

The Devil in Virginia: Fear in Colonial Jamestown, 1607-1622

Matthew John Sparacio

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
History

Crandall A. Shifflett, Chair
A. Roger Ekirch
Brett L. Shadle

16 March 2010
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Early Modern England; Colonial Virginia; Jamestown; Devil; Fear

Copyright 2010, Matthew John Sparacio

The Devil in Virginia: Fear in Colonial Jamestown, 1607-1622

Matthew John Sparacio

ABSTRACT

This study examines the role of emotions – specifically fear – in the development and early stages of settlement at Jamestown. More so than any other factor, the Protestant belief system transplanted by the first settlers to Virginia helps explain the hardships the English encountered in the New World, as well as influencing English perceptions of self and other. Out of this transplanted Protestantism emerged a discourse of fear that revolved around the agency of the Devil in the temporal world. Reformed beliefs of the Devil identified domestic English Catholics and English imperial rivals from Iberia as agents of the diabolical. These fears travelled to Virginia, where the English quickly ‘satanized’ another group, the Virginia Algonquians, based upon misperceptions of native religious and cultural practices. I argue that English belief in the diabolic nature of the Native Americans played a significant role during the “starving time” winter of 1609-1610. In addition to the acknowledged agency of the Devil, Reformed belief recognized the existence of providential actions based upon continued adherence to the English’s nationally perceived covenant with the Almighty. Efforts to maintain God’s favor resulted in a reformation of manners jump-started by Sir Thomas Dale’s Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, and English tribulations in Virginia – such as Opechancanough’s 1622 attack upon the settlement – served as concrete evidence of God’s displeasure to English observers. A religiously infused discourse of fear shaped the first two decades of the Jamestown settlement.

For 32

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Notes on Sources	x
Introduction	1
Chapter I: “Their damnation is certaine, and hell is open for them”	12
Religion in Early Modern England	14
The Devil in Early Modern England	16
Antichrist as Corporation	19
Satan and Iberia	21
Religion and Colonization	28
Catholicism in Jamestown	32
Fear of Spain in Jamestown	33
Conclusion	39
Chapter II: “To satisfy Crewell hunger”	40
Wilderness and Expectation	42
Roanoke	47
Indian Practices and Early Modern English Demonism	50
Ceremony and Captivity	56
“We are starved!”	60
Environmental Factors	63
Social Factors	68
Conclusion	73
Chapter III: “So full of misery and misgovernment”	75
<u>Lawes Martiall</u>	77
<u>Lawes Morall</u>	80
<u>Lawes Divine</u> and the Reformation of Manners	83
A Silky Solution?	90
John Rolfe and Demonism in the New World	92
Nightmares Realized – 22 March 1622	96
Providence and 1622	99
The Legacy of 1622	102
Conclusion	104
Conclusion	106
Bibliography	110

Acknowledgments

From the very beginning, there have been many moments during which I would step back and wonder, “Will this project ever be finished?” Such an interrogative was never made in total exasperation; every *eureka!* moment during research made the effort completely satisfying. These instances of frustration were mostly products of circumstance outside the academic sphere. I certainly know more about health insurance and the statutes of the Commonwealth of Virginia than I ever expected.

An old adage goes something along the lines of, “To be successful in school, one needs to be well-versed in the three Rs: reading, ‘riting, and ‘rithmetic.” I can attest, although I would like to amend my three Rs to Randy, Richard, and A. Roger. Quite simply, without Randy Shifflett, this project would have never been undertaken. As an undergraduate, the history of early colonial America never caught my attention, and even after I commenced graduate work, my focus remained on the era of American independence; Paul Revere and Samuel Adams preoccupied my mind more than John Smith. But after taking Dr. Shifflett’s Transatlantic Studies class – and in an ironic twist of fate, was assigned as a teaching assistant to his Colonial America undergraduate class – my feelings towards the first colonists radically shifted from gentle ambivalence to pure fascination. Chief Randy repeatedly mentioned how fear could be a tool of

analysis in colonial Virginia. Still searching for a research topic, this idea seemingly landed in my lap. I am grateful to have taken this idea and run with it. I am also grateful to call Dr. Shifflett my friend.

I had the pleasure of working with Richard Hirsh for two semesters as a teaching assistant for his sections of Historical Methods. More than Chicago University's or Kate Turabian's writing guides, Dr. Hirsh's exercises for historical writing aimed at college freshman and sophomores influenced my writing style for the better. In addition to my constant vigilance towards utilizing the verb "to be," I have come to consider Richard as a valuable friend, and he will never know the impact he has had on my life. If I become half the type of person he exemplifies, I well have done will for myself.

A. Roger Ekirch rounds out my three Rs. Dr. Ekirch has been more than a mere sounding-board for ideas. His advice to keep in mind the studies of colonial New England greatly affected the final product you now read, especially in regards to moral reforms and English interpretations of the indigenous peoples of North America. His confidence in my ability to maintain focus has meant the world. Another member of my research committee, Dr. Brett Shadle, also deserves special mention. Over the past few years, I have joked with him about how much closer to tenure I am at Virginia Tech than he is (I started taking classes the semester before he arrived in Blacksburg). Alas, it appears he will overcome me in the coming months. I will greatly miss the lunches and life lessons we shared at Bollos and the Rivermill. But after six years, the time to leave Tech has arrived.

Before I step out of the shadows of Burress Hall and Lane Stadium, I wish to recognize a number of other people. From the Department of History, I feel indebted to both Daniel Thorp and Amy Nelson, who gave me the opportunity to study what I love at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. This project would have been impossible without the aid of the pleasant staff of Newman Library. Michael Alexander's suggestion to refer to Alexandra Walsham's work proved priceless. Heather Gumbert allowed me to voice my vexations as a teaching assistant while also instructing me how to teach with my mouth shut. Glenn Bugh – who as I write this (not a little jealously, I may add) is leading a group of Tech students in a semester abroad in Ticino, Switzerland – always had his door open, and proved nothing more than magnanimous with his advice. I thank him for introducing me to the Ancient World, and their Eastern inheritors. Without having taken Dr. Bugh's Byzantine history class in fall of 2007, I never would have realized my passion for the complex history of Christianity. Ennis McCrery has provided answers for my endless amounts of questions, and been immensely helpful in the past weeks. Ray Hartley has fought the good fight on my behalf outside of the confines of Tech. Jennifer Wagstaff also deserves special mention for her innumerable contributions; my talks with her have gone a long way in staying grounded throughout the entire process.

I have been lucky to experience graduate school with such an impressive cohort. Ryan Updike and Eric Vanover more than proved their character when I needed transportation to Montgomery Regional Hospital for a broken clavicle. It is no secret that I will bestow the "Golden Pigeon" award to Brian Quinn for his combination of smarts and antics. Joe Forte, like myself a Jersey-born historian who found himself in

Southwest Virginia, offered wisdom and thought-provoking commentary. Lora Settle provided baked goods and excellent conversation when we shared an office in 2008-2009. Ditto for Sarah Hewitt, whose work ethic set a standard I always strive to attain. I look forward to seeing her research on Anglo-Powhatan relations expanded.

Those close to me understand when I say that the previous year has been amongst my most difficult. Because of that, I wish to thank the following people: rowers under my tutelage on the Virginia Tech Novice Women's Rowing team, for giving me a blissful reprieve from the grinds of research and life in general; my friends in Blacksburg – especially Brendon Burns, Matthew Given, Emily Mannel, Grace Martin, Andrew Kendus and Holly Harrison – who have stood by my side and supported me as my world seemingly unraveled; Jennifer Bruns, who has been a most welcome source of encouragement and confidence; my fellow Hokies dispersed throughout the country – Dan Alexander, Amy Steigerwalt, Thomas Goidich, John Hoke III, Sean Reilly, Elizabeth Hagwood, Christopher Donnelley, Adam Penfield, Nicholas Sarokhanian, Kathleen Keenan, Casey Rapalje, and Stephanie Buxton – whose support remains but a phone call away; and my dog Murphy. Paige Hungerford, a friend with whom I had the pleasure of studying abroad in Europe, once explained to me the joys of coming home to a loyal canine. Her words resonate every time I open the door to my apartment.

It goes without saying that the love and support of my family are irreplaceable. I thank my parents for instilling in me a sense of determination that has resulted in this study. Because of this "Sparacio Ethic," the thought never crossed my mind to throw in the towel when the going has gotten rough. And rough the journey has been. That being

said, this project came to fruition because of my mother and father. I thank my sister Theresa for being there when I call, which is not nearly as often as it should be. I also thank her for saying “yes” when a man named Andrew asked her to marry him. I cannot think a better brother-in-law. I have been truly blessed with such a support group; I only hope that I have not disappointed them.

