-Industrial Europe, ed. Beat Kümin (Surrey: Ashgate, 2009)

The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque, eds. David Bevington and Peter Holybrook (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Prest, Wilfred R., *The Inns of Court Under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590 – 1640* (London: Longman, 1972)

Quinn, David B., 'Advice for Investors in Virginia, Bermuda, and Newfoundland, 1611', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 23:1 (1966), pp. 135-45

--- 'Notes by a Pious Colonial Investor, 1608-1610', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 16:4 (1959), pp. 551-55

-- 'Renaissance Influences in English Colonisation: the Prothero Lecture', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 26 (1976)

Quitt, Martin H., 'Immigrant Origins of the Virginia Gentry: A Study of Cultural Transmission and Innovation', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 45:4 (1988), pp. 629-55

--- 'Trade and Acculturation at Jamestown, 1607 – 1609: the Limits of Understanding', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 52:2 (1995), pp. 227-58

Rabb, Theodore K., *Enterprise and Empire: Merchant and Gentry Investment in the Expansion of England, 1575-1630* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967)

--- *Jacobean Gentleman: Sir Edwin Sandys, 1561 – 1629* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998)

Raffield, Paul, *Images and Cultures of Law in Early Modern England: Justice and Political Power, 1558 – 1660* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Ransome, David R., 'Founders of the Virginia Company', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <www.oxforddnb.com>

- Rapple, Rory, 'Gilbert, Sir Humphrey (1537-1583)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <www.oxforddnb.com>
- Raymond, Joad, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)
- Rebhorn, Wayne A., 'Baldesar Castiglione, Thomas Wilson, and the Courtly Body in Renaissance Rhetoric', *A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 11:3 (1993), pp. 241-74
- Rees, Joan, 'Hogs, Gulls, and Englishmen: Drayton and the Virginian Voyages', *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 13 (1983), pp. 20-31
- Riggs, David, *The World of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Faber and Faber, 2004)
- Roach, Joseph, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996)
- Roche, J.J., 'Hariot, Thomas (1560-1621)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12379?docPos=1>
- Roper, L.H., *The English Empire in America, 1602-1658: Beyond Jamestown* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009)
- Rountree, Helen C., *The Powhatan Indians of Virginia* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989)
- Routledge Encyclopaedia of International Political Economy*, ed. R.J. Barry Jones (New York: Routledge, 2001)
- Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*, eds. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002)
- Rublack, Ulinka, *Dressing Up: Cultural Identity in Renaissance Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)
- Rustici, Craig, 'The Smoking Girl: Tobacco and the Representation of Mary Frith', *Studies in Philology*, 96:2 (1999), pp. 159-79
- Ryrie, Alec, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)
- Sanday, Peggy Reeves, *Divine Hunger: Cannibalism as a Cultural System* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1986)
- Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. Roger A. Mason (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

- Sekora, John, *Luxury: The Concept in Western Thought, Eden to Smollet* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1977)
- Seed, Patricia, 'Review: *European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism* by Anthony Pagden', *The American Historical Review*, 99:2 (1994), pp. 535-6
- Shagan, Ethan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Sharpe, Kevin, 'Virtues, Passions and Politics in Early Modern England', *History of Political Thought*, 32:5 (2011), pp. 773-98
- Shepard, Alexandra, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- Shohet, Lauren, 'Interpreting "The Irish Masque at Court and in Print"', *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, 1:2 (2001), pp. 42-65
- Smith, David L., *A History of the Modern British Isles, 1603 – 1707: The Double Crown* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998)
- *The Stuart Parliaments, 1603 – 1689* (London: Arnold, 1999)
- Smith, James, 'Effaced History: Facing the Colonial Contexts of Ben Jonson's "Irish Masque at Court"', *English Literary History*, 65:2 (1998), pp. 297-321
- Smuts, Malcolm, *Culture and Power in England, 1585-1685* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999)
- Social Control in Europe: Vol. 1, 1500 – 1800*, eds. Herman Roodenburg and Pieter Spierenburg (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2004)
- Stallybrass, Peter and Ann Rosalind Jones, 'Fetishising the Glove in Renaissance Europe', *Critical Inquiry*, 28:1 (2001), pp. 114-32
- *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Strong, Roy, *Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Pimlico, 1986)
- The Stuart Kingdoms in the Seventeenth Century: Awkward Neighbours*, eds. Allan I. Macinnes and Jane Ohlmeyer (Portland: Four Courts Press, 2002)
- Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture*, eds. Peter Stallybrass, Margreta de Grazia and Maureen Quilligan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Sugg, Richard, “‘Good Physic but Bad Food’: Early Modern Attitudes to Medicinal Cannibalism and its Suppliers”, *Social History of Medicine*, 19:2 (2006), pp. 225-40

The Taking and Displaying of Human Body Parts as Trophies by Amerindians, eds. Richard J. Chacon and David H. Dye (New York: Springer, 2007)

Taylor, Gary, ‘Middleton, Thomas (1580-1627)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <www.oxforddnb.com>

Thirsk, Joan, *Economic Policy and Projects: The Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008)