Lastly, I would be remiss if I failed to mention the impact of a certain Lauren Natale. Without her, I would not have realized the profound impact that emotions can have on one’s life. When uncertainty regarding what to focus my research upon clouded my mind, her assurance that I would find the right topic helped me persevere. I also wish to thank her parents, who welcomed me into their home in Virginia Beach for me to utilize as a summer base for research trips to the College of William and Mary, Colonial Williamsburg and Jamestown. Their generosity proved invaluable. At the beginning of this project, Lauren refused to be anything less than my biggest fan. Regardless of what has unfolded over the past twelve months, I remain hers.

MJS

Blacksburg, VA

March 2010

Notes on Sources

In an attempt to preserve the uniqueness of the primary sources I have utilized, I have made little modernizing changes unless I deemed them necessary for comprehension by the reader. Some primary sources, such as those cited from Edward W. Haile's Jamestown Narratives, have already been modernized. Dates remain unchanged from their sources.

Introduction

In late May 2008, a group of historians convened a workshop sponsored by The William and Mary Quarterly and the University of Southern California – Huntington Early Modern Studies Institute in San Marino, California. Keynote speaker John Demos started the event with a presentation distinguishing what he terms “heart” and “head” histories. Put simply, “head” history is recognized for its theoretical groundwork, an appeal to readers “at the level of cognition;” on the other hand, “heart” history “evokes the past in emotionally direct, personal ways.”¹ For the most part, the historical discipline has gravitated towards the former, perhaps out of convenience as specialization has become the discipline’s norm, or perhaps more out of a misunderstanding amongst historians who regard emotions as “tangential,” if not “fundamentally opposed” to their enterprise.² Yet emotions are not tangential or irrelevant, they influence contingency and therefore are a necessary – if not natural – component in the ongoing unfolding of history. The challenge for historians, it seems, has been in the establishment of a framework with which to analyze such an ambiguous, individual phenomenon.

¹ Fred Anderson and Andrew Cayton, “The Problem of Authority in the Writing of Early American History,” The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series 66, no. 3 (2009): 467-494, quotes from 472-3.

² Barbara H. Rosenwein, “Worrying about Emotions in History,” The American Historical Review 107, no. 3 (2002): 821-845, quote from 821.

The Historiography of Emotion

The history of emotions emerged relatively recently as a sub-discipline, even though historians have “*always* talked about emotions.”³ Early works by Johan Huizinga and Norbert Elias brought to the fore how emotions and their restraint contributed to the rise of the historian’s construct known as Western Civilization.⁴ Within the last twenty years, a myriad of frameworks through which historians interpret emotions have emerged. In the mid-1980s Carol and Peter Stearns coined the term ‘emotionology’, spurring a series of studies on emotions in modern America.⁵ Yet the Stearns’ methodology for deducing the “emotional standards” of a society is based almost exclusively on modern popular advice manuals.⁶ Without the proper sources, then, emotionology cannot be said to have existed in the pre-modern and early modern eras, even though we can safely assert that emotions were experienced before modernity.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Historians point to Huizinga’s Herfsttij der Middeleeuwen as the pioneering work of the sub-discipline. I utilized an English translation of the 1921 Dutch edition, The Autumn of the Middle Ages (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996). Put succinctly, Huizinga argues that Europeans of the Middle Ages were psychologically ‘children’ – “every experience had that degree of directness and absoluteness that joy and sadness still have in the mind of a child” (1). Norbert Elias emphasizes the influence of royal courts as a means of restraining the violence of the Middle Ages; see Elias, The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations (Malden, MASS: Blackwell, 2000).

⁵ See also Carol Z. Stearns, Anger: The Struggle for Emotional Control in America’s History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); Peter Stearns, American Fear: the Causes and Consequences of High Anxiety (New York: Routledge, 2006); An Emotional History of the United States, eds. Peter Stearns & Jan Lewis (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

⁶ Peter & Carol Z. Stearns, “Emotionology: Classifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards,” The American Historical Review 90, no. 4 (1985): 813-836.

William Reddy offered an alternative framework for studying the history of emotions. In his Navigation of Feeling, Reddy argues the case for what he terms “emotives,” linguistic attempts by people to describe their feelings.⁷ Emphasizing the language of emotion, Reddy states that emotives contribute to the creation of an “emotional regime” that maintains expressions throughout a society. Reddy’s theory, while compelling, implies a top-down, regimented implementation of emotional control, and calls into question the degree of agency attributed to historical actors. Building off Reddy’s framework, Barbara Rosenwein argues for “emotional communities” instead of regimes, emphasizing the contributions of “ideologies, teachings, and common presuppositions” to a community’s interpretive framework.⁸

Fear and the Nature of Emotions

The ambiguous nature regarding emotions results from the seemingly perpetual debate over the Cartesian mind-versus-body explanations for human development.⁹ Some scholars argue minds “are basically processors of information;” others disagree.¹⁰ That cognition plays a role in emotion “seems beyond doubt,” and perhaps the best

⁷ William Reddy, The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), xii.

⁸ Rosenwein, Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 24-5.

⁹ Renee Descartes, Descartes: Selected Philosophical Writings, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). For further commentary on the separation of mind and body, see Antonio Damasio, Descartes’ Error: Emotion, Reason and the Human Brain (New York: Putnam, 1994) and The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the Making of Consciousness (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1999).

¹⁰ The Foundations of Cognitive Science, ed. João Branquinho (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), vii.

explanation is offered by Peter Stearns, who writes, “There is general agreement that emotions, even those as basic as fear, contain a mixture of ingrained impulses (what Charles Darwin termed “expressions” in 1872) and a degree of cognition that evaluates and, to some degree regulates, the same impulse.”¹¹ The problem faced by those who study emotion is complex; does emotion elicit cognition, or vice versa? Less dichotomously, do they act in tandem?

In the late nineteenth century, theorists viewed emotions in a “hydraulic” sense, the premise being that emotions were relatively uncontrollable internal forces, apt to overflow any time much like a pot of boiling water.¹² Within the last fifty years, a sea-change has occurred in the understanding of emotions, resulting in two, non-“hydraulic” theories. The cognitive view, in which emotions are regarded as an evaluative process of rewards and punishments, has already been touched upon.¹³ Out of cognitive theory grew the social constructionist argument, that emotions are formed and shaped by the society in which they operate.¹⁴ This social constructionist theory – more than the other two schools of thought – allows for the multiple causality inherent in discussions of history, keeping such factors as language, religion, and expectations relevant in the formation of emotions, and provides a helpful framework for understanding colonial Jamestown.

¹¹ Ibid.; Peter Stearns, American Fear, 13. See also Charles Darwin, The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals (1872), vol. 23 of The Works of Charles Darwin (New York: New York University Press, 1989).

¹² Keith Oatley, Emotions: A Brief History (Malden, MASS: Blackwell, 2004), 16-7. See also Rosenwein, “Worrying about Emotions,” 833-5.

¹³ Edmund T. Rolls, Emotions Explained (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 2.

¹⁴ Rosenwein, Emotional Communities, 16-7.

Even though Raymond Aron once claimed, “fear needs no definition,” one is necessary for our purposes, accentuated by the fact that fear in early modern society is a “problematic subject.”¹⁵ If emotions act as bridges to thoughts, then a pure cognitive theorist might define fear as “belief that there is a danger present” and a subsequent mental process as the actions needed to avoid said danger; in other words, a survival mechanism.¹⁶ This accounts for most visceral fearful responses in people, but the influence of the environment is also a contributing factor in these responses. I argue that the environment that shaped the emotional community – and therefore decision-making – in early modern England remained deeply embedded in religious belief. The Protestant doctrine that the first white settlers transplanted to Virginia helped to explain the trials and tribulations that the settlers encountered, influencing not only English perceptions of others, but also how they dealt amongst themselves. Religion adds a supernatural factor that exacerbated anxieties already held by the early modern English, a factor often overlooked by scholars.

This idea of “English Protestantism” requires some more commentary. I am less interested in the emerging divergence between Anglican and Puritan doctrines that unfolded during the first twenty years of English settlement in America than more dichotomous polarities of Catholic-Protestant or Algonquian-Protestant.¹⁷ Movements

¹⁵ Fear in Early Modern Society, eds. William Naphy & Penny Roberts (New York: Manchester University Press, 1997), 2. Aron quoted in Corey Robin, Fear: The History of a Political Idea (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 9.

¹⁶ Jesse J. Prinz, Gut Reactions: A Perceptual Theory of Emotion (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 8.

¹⁷ Michael Kamman has argued that these dichotomies – in his words, “biformities” – helped shape the paradoxical nature of the American national character. See People of

such as the 'Reformation of Manners,' as well as beliefs in both the Devil and providence were not confined to one sect of Protestantism, nor a specific social class in early modern England. Protestants "from all points of the ideological spectrum employed the same metaphors" when speaking about these subjects.¹⁸ Furthermore, it is impossible to write about how religious beliefs contributed to early modern anxieties without also acknowledging the fact that Protestantism acted as a source of comfort in the face of these fears as well.