--- ‘Younger Sons in the Seventeenth Century’, *History*, 54:182 (1969), pp. 358-77

Thompson, Peter, ‘William Bullock’s “Strange Adventure”: A Plan to Transform Seventeenth-Century Virginia’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 61:1 (2004), pp. 107-28

Trade in the Pre-Modern Era, 1400 – 1700, ed. Douglas A. Irwin (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1996)

Vaughan, Alden T., *Transatlantic Encounters: American Indians in Britain, 1500 – 1776* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

Violent Masculinities: Male Aggression in Early Modern Texts and Culture, eds. Jennifer Feather and Catherine E. Thomas (New York: Palgrave, 2013)

Wakelin, Daniel, *Humanism, Reading, and English Literature, 1430-1530* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

Wall, Alison, *Power and Protest in England, 1525 – 1640* (London: Arnold, 2000)

Walsham, Alexandra, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993)

--- “‘Domme Preachers’”? Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print’, *Past and Present*, 168 (2000), pp. 72-123

--- *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

Walter, John, ‘Abolishing Superstition with Sedition? The Politics of Popular Iconoclasm in England, 1640-1642’, *Past and Present*, 183 (2004), pp. 79-123

Warren, Ian, 'The English Landed Elite and the Social Environment of London, 1580 -1700: the Cradle of an Aristocratic Culture?', *English Historical Review*, 126: 518 (2011), pp. 44-74

Weber: Political Writings, ed. Peter Lassman and Ronald Speirs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic and America, 1480 – 1650, eds. K.R. Andrews *et al.* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1978)

Whatley, Janet, 'Food and the Limits of Civility: The Testimony of Jean de Léry', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 15:4 (1984), pp. 387-400

--- 'Savage Hierarchies: French Catholic Observers of the New World', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 17:3 (1986), pp. 319-30

Wheeler, Rozann, *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000)

White, Richard, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650 – 1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

Whitehead, Neil, 'Hans Staden and the Cultural Politics of Cannibalism', *The Hispanic American Historical Review*, 80:4 (2000), pp. 721-51

Wild, Antony, *The East India Company: Trade and Conquest from 1600* (London: Harper Collins, 2000)

Withington, Phil, 'Company and Sociability in Early Modern England', *Social History*, 32: 3 (2007), pp. 291-307

--- 'Intoxicants and Society in Early Modern England', *The Historical Journal*, 54:3 (2011), pp. 631-57

--- 'Introduction: Cultures of Intoxication', *Past and Present: Supplement 9* (2014), pp. 9-33

Wood, Andy, *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

--- *Riot, Rebellion and Popular Politics in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002)

Wood, Neal, *Cicero's Social and Political Thought* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991)

Wormald, Jenny, 'James VI and I (1566-1625)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <www.oxforddnb.com>

--- 'A Very British Problem: the Stuart Crown and the Plantation of Ulster', *History Ireland*, 17:6 (2009), pp. 20-23

Ziser, Michael, 'Sovereign Remedies: Natural Authority and the "Counterblaste to Tobacco"', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 62:4 (2005), pp. 719-44

DIGITAL RESOURCES

The Atlantic <<http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2013/05/cannibalism-in-jamestown-colonists-ate-a-14-year-old-girls-brain/275490/>>

British History Online <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/>>

A Calendar of the Inner Temple Records
<www.innertemple.org.uk/downloads/archivesdept/Vol2>

CELT: Corpus of Electronic Texts, Cork
<www.ucc.ie/celt/published/E620001>

Cornell University Law School: Legal Information Institute
<<http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/cannibalism>>

Early Stuart Libels <www.earlystuartlibels.net>

Harvard University Archives: Charters and Legislative Acts
<<http://oasis.lib.harvard.edu/oasis/deliver/~hua10011#charterasuba>>

History of Parliament Online
<<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/research>>

Museum of London Tobacco Pipes Database
<<http://archive.museumoflondon.org.uk/claypipes/>>

The National Archives <<http://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk>>

Oxford English Dictionary Online <www.oed.com>

The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn: The Black Books, Vols. I and II <<https://archive.org/details/blackbookrecord01lincuoft>>

Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521 – 1889 <<https://archive.org/details/registerofadmiss00gray>>

Register of Admissions for the Middle Temple <
<https://www.middletemple.org.uk/library-and-archive/archive-information-and-contacts/register-of-admissions>>

Virginia Company Archives <www.virginiacompanyarchives.amdigital.co.uk>

Virtual Jamestown Project <<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu>>

PhD THESES

Flavin, Susan, 'Consumption and Material Culture in Sixteenth-Century Ireland' (University of Bristol, unpublished PhD thesis, 2011)

Ingram, Anders, 'English Literature on the Ottoman Turks in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries' (University of Durham, unpublished PhD thesis, 2009)

Mills, Jannis Jane Darvill, 'Early Modern Legal Poetics and Morality, 1560 – 1625' (University of Sussex, unpublished PhD thesis, 2011)

Westlake, David, 'Positive Representation of Inns of Court Lawyers in Jacobean City Comedy' (Brunel University, unpublished PhD thesis, 2010)