Fear in Jamestown

This leads us to an important question: why an emotional analysis of Jamestown? The answer, I believe, is two-fold. While the subject of Jamestown itself has a massive secondary *corpus* of scholarship – with many recent contributions in the wake of the quadcentennial celebration in 2007 – works on the formation of the colony, as well as studies regarding Anglo-Amerindian interactions focus on the socio-political. For instance, the ideas of trade and acculturation and discussions of English and Native American cultural misunderstandings have greatly added to our view of early seventeenth century Virginia.¹⁹ However, an examination of emotions and their role in the Chesapeake is noticeably absent.

Paradox: An Inquiry Concerning the Origins of American Civilization (New York: Knopf, 1973), 113.

¹⁸ Alexandra Walsham, Providence in Early Modern England (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 151.

¹⁹ On the effects of trade between the English and Indians, see Martin H. Quitt, "Trade and Acculturation at Jamestown, 1607-09: The Limits of Understanding," The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series 52, no. 2 (1995): 227-258 and Seth Mallios, The

Although “emotion has emerged as a topic of central importance” in literary studies, philosophy, anthropology, and psychology, historical examinations with an emotional lens have yet to be widely employed.²⁰ A few periods of study have elicited scholarship in this sub-discipline of history, most notably the Middle Ages, the Reign of Terror during the French Revolution, and works concerned with terrorism as a result of the attacks of 11 September 2001.²¹ This is not to say that the era of Transatlantic imperial expansion has been completely ignored; Stephen Greenblatt has examined another passion – wonder – as an intellectual and philosophical concept, deeming it “the central figure in the initial European response to the New World, the decisive...experience in the presence of radical difference.”²² Fear as a means of

Deadly Politics of Giving: Exchange and Violence at Ajacan, Roanoke, and Jamestown (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006). On cultural misunderstandings, see Karen Ordahl Kupperman, Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America (New York: Cornell University Press, 2000).

²⁰ Daniel M. Gross, The Secret History of Emotion (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 9. See also The Soft Underbelly of Reason: The Passions in the Seventeenth Century, ed. Stephen Gaukroger (London: Routledge, 1998) and Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion, eds., Gail Kern Paster, Katherine Rowe, & Mary Floyd-Wilson (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

²¹ For emotional studies of the Middle Ages, see Huizinga, Autumn of the Middle Ages, Rosenwein, Emotional Communities, and Rosenwein, Anger's Past: The Social Uses of Emotion in the Middle Ages (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998). One of the most influential works on the Reign of Terror remains Georges Lefebvre's La Grande Peur de 1789 (Paris: Société d'Etude Pour le Développement Economique et Sociale, 1932); the English translation used here is The Great Fear of 1789: Rural Panic in Revolutionary France (New York: Pantheon Books, 1973). Works on terrorism and post-9/11 emotions include Stearns, American Fear and Joanna Bourke, Fear: A Cultural History (Emeryville, CA: Shoemaker Hoard, 2006).

²² Stephen Greenblatt, Marvelous Possession: The Wonder of the New World (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 14. See also Catherine Lutz, “Emotion, Thought and Estrangement: Emotion as a Cultural Category,” Cultural Anthropology 1, no. 3 (1986): 287-309.

dictating colonial interactions has been examined in Spanish colonization, but not yet in the southern North American English colonies.²³ The formation of the Jamestown settlement, and by extension the period that saw the rise of the early modern West, should receive the same scholarly attention in the history of emotion.

Besides providing an emotion-based study, this work aims to return religion to the discussion of colonial Virginia. Until recently, historians examining religion in early America have generally maintained their focus upon the New England colonies, with scant commentary on the Chesapeake.²⁴ This is for several reasons. First of all, the amount of sources from colonial New England far outnumber the sources from the Southern colonies, courtesy of acts of both God (fire) and man (the Civil War). Secondly, attempts to explain the exceptional nature of the United States led to an emphasis on the New England town; this opinion can be traced in the writings of theorists from de Tocqueville to Hartz.²⁵ This exceptional nature of America is no longer taken for granted, and the “new history” shift towards regionalism and the Transatlantic

²³ Rolena Adorno, “The Negotiation of Fear in Cabeza de Vaca’s *Naufragios*” in New World Encounters, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 48-84.

²⁴ One of the earliest examinations of religion in Virginia was Perry Miller, “The Religious Impulse in the Founding of Virginia: Religion and Society in the Early Literature,” The William & Mary Quarterly, Third Series 5, no. 4 (1948): 492-522. Edward Bond has spearheaded the recent reemphasis on piety in Virginia with his Damned Souls in a Tobacco Colony: Religion in Seventeenth Century Virginia (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2000) and Spreading the Gospel in Colonial Virginia: Sermons and Devotional Writings (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books for the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 2004).

²⁵ Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America (New York: Signet Classic, 2001). Louis Hartz, The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1991).

system has brought renewed emphasis to colonial Virginia.²⁶ Reevaluations of the role played by religion in Atlantic colonization is necessary, because it was religion, more than anything else, that provided the defining characteristic of the “emotional community” settling in Virginia. The English settlers considered themselves emissaries of Christendom more so than simply ‘English.’ It is time historians do the same, acknowledging that religion constituted more than a mere footnote in the history of colonial Virginia.

My analysis begins with an introduction to the post-Reformation religious climate of early modern England. Belief in the Devil and the widespread extent of his agency dictated the way the English interacted with both the English Catholic minority at home and their Spanish imperial rivals abroad. The anxieties towards these groups were not confined to the British Isles, as the writings of early adventurers and the records of the Virginia Company of London confirm these fears were transplanted to Virginia.

Catholics and Spaniards were not the only groups regarded as members of a larger “Antichrist corporation.” Chapter II examines the ‘Native American as agent of the diabolical’ discourse that dominated early modern English literature. A number of factors contributed to this, such as the Indians’ uncertain origin story, as well as the religious and cultural practices of the Virginia Algonquians. While acknowledging other causes, I argue that it was predominantly these English misconceptions that contributed to the miseries experienced by the colonists during the winter of 1609-10, a period coined by Captain John Smith as “the starving time.”

²⁶ Ian Tyrrell, “American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History,” The American Historical Review 96, no. 4 (1991): 1031-55.

Implementations of strict moral statutes like Sir Thomas Dale's Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall served a two-fold purpose; the concluding chapter will look at efforts to fight the insidious influence of the Devil, as well as the role of providence in colonial Virginia. These attempts at moral regulation can be traced to the larger 'Reformation of Manners' occurring concurrently in England, and factored in the diversification of commodities at Jamestown. The study ends with commentary on the providential nature of the Indian attack of 1622.

A study of fear in colonial Jamestown is bounded by certain, and some regrettably unavoidable, parameters. This work encompasses a brief period of time – less than two decades – from the founding of the settlement in Virginia in 1607 to Opechancanough's expansive attack upon the English settlers in March 1622. I feel this an appropriate place to end my analysis because the event cemented both English policy and sentiment towards the native population, breaking the peace brought about by Pocahontas' marriage to John Rolfe in 1614 and setting both groups down the path towards "total war."²⁷

Also, this study is concerned only with English fears, and more specifically, the fears of English men. The first group of English settlers in 1607 comprised one hundred-four men and boys, and it took over a year before the colony saw its first female inhabitants. Historians have generally regarded women in Jamestown as either political non-factors or victims, and while the reality was much more complex, the pool of

²⁷ Howard Zinn, A People's History of the United States, 1492-Present (New York: Perennial, 2001), 12.

sources I utilized were predominantly authored by males.²⁸ Also, an attempt to outline both English and Amerindian fears, while compelling, sets the parameters too wide for a project this size. A holistic study of emotions in British colonial America is complicated by the fact that there are no written Native American sources; the intentions of Native Americans would have to be pieced together from examinations of European primary sources.²⁹ As such is the case, only the “emotional community” of the English settlers will be focused on.

The trials and tribulations of the English “emotional community” at Jamestown were amplified by a transplanted belief system that identified the agency of the Antichrist in a host of groups, including the Spanish, Roman Catholics, and Native Americans. As we shall see, the impact of this piety-induced discourse of fear was profound. Similar discourses of fear exist in the present. We need to look no further than the era of global terrorism we currently find ourselves mired in, willingly or not. By examining the ordeals of our earliest colonial settlers, perhaps we can learn both something about ourselves and how to deal with the challenges we now face.

²⁸ Kathleen Brown, “Women in Early Jamestown,” accessed on Virtual Jamestown <http://www.virtualjamestown.org/essays/brown_essay.html>. For more on women and the roles they played in colonial America, see also Brown, Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Sharon Block, Rape and Sexual Power in Early America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2006); and Mary Beth Norton, “The Evolution of White Women’s Experience in Early America,” The American Historical Review 89, no. 3 (1984): 593-619.

²⁹ While I am not attempting such a study, Native American history through the words of English sources is not impossible. Refer to Michael L. Oberg, The Head in Edward Nugent’s Hand: Roanoke’s Forgotten Indians (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008) and Helen C. Rountree, Pocahontas, Powhatan, Opechancanough: Three Indian Lives Changes by Jamestown (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006).

Chapter I

“Their damnation is certaine, and hell is open for them”

While making their first excursion of discovery into the Chesapeake, the leaders of the English settlement at Jamestown posted crosses to mark the extent of their exploration. In late spring 1607, the English set up a cross bearing the inscription “Jacobus Rex. 1607” at the head of a river henceforth referred to as the James in honor of the English monarch.¹ Inquisitive indigenous folk questioned the significance of this ritual. “A representation of our friendship,” replied Captain Christopher Newport, leader of the English party, attempting to link the cross-bars with good relations. Crosses remained a part of colonial discourse with the release of Captain John Smith’s Map of Virginia in 1612.² Illustrating expeditions into the unknown that was Virginia, Smith’s map is littered with “Maltese Crosses” which signify the boundary between what “hath bin discovered”

¹ Gabriel Archer, “A relation of the discovery of our river from James Fort into the main, made by Captain Christofer Newport, and sincerely written and observed by a gentleman of the colony,” in Jamestown Narratives: Eyewitness Accounts of the Virginia Colony, The First Decade: 1607-1617, ed. Edward Wright Haile (Champlain, VA: Roundhouse, 2001), 109. See also Karen Ordahl Kupperman, The Jamestown Project (Cambridge: Belknap, 2007), 221.

² John Smith, A Map of Virginia (London: J. Barnes, 1612) accessed via Early English Books Online <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99857046>. For a brief discussion regarding the actual map-maker of Smith’s famous map, see Worthington C. Ford, “Captain John Smith’s Map of Virginia, 1612,” Geographical Review 14, no. 3 (1924): 433-443.

and explored in person, and those lands by which the English know only “by relation” of Indian emissaries.³

The choice of a cross was no coincidence. The religious beliefs of the transplanted English in the Chesapeake molded all aspects of their lives; in the words of Carl Bridenbaugh, “everything that Englishmen did or wrote about colonizing was encased in religion and suffused with a genuine piety.”⁴ This piety shaped the fears of the initial English settlers, influencing early modern English relations with the Spanish and the Native Americans, contributing to the near downfall of the Virginia venture.

This chapter situates the study within the early modern English world. Since religious beliefs influenced emotions, an introduction to the religious climate of the time must be examined. Absolutes of good and evil anchored the ontology of English colonialism and from this intellectual framework emanated a discussion about the Devil in early modern England that had special significance in English interactions with perceived threats in the New World. Because religious views influenced political action, the national and theological competition between Protestant England and Roman Catholic Spain requires examination as well. In doing so, a picture of how fear encased in religion influenced the early days of English colonization will emerge.

³ For more on the significance of Smith’s map, see Lisa Blansett, “John Smith Maps Virginia: Knowledge, Rhetoric, and Politics” in Envisioning an English Empire: Jamestown and the Making of the North Atlantic World, eds. Robert Appelbaum and John Wood Sweet (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2005), 68-91, especially 74-75.

⁴ Carl Bridenbaugh, Jamestown 1544-1699 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 61.

Religion in Early Modern England

Separated from the rest of the continent, England still found herself mired in the religious milieu that characterized Europe's early modern era. William Bouwsma, Barbara Rosenwein, Johan Huizinga, Michael Walzer, Jean Delumeau and others have convincingly argued that early modern Europe was an era of general uneasiness, with Europeans immersed in a culture of "guilt and shame."⁵ In England, Protestantism fell under siege. Even though the Reformation brought about significant change in the form of Protestant doctrine, historians acknowledge that many of the basic characteristics of Catholicism continued to persevere.⁶

Two distinct preoccupations – among many others – distinguished Protestantism from Catholic doctrine in the early modern era: eschatology and fear concerning predestination. Delumeau states that even though Calvin himself did not espouse the idea of double predestination, there was an overall Protestant emphasis on the idea. This particular aspect of Protestant belief could lead to incredible, inconsolable despair

⁵ William J. Bouwsma, "Anxiety and the Formation of Early Modern Culture" in After the Reformation: essays in honor of J. H. Hexter, ed. Barbara C. Malamet (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980) p. 215-246. See also Barbara Rosenwein, Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006); Johan Huizinga, The Autumn of the Middle Ages (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996); Michael Walzer, "Puritanism as a Revolutionary Ideology," History and Theory 3, no. 1 (1964): 59-90; and Jean Delumeau's Le Péché et La Peur (Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1983); the English translation used here is Sin and Fear: the Emergence of a Western Guilt Culture, 13th-18th centuries (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990).

⁶ For an introduction to the English Reformation, see Eamon Duffy, The Stripping of the Alters: Traditional Religion in England c.1400 - c.1580, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005) and Christopher Haigh, English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993); see also Delumeau, Sin and Fear, 505.

for those who did not believe themselves members of the elect.⁷ Focusing upon the Anglican Church in particular, the culmination of events in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries simply “confirmed the apocalyptic interpretation of the Reformation.”⁸ For example, Arthur Dent in his 1603 work Ruine of Rome called on Englishmen to wait “every hour for the sound of the seventh trumpet of the Apocalypse.”⁹

In addition to the anxiety felt regarding the end of days and assurance of one’s own election, any type of misfortune was interpreted as the judgment of God, following the law of nature.¹⁰ In the words of Perry Miller, events were not “produced by the blind operations of cause and effect, economic motives, or human contrivances; these were ‘second causes’ through which God worked.”¹¹ The records of the Virginia Company of London yield repeated instances when obstacles were attributed to providence, usually perceived as a result of a failure to uphold the covenant the English believed they were

⁷ John Stachniewski, The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 19. Simply put, double predestination is the belief that God has already selected those who will attain salvation and a place in Paradise. Those not among God’s ‘elect’ are destined for eternal damnation. Theorist Max Weber traced the origins of the capitalist spirit in the efforts to attain self-assurance in one’s pre-destined election; see Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the “Spirit” of Capitalism and other writings (New York: Penguin, 2002), 1-201.

⁸ Delumeau, Sir and Fear, 532; Kupperman, The Jamestown Project, 12.

⁹ Quoted in Delumeau, Sir and Fear, 532. For a concise description of post-Reformation belief in the apocalypse, see Frederic J. Baumgartner, Longing For the End: A History of Millennialism in Western Civilization (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 81-104.

¹⁰ There is no better introduction to early modern English conceptions of providence than Alexandra Walsham’s Providence in Early Modern England (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

¹¹ Percy Miller, “The Religious Impulse in the Founding of Virginia: Religion and Society in the Early Literature,” The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series 5, no. 4 (1948): 503.

entered in with the Almighty.¹² These providential obstacles the English perceived in the New World will be discussed in further detail in Chapter III.

The Devil in Early Modern England

If God himself proved a source of fear, it is not surprising to observe the fear of early modern Englishmen and women reserved for His antithesis. There existed widespread belief that Satan could affect the lives of man both physically and mentally. The Devil could take physical form, and also insidiously influence the thoughts of men through temptation to cause sin.¹³ Darren Oldridge argues that these conceptions resulted from the incomplete nature of the Reformation.¹⁴ This is not to say that a “distinctly Protestant set of ideas about the Devil” failed to emerge, but is more so a testament to the dexterity of “traditional ideas of the Devil [that] not only survived [the Reformation] but continued to flourish.”¹⁵

There existed in England a common belief that the “father of lyes” could be physically summoned via witchcraft, usually appearing in the form of an animal. Satan preferred the form of a crow or that of the “great dogge” because these appearances

¹² For more on the English perceived covenant with God, see Edward Bond, Damned Souls in a Tobacco Colony: Religion in Seventeenth Century Virginia (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2000). For a short introduction to the transplantation of faith in Virginia, see also E. Clowes Chorley, “The Planting of the Church in Virginia,” The William and Mary Quarterly, Second Series 10, no. 3 (1930): 192-213.

¹³ Nathan Johnstone. The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 6-7.

¹⁴ Darren Oldridge, The Devil in Early Modern England (Gloucestershire, UK: Sutton, 2000), 16-39.

¹⁵ Johnstone, Devil and Demonism in EME, vii, 1, 59.

“favored the darkness of night.”¹⁶ The witch’s séance was identified as one of the avenues towards diabolical apparition. As a result, English leadership took precautionary steps towards eliminating the practice of witchcraft. In 1542, witchcraft became a capital crime, with Henry VIII imposing the death penalty on any witchcraft from *maleficium* to “invocacons or conjuracons” that might summon Satan into the temporal world.¹⁷ After the ascension of James I – who while still King of Scotland in 1597 published a treatise on the subject of witchcraft titled Daemonologie – the death penalty remained a means of protection against evil spirits thought to be the minions of the diabolical.¹⁸ The English would transplant these anxieties towards witchcraft to the New World, where the fears of “these detestable slaves of the Devill” took root, most infamously evidenced by the trails in Salem, Massachusetts in 1692.¹⁹

¹⁶ Oldridge, Devil in Early Modern England, 39-60. A. Roger Ekirch, At Day’s Close: Night in Times Past (New York: Norton, 2005), 15.

¹⁷ Henry VIII, “An Act against Conjurations, Witchcrafts, Sorcery, and Enchantments,” (1541/2) in Witchcraft and Society in England and America 1570-1750, ed. Marion Gibson (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 1-2.

¹⁸ James I, “An Act against Conjuraton, Witchcraft and dealing with evil and wicked Spirits,” (1604) in Gibson, ed., Witchcraft and Society, 6.

¹⁹ James I, Daemonologie (London, 1597), xi accessed online via Project Guttenberg <<http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/25929>>. On witchcraft in colonial Virginia, see Richard Beale Davis, “The Devil in Seventeenth Century Virginia,” in Literature and Society in Early Virginia, 1608-1840 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973), 14-42; Carson O. Hudson Jr., These Detestable Slaves of the Devill: A Concise Guide to Witchcraft in Colonial Virginia (Haverford, PA: Infinity, 2001); and Lindsay M. Newman, “‘Under an Ill Tongue’: Witchcraft and Religion in Seventeenth Century Virginia” (M.A. thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2009). On witchcraft in colonial New England, see John Demos, Entertaining Satan: Witchcraft and the Culture of Early New England (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Richard Goodbeer, The Devil’s Dominion: Magic and Religion in Early New England (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992); David D. Hall, Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990); Mary Beth Norton, In the Devil’s Snare: The Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692 (New York:

While the Devil might assume the appearance of any number of animal 'familiars,' tradition held that such an encounter would take place during the dark hours of the night, which "closely resembled hell, Satan's eternal home, where fire gave no light."²⁰ As a result, nighttime became an object of fear in early modern England. The darkness of the night paled in comparison to the darkness that could develop in the furthest recesses of the mind, resulting from the insidious nature of the Devil's attack on one's thoughts, which could occur at any time of day. This internal attack became "the most important and dangerous aspect of his agency." The incomplete nature of the Reformation had an unintended lasting effect in this regard: reformers did not wish "to overturn the traditional belief in the Devil, as they did more high profile aspects of Catholic religion," but by eschewing the traditional spiritual power of the clergy, early modern Englishmen and women were forced to combat individually and personally the influence of Satan. This battle was all the more terrifying considering the difficulty of actually being able to identify the Devil's subtly-placed temptations. "Protestant writings," Nathan Johnstone observes, "reveal that it was not obviously sinful thoughts that might be suspect, but also those which, although ostensibly pious, might hold within them the seeds of heresy or antinomianism," the belief that one is released by grace from obeying moral laws. Indeed, "the very subtlety of the thoughts Satan was understood to introduce into the conscience" made this threat so profound.²¹ The stress of constant vigilance against the Devil prompted George Gifford, a preacher from Essex,

Knopf, 2002); and Jane Kamensky, et al., "Forum: Salem Repossessed," The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series 65, no. 3 (2008): 391-534.

²⁰ Ekirch, At Day's Close, 15.

²¹ Johnstone, Devil and Demonism in EME, 2-3, 24.

to lament a sense of hopelessness in his condition. “How shall wee descry the practise of devils,” bemoaned Gifford, “who are more deepe and subtil, and can cover their fleights and false conveiances more craftily then men!”²²

Demonism proved a tangible source of anxiety in early modern England. This demonism did not simply include the Devil himself, but also a variety of vehicles that the English perceived to be acting either directly under the influence of or in conjunction with the Antichrist, which we will now examine.

Antichrist as Corporation

Both spiritual and political doctrine advanced the idea that Satan gained agency through the Catholic Church. Spiritually, the reformed saw in Catholics’ perceived idolatry the influence of Satan and “his power to invade consciousness disguised as the commonplace thoughts and desires.”²³ Even so, this doctrinal critique of idolatry was reconcilable by the masses, as evidence shows that Catholic perceptions of the diabolical remained popular among early modern Englishmen and women.²⁴ In addition to these doctrinal holdovers from Catholicism, folk magic also continued to be practiced. As A. Roger Ekirch writes, “Rather than rivaling God’s words, folk magic equipped ordinary men and women with an additional means of combating Satan’s will.”²⁵

²² George Gifford, A Discourse of the Subtill Practises of Devilles (1587) (Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1977), B.

²³ Johnstone, Devil and Demonism in EME, 28.

²⁴ Oldridge, Devil in Early Modern England, 59.

²⁵ Ekirch, At Day’s Close, 98. For a look at the sustained popularity and implementation of folk beliefs, see Goodbeer, The Devil’s Dominion; Hall, Worlds of Wonder; and Keith

The political ramifications of the Devil's perceived alliance with the Catholic Church might have been of greater importance to early modern Englishmen and women's fears of Satan. Henry VIII's divorce allowed the English government "to perceive diabolical persecution in its conflicts with the Pope." Spurred by the king's excommunication in 1533, English reformers demonized the "Synagoge of Satan" in Rome via "print and pulpit."²⁶ But early modern Englishmen and women took a Reformed viewpoint of the Antichrist, "defining Antichrist as an institution rather than a single man." By employing this definition of Antichrist as a corporation, the reformed attacked all levels of the Church in Rome, not simply its administrative head. The English considered both clergy and laity as pawns of the Devil, and these public sentiments usually were most virulent during periods of perceived national threat.²⁷ One such threat occurred in November of 1605, when a group of English Catholic gentlemen hired Guy Fawkes – a "soldier of fortune" who came to be known as "the Divell of the Vault" for his involvement – and conspired to blow up Parliament with thirty-six barrels of gunpowder.²⁸ The heads of English government were saved only because one of the conspirators revealed the treasonous plan, and palace guards were able to apprehend

Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England (Hamondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1973).

²⁶ Johnstone, Devil and Demonism in EME, 29, 33.

²⁷ Oldridge, Devil in Early Modern England, 28-9, 85. To see what efforts were taken against Catholic recusants before the Gunpowder Plot, see Religion & Society in Early Modern England: A Sourcebook, eds. David Cressy & Lori Anne Ferrell (New York: Routledge, 1996), 132-5.

²⁸ Fawkes' nickname can be traced to William Barlow's Sermon preached at Paules Cross, the tenth of November, being the next Sunday after the Discoverie of this late Horrible Treason (London, 1606); see Johnstone, Devil and Demonism in EME, 190-1, n60.

Fawkes in Westminster Palace the night before. The Gunpowder Plot only served to proliferate widespread anti-Catholic suspicion.²⁹ The matter-of-factness of this diabolic perception of Rome in early modern England is supported, as Darren Oldridge points out, by the fact that “many of the anti-Catholic references in popular literature appeared in works that were *not* written primarily as attacks on the Roman Church. This suggests that the satanic nature of Catholicism was sufficiently well-known to be taken for granted; the theme could be dropped into popular texts of all kinds without any need for explanation.”³⁰

Satan and Iberia

This idea of Antichrist as corporation also influenced English opinions about their Iberian rivals, who were perceived as an extension of Rome. This rivalry of Christian ideologies – as well as politics and economics – was heightened by a variety of sources. To some degree, imperial jealousy of the Spanish by the English – the Spanish were firmly entrenched in the New World, whereas the English had yet to secure an overseas holding – exacerbated this tension. The holy obligations inherent in colonization in the

²⁹ Clayton Roberts, David Roberts, & Douglass R. Bisson, eds., A History of England, vol. I, Prehistory to 1774, 5th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2009), 329. An examination of how the Gunpowder Plot was represented in print can be found in Walsham, Providence in Early Modern England, 246-266. For further discussion on the memory of 5 November 1605, refer to David Cressy, Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 141-155.

³⁰ Oldridge, Devil in Early Modern England, 86 (emphasis added). For further commentary of the Devil in early modern English literature, see John D. Cox, The Devil and the Sacred in English Drama, 1350-1642 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

early modern era portrayed the rivalry as being fought over the unclaimed souls of the world. The constant threat of invasion by the Spanish repeatedly troubled English minds. Additionally, the writings of sixteenth and seventeenth-century polemicists in England raised awareness and turned the rivalry into an assault on the Spanish via the written word.

By the end of the sixteenth century, the Spanish king controlled an empire that spanned the world over, from Peru to the Philippines. In the Old World, the *Reconquista* eliminated Muslim holdings in Iberia, and in conjunction with the Venetian navy the Spanish routed the Ottoman fleet at Lepanto. Columbus' accidental discovery of the Americas was followed by the papal bulls of 1493-4, which bolstered the legitimacy of Iberian control over the New World. Pope Alexander VI's donation proclaimed Iberian dominion over any lands discovered or still to be discovered on the westward route to Asia, on the condition that the Iberians assumed responsibility for protecting and evangelizing the indigenous inhabitants.³¹ Explorers flying under the English banner reached North America as early as 1497, but by the time Sir Walter Raleigh's ill-fated attempts at colonization on Roanoke Island were organized, the Spanish had thriving holdings in both North and South America. In fact, the Spanish were the first Europeans who attempted settlement in the Chesapeake, at Ajacan in 1570-71.

Spanish interest of the *Bahia de Santa Maria* (the Spanish title for the Chesapeake Bay) can be traced back at least a decade before settlement, when an

³¹ J. H. Elliott, Empires of the Atlantic World: England and Spain in America 1492-1820 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 11. See also Anthony Pagden, Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c.1500-c.1800 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

Algonquian returned with a group of Spanish explorers back to New Spain and then the Old World. Amongst the Spaniards, he converted to Catholicism and adopted the name Don Luis de Velasco. Don Luis would return to Virginia with a group of Jesuits, who attempted to establish a mission on the Chickahominy River. Upon his arrival, Don Luis abandoned the Jesuits for his native brethren. After a year, he led an attack upon the mission, which left only one survivor, a boy named Alonso de Olmos.³² The disastrous outcome of the Jesuit mission at Ajacan put an end to Spanish aspirations in Virginia, and the Iberians focused on their holdings in Florida, Central and South America. Not until Jamestown were the English able to establish a foothold in North America. Even then, it still took upwards of two decades – and the fortunate discovery of John Rolfe’s transplanted tobacco seeds – until the Virginia venture could be termed even remotely successful.³³ For over two decades after the initial settlement at Jamestown, the English continued to get reports on and fear Spanish assault.

The rivalry between Spain and England encompassed not only an overseas land-grab, but also a race to procure the unaccounted-for souls of the world. The first point mentioned in Richard Hakluyt’s Discourse Concerning Westerne Planting – and Hakluyt’s most important argument for the case of English colonization – is for

³² Seth Mallios, The Deadly Politics of Giving: Exchange and Violence at Ajacan, Roanoke, and Jamestown (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006), 37-57. Carl Bridenbaugh posits that Don Luis de Velasco and Opechancanough, leader of the Powhatan attack on the English settlers in 1622, are the same person, stating it is “a reasonable, workable, and plausible hypothesis into which the known facts fit nicely.” See Bridenbaugh, Jamestown, 1544-1699, 10-33.

³³ For more on the evolution of English colonization methods, see Karen Ordahl Kupperman, “The Beehive as Model for Colonial Design” in America in European Consciousness, 1493-1750, ed. Kupperman (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 272-292.

“thinlargemente of the gospel of Christe, whereunto the princes of the reformed religion are chefeley bounde.” Hakluyt refers to the populace of the New World as “idolaters,” a designation with derisive Catholic connotations that would not be lost upon his readers. The effects of conversion would be two-fold; not only would the ranks of the elect swell – supporting Reformed views that theirs was the true faith – but conversion would also yield to “these simple people that are in errour into the righte and perfecte way of their salvation.” The idea that mere numbers justified the validity of one brand of Christianity over another – and Catholicism’s success in South America – was one that deeply troubled Hakluyt. He observed that “the papists confirme themselves and drawe others to their side, shewing that they are the true Catholicke church because they have bene the onely converters of many millions of infidells to Christianitie... how many infidells have been by us converted?”³⁴

The threat of invasion by Catholic Spain weighed heavily upon the minds of the English. During the Marian Revolt, a plan to launch a Spanish invasion of England via Scotland was uncovered.³⁵ While these plans never came to fruition, the constant tension eventually resulted in England breaking diplomatic relations with Spain by

³⁴ Richard Hakluyt, A Discourse Concerning Westerne Planting, Written in the Year 1584 (Cambridge: John Wilson and Son, 1877), 3-11. For more on Hakluyt and his work, see Peter C. Mancall, Hakluyt’s Promise: An Elizabethan’s Obsession for an English America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007) and David S. Shields, “Discourses on Western Planting: Richard Hakluyt and the Making of the Atlantic World,” in The Atlantic World and Virginia, 1550-1624, ed. P. Mancall (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 410-453.

³⁵ For more on the Marian Revolt and the Spanish connection, see History of England Vol. I, 279-285.

1584.³⁶ Hakluyt railed against the way Spain dabbled in English territories: “Hath not he [Spain’s King Philip II] sente rounde somes of money into Scotland, bothe to the kinge and those that are aboute him, to alter the estate there and to trouble oures?” “Hath not this Spanish asse,” continued Hakluyt, “divers tymes sente forren forces into Ireland, furnished with money, armor, munitions, and victuals?”³⁷ The fact that Ireland remained predominantly Catholic contributed to this constant concern of invasion, as Ireland presented another plausible launching pad for their Iberian Catholic brethren.³⁸ The year 1588 confirmed many Englishmen’s worst fears with the deployment of the fabled Armada across the English Channel. A combination of fortuitous weather, undermanned and under-gunned Spanish ships and (according to the English) providence contributed to the defeat of the Spanish fleet.³⁹ Even this seminal moment in English history was not without frightening controversy, prompting the release of a pamphlet, A Packe of Spanish Lyes, to counter rumors of “the imprisonment of Francis Drake and other great Nobles of Englande” and that “the Queene is in the field with an armie”

³⁶ Spanish intrigue into English affairs were the norm from the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign; see Walter K. Hunt “Anglo-Spanish Relations During the Early Years of Elizabeth I, 1558-1574” (M.A. thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1974).

³⁷ Hakluyt, Discourse Concerning Westerne Planting, 53.

³⁸ Carla Pestana argues that the reason why Catholicism persevered in Ireland rests in the fact that the Irish identified the Reformed faith with the invading and unwanted English forces. See Pestana, Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic World (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 51-3.

³⁹ William S. Maltby, The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558-1660 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1971), 76.

fighting not only the Spanish but also “a certaine mutinie which was amongst the Queenes army.”⁴⁰

The two nations remained at war on the seas until the peace brokered by England’s James I in 1604 “sealed Britain’s participation in Philip III’s *Pax Hispanica*.”⁴¹ This peace proved shaky at best, and while the Spanish never attacked the Jamestown settlement specifically, they did target vessels involved with the Virginia venture on the high seas. For instance, in March 1621 the English vessel *Margaret and John* battled not one, but two Spanish men-of-war in the West Indies en route to Virginia, where the crew “hoped to transact some profitable business.” The exploits of the *Margaret and John*, commanded by Anthony Chester, are all the more remarkable considering the crew could not “place our cannon as we wanted to” because of the bountiful amount of trade goods on board. The Spaniards demanded the surrender of the ship, and having refused them, the English “had to choose between two evils” and engaged the Spanish. Chester’s crew proved more than capable; the English were able to put one Spanish ship to flight and disable the other “to such an extent that the whole crew had to take to shore to save themselves from a watery grave.” Ten Englishmen were lost, but this number seems to pale in comparison to the casualties inflicted upon the Spanish. Chester himself was unsure of the number of Spanish casualties, but confident in an English total victory; “How many of the Spaniards were killed we never knew,” he

⁴⁰ A Packe of Spanish lyes, sent abroad in the world: first printed in Spaine in the Spanish tongue, and translated out of the originall. Now ripped vp, vnfolded, and by just examination condemned, as conteyning false, corrupt, and detestable wares, worthy to be damned and burned (1588) (Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1972), 1-2.

⁴¹ Kupperman, Roanoke, 6. Eric Griffin, “The Specter of Spain in John Smith’s Colonial Writing” in Envisioning an English Empire, 119.

reported, “but certain it is that during the encounters we saw many of them fall and not a few find their grave in the water which was actually red with their blood.”⁴²

The threat of invasion broadcasted through early modern print culture both reflected and shaped English conceptions of the Spanish. Works regarding the Inquisition, as well as English-language translations of Spanish travel literature such as Bartolomé de Las Casas’ Brevissima Relación de la Destrucción de Las Indias (first translated in 1583) painted a cruel, inhumane, and certainly non-Christian picture that eventually manifested itself in the form of *la leyenda negra*.⁴³ Richard Hakluyt’s Discourse Concerning Westerne Planting may be said to have launched the Black Legend in England, having been released before Las Casas’ translation. In his Discourse, Hakluyt argued against the validity of the Alexandrian bull of donation, stating, “No Pope had any lawfull auctoritie to give any such donation at all.”⁴⁴ Writing of Virginia specifically, William Strachey voiced sentiments similar to those of Hakluyt; “No prince may lay claim to any amongst these new discoveries...[other] than what his people have discovered, took actual possession of, and passed over to right” and that the King of Spain “hath no more title, nor colour of title, to this place...than hath any Christian prince.”⁴⁵ Some of these works railing against the Spanish and Catholic

⁴² “Two Tragical Events.” The William and Mary Quarterly, First Series 9, no. 4 (1901): 203-07.

⁴³ The Dutch prince William I of Orange explained the brutal behavior exhibited by the Spanish conquistadors was a result of their bloodlines; “the greatest parts of the Spanyardes...are of the blood of the Moores and Jews.” William I, Apology (1581) quoted in Griffin, “The Specter of Spain,” 117.

⁴⁴ Hakluyt, Discourse Concerning Westerne Planting, 129.

⁴⁵ William Strachey, “The Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania” (1612) quoted in Elliot, Empires of the Atlantic World, 11, 23.

components of the Antichrist corporation were intended for small, private audiences; others, like John Foxe's Acts and Monuments, commonly known as the Book of Martyrs, "went through literally innumerable editions and soon took its place besides the Bible as the staple reading of Protestant England."⁴⁶

Early modern Englishmen and women viewed their Iberian rivals as sources of diabolical agency. Jealousy, an innate feeling of national self-preservation, and popular literature contributed in the production of English fears linking Satan with Iberia. These fears greatly influenced arguments for English colonization, the next topic of discussion.

Religion and Colonization

The reasons for colonization issued by the Virginia Company of London provide an excellent example of how the religious climate influenced seemingly secular goals. Sir Thomas West – more commonly referred to as the third Baron De La Warr – was instructed before he assumed the designation of First Governor and Captain-General that the Jamestown colony was to meet three "*Religious and Noble and Feasable*" ends.

First, and supposedly of the utmost importance, was "to preach and baptize into *Christian Religion*, and by propagation of the *Gospell*, to recover out of the Armes of the Divell, a number of poore and miserable soules...in almost *invincible ignorance*, and accomplishment of the number of the elect, which shall be gathered from out all corners

⁴⁶ Maltby, The Black Legend in England, 33. See also John D. King, Foxe's "Book of Martyrs" and Early Modern Print Culture (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 2006).

of the earth.”⁴⁷ The influence of religion is obvious, and mention of the Devil can be interpreted in two ways. This allusion could be taken to mean that the Devil gained agency through the Native Americans. The “Armes of the Divell” might also be a trope for the Spanish. Taking this into consideration, a religious flair to the imperial competition between Protestant England and Catholic Spain emerges. Both nations – and therefore both faiths – competed in attempting to enlarge the membership of their brand of Christianity.⁴⁸

The second reason for colonization addressed a palpable fear that inhabited the minds of Virginia Company officials regarding the problem of England’s surplus population.⁴⁹ Even before colonization efforts began in earnest, English polemicists recognized the excess of English workers. Stephen Batman, in his A Christall Glasse of Christian Reformation, bluntly described the unemployment situation of early modern England: “Of such idle labourers,” he wrote, “there are to[o] many.”⁵⁰ In order “to provide

⁴⁷ Thomas West, Sir Thomas Smith, Sir Walter Cope, and Master Waterson, “A True and Sincere Declaration of the Purpose and Ends of the Plantation Begun in Virginia,” (London, 1610) in The Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century: A Documentary History of Virginia, 1606-1700, ed. Warren M. Billings (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2007), 15.

⁴⁸ Pestana, Protestant Empire, 33.

⁴⁹ James Horn points out that the English population more than doubled from 2.3 to 4.8 million between 1520 and 1630. See Horn, Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1994), 19-77; Horn, “Leaving England: The Social Background of Indentured Servants in the Seventeenth Century” on Virtual Jamestown <http://www.virtualjamestown.org/essays/horn_essay.html>; Edmund S. Morgan, American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia (New York: Norton, 2003), 44-70.

⁵⁰ Stephen Batman, A Christall Glasse of Christian Reformation wherein the Godly Maye Beholde the Coloured Abuses Used in this our Present Tyme. Collected by Stephen Bateman Minister (London, 1569), g.i. accessed online via Early English Books

and build up for the publike *Honour* and *Safety* of our *Gratious King* and his *Estates*,” Hakluyt pushed for the transplantation of the “ranckness and multitude of increase in our [English] people.” This spike in English population was not accompanied by a rise in available jobs, instigating a dispersion of jobless vagrants. These men posed a threat to any Englishman; without any means of supporting themselves, they turned to “pilferinge and thevinge and other lewdness.”⁵¹ Hakluyt identified Virginia as a logical destination for the unemployed masses, whereby they would be assigned jobs, able “to worke for their life and sustentation” instead of becoming “a burthen to another.”⁵² In effect, the English Crown killed two birds with one stone: providing jobs for the jobless, whose production, in return, would help fill the Crown’s coffers. “It will prove a general benefit unto our Country,” explained George Peckham in 1583, “that through this occasion [the colonization of North America]... a great number of men which do now live idly at home, and are burdenous, chargeable, and unprofitable to this Realme, shall be set to work.”⁵³ This fight against idleness can also be seen as a defense against the influences of Satan. In early modern England, idleness was considered the “mother of all vice,” and Batman wrote that the insidious nature of the Devil manifested itself as “an inward sloth or sluggishness.”⁵⁴

Online database <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99850586>.

⁵¹ Hakluyt, *Discourse Concerning Westerne Planting*, 37.

⁵² “A True and Sincere Declaration,” in *Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century*, 15.

⁵³ George Peckham in *The English Literatures of America, 1500-1800*, eds. Myra Jehlen and Michael Warner (New York: Routledge, 1997), 63.

⁵⁴ Batman, *A Christall Glasse*, f.iii.

The third reason for colonization outlined for Lord De La Warr was economical, seemingly devoid of religious influence. An acknowledged need for the development of importable commodities existed, and in the eyes of Englishmen, the islands had relied far too often on the natural resources of others. Buying into the many reports of the New World being a land of plenty, as well as observing the successes of their Iberian rivals in South America, the English hoped to use the settlement at Jamestown to “furnish and provide” for the Kingdom with goods and resources they felt “enforced to buy, and receive at the curtesie of other Princes,” namely those of Spain, France, and Italy.⁵⁵ If successful, the English Crown would no longer have to fear being unable to provide for its Empire. This fear drove the Crown to push the colonists in Virginia towards commodity diversification, which – with the exception of John Rolfe’s important transplantation of a West Indian strain of tobacco – most often ended in failure.⁵⁶ While this drive for marketable commodities is at the core economic, we again see the Protestant – Catholic rivalry present. These endeavors aimed to release Protestant England from continental traders who were overwhelmingly Catholic, and therefore fell under the umbrella of the Antichrist corporation.

In early modern England, the machinations of the Devil were interpreted in the actions of both England’s Catholic minority and their Iberian rivals. Measures to combat these agents of the Antichrist corporation influenced everyday assumptions and interactions between the English and both parties. When the English settled Jamestown

⁵⁵ “A True and Sincere Declaration,” in Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century, 15.

⁵⁶ See Chapter III.

in 1607, the colonists transplanted these anxieties associated with followers of Catholicism and the Spanish. It is these transplanted fears to which we now turn.

Catholicism in Jamestown

Across the Atlantic, the Catholic arm of the Antichrist continually manifested itself within the confines of the Jamestown settlement. Edward Maria Wingfield found himself elected the first governor of Virginia, most likely on his status as a main stockholder in the expedition and despite his adherence to Catholicism. During the initial days of colonization, Wingfield faced allegations of food hoarding. In his *apologia* to the Virginia Company, Wingfield described specifically how John Ratcliffe accused the governor of denying him but a “spoon-ful of beer” and served him provisions of foul corn. Wingfield also found himself accused of atheism because he “carried not a Bible” on his person.⁵⁷ An easy target because of his strong Catholic background, he was deposed of in favor of Captain John Smith.⁵⁸

After the Wingfield fiasco, anxiety of Catholics continued in colonial Jamestown. John Pory traveled to Virginia in 1619 and assumed the role of secretary under Governor George Yeardley. In June the following year, Pory wrote a letter to Sir Edwin Sandys, who at the time held the office of treasurer of the Virginia Company in London.

⁵⁷ Edward Maria Wingfield, “A Discourse of Virginia,” in Jamestown Narratives, 189, 197-9.

⁵⁸ Not much historical inquiry has been devoted to Virginia’s first governor, the same man with a plaque devoted to his contributions to the colony located in the still-standing Jamestown Church. His only biography was written by a descendent. See Jocelyn R. Wingfield, Virginia’s True Founder: Edward Maria Wingfield and His Times, 1550-1631 (North Carolina: Book Surge, 2007).

The letter mostly concerns itself with suggestions as to how the Company can take steps to improve the venture, including time of arrival, route of passage, and “y^e eleccon of yo^r people.” At the conclusion of the letter, Pory makes mention of a certain “M^r Chanterton” who “smells too much of Rome.” Mr. Chanterton was a devout Catholic, for he attempted “to worke myracles wth his Crucyfixe” while “mayntaining his sensles religion as he doth professe yt wth blindnes.” The “Zeale” of Chanterton’s faith troubled Pory, who was of the belief that Chanterton came “*hither as a spy.*” Pory had well-grounded reasons for suspicion; Chanterton himself told Pory of his recent travels to “Rome in Octob^r Last.”⁵⁹ Ultimately, no action was taken against the Catholic, as the administration in Virginia agreed to “take no notice.”⁶⁰ Regardless, as evidenced by this letter, Chanterton’s mere presence and his blatant Catholicism caused others to look suspiciously upon him and heightened anxieties amongst his fellow colonists as well.

Fear of Spain in Jamestown

Catholics like Chanterton composed just one group by which the early modern Englishmen in Jamestown perceived the agency of the Antichrist; the Spanish constituted another. Fear of the Spanish continually manifested itself in the writings of the Jamestown settlers. In 1619 – more than a decade after the initial English settlement – John Pory still voiced concern in the “event whereof (we may misdoubte)

⁵⁹ John Pory to Sir Edwin Sandys, 12 June 1620 in The Records of the Virginia Company, Vol. III, ed. Susan M. Kingsbury (Washington D.C.: GPO, 1933), 301-4 (Henceforth referred to as RVC Vol. III).

⁶⁰ Bond, Damned Souls in a Tobacco Colony, 113.

will prove some attempte of the Spaniard upon” the Jamestown colony.⁶¹ John Rolfe voiced similar concerns to Sir Edwin Sandys the same year; Rolfe was wary of establishing a plantation at Point Comfort (located at the mouth of present day Hampton Roads, Virginia) because “the Colony would be quyte vndone and that ere long: for that vndoubtedly, the Spanyard would be here the next spring wch [an informant] gathered (as was sayd) from some Spanyarde in y^e West Indyes.”⁶² As a result, the Virginia Company stressed constant vigilance. In a letter from London to the Governor and Council in Virginia, the company officials reminded the colonists to “tend to yo^r saftie, to w^{ch} no gaine can be comparable, but to be alwaies so prepared as in imminent danger,” specifically to the Spanish, who continued to preoccupy English minds.⁶³

Calls for refortification of the settlement were suggested more in response to the Spanish than the threat posed by the Native Americans.⁶⁴ George Thorpe, a minister sent to Jamestown who undertook the responsibility of schooling the natives in the finer points of Protestantism, admitted that the settlement in Virginia was ill-equipped to stave off a Spanish attack, and requested supplies to refortify. “I praie,” Thorpe wrote, “therefore bee a meanes wee maie have some Pikes sent vs w^{ch} weapon the maner of o^r peoples fightinge wth the natives hath worne quite out of vse but if shall have to doe

⁶¹ John Pory to “The Right Honble and my singular goode lord,” 30 September 1619 in RVC Vol. III, 219-20.

⁶² John Rolfe to Sir Edwin Sandys, January 1619/20 in RVC Vol. III, 244-45.

⁶³ Council of the Virginia Company to the Governor and Council in Virginia, 5 December 1621 in RVC Vol. III, 533.

⁶⁴ Frederic Gleach wrote that for the English, “avoiding attack by other Europeans was more important than waging war against the Powhatans.” See Gleach, Powhatan’s World and Colonial Virginia: A Conflict of Cultures (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 162-3.

wth the Spaniard wee must fight wth him in his treanches.” Thorp had little confidence in the palisades that surrounded him, but even less confidence in his own ability to fight: “hee that can doe wth a Pike is better Soldier than I.”⁶⁵

Jamestown did hold Spanish prisoners, and there is great probability that at least one settler was executed on the grounds that he was a Spanish spy.⁶⁶ Captain George Kendall was a member of the First Council at Jamestown, his previous services to the Crown including an assignment to spy upon Roman Catholic rebel Englishmen in the Netherlands. In late summer of 1607, Kendall was “put off... the council, and committed to prison, for that it did manifestly appear he did practice to sow discord between the president and council.”⁶⁷ As a result, Kendall “was by a jury condemned and shot to death.”⁶⁸ While contemporary sources speak of an ambiguous “dangerous conspiracy,” Philip Barbour argues that Captain Kendall played the role of double agent, offering his faculties to both Protestant England and Roman Catholic Spain.⁶⁹ The most compelling evidence in support of this argument emerges from Spanish sources. Correspondence between Don Alonso de Velasco (the Spanish ambassador to London) and the King included a report penned by a certain “Francisco Maguel.” Maguel wrote that the English “have tried in that fort of theirs at Jamestown an English Captain, a Catholic,

⁶⁵ George Thorp to Sir Edwin Sandys, 15 May 1621 in RVC Vol. III, 447.

⁶⁶ Kupperman, Jamestown Project, 218-220.

⁶⁷ Wingfield, “A Discourse of Virginia,” in Jamestown Narratives, 186.

⁶⁸ John Smith, “A True Relation of such occurrences and accidents of note as hath hap’ned in Virginia since the first planting of that colony which is now resident in the south part thereof, till the last return from thence. Written by Captain Smith, one of the said colony, to a worshipful friend of his in England,” (London, 1608) in Jamestown Narratives, 154.

⁶⁹ Philip L. Barbour, “Captain George Kendall: Muntineer or Intelligencer?” Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 70 (1962): 297-313.

called Captain Tindol because they knew that he had tried to get to Spain, in order to reveal to his Majesty all about this country and many plans of the English which he knew.”⁷⁰

For at least three years, the sight of Spanish prisoners was normal at Jamestown. In 1611, a Spanish caravel with 11 or 12 men ventured into the Chesapeake “to seek a ship of the King of Spain which had been lost on that coast.”⁷¹ Three of those men – Diego de Molina, Antonio Perez, and Francisco Lembri – landed, were subsequently apprehended by the English, and “broughtt to James Towne and sentt as prissoners A board severall shippes.”⁷² One of the Spaniards, Perez, we know little of except for a report that he died “more from hunger than from sickness, but certainly with the patience of a saint and the spirit of a good soldier.” His fellow captives provide examples of the perceived Spanish arm of the Antichrist corporation at work against the English in the New World.

Don Diego de Molina, the recognized leader of the Spanish landing party, gained permission to write letters home from Jamestown. Two years after his capture, Molina relayed information back to the Spanish Crown in a secret letter “between the soles of a

⁷⁰ Francis Maguel, “Report of what Francisco Maguel, an Irishman, learned in the state of Virginia during the eight months that he was there, July 1, 1610,” in Jamestown Narratives, 453.

⁷¹ John Clark, “Declaration of the Englishmen in Virginia, 23 July 1611,” in Jamestown Narratives, 547.

⁷² George Percy, “A Trewe Relacyon of the Pcedeings and Ocurrentes of Momente wch have hapned in Virginia from the Tyme Sr Thomas GATES was shippwrackte upon the BERMUDES ano 1609 untill my depture outt of the Country wch was in ano Dñi 1612,” Tyler’s Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine 3, no. 4 (1922): 279, accessed via Virtual Jamestown, <<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1063>>.

shoe” via “a gentlemen from Venice...who having fallen into certain grave errors is now restored to his first [Catholic] religion.” In the letter, Molina reported the emotional state of the colony, suggesting morale low enough that the English colonists would be “anxious to see a fleet from Spain to release them from this misery,” even going so far as to proclaim that “not a single person” would resist a Spanish takeover. Molina also provided commentary on the preparedness (or lack thereof) of the fort’s defenses, deriding the English fortifications as constructed “without skill” and “so fragile that a kick would destroy them.”⁷³ Eventually – at the behest of the Spanish ambassador, Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, Conde de Gondomar – Molina was transported back to England aboard the *Treasurer*, the same ship that ferried John Rolfe and Pocahontas (now Rebecca Wolfe after baptism and the adoption of a Christian name) across the Atlantic for their English tour. Molina returned to Spain thereafter, and remained a source of anxiety for the English. According to George Percy, Molina was “made Generall of six tall shippes” that presumably “sett outt of purpose to Supplantt” the English venture in Virginia.⁷⁴

A more fascinating story belongs to the third member of the landing party, Francisco Lembri. According to Molina, Lembri “claimed to be from Aragon;” his English captors disagreed.⁷⁵ John Clark identified Lembri as an English spy named Limbrecke based upon a previous encounter. Two years previous, Clark claimed to have seen

⁷³ Don Diego de Molina to Don Alonso de Velasco, 28 May 1613 in Jamestown Narrative, 750-1.

⁷⁴ Percy, “A Trewe Relaycon,” 279-80.

⁷⁵ Don Diego de Molina to Don Alsonso de Velasco, 8 July 1613 in Jamestown Narratives, 784.

Limbrecke in Malaga “serving as a pilot in the armada of Don Luis Faxardo.”⁷⁶ Although uncertain of his allegiance, the English leaders in Jamestown nevertheless considered the “hispayolated Englishman” Limbrecke a traitor. During the same voyage that returned Molina back to Europe, the ambiguous Limbrecke was made an example of: George Percy reported that once the ship bearing the Rolles, Molina, and Sir Thomas Dale came “wth in sighte of the English Shoare,” Limbrecke was “hanged upp att the yardes Arme” of the *Treasurer*.⁷⁷

Even after the Indian attack of 1622 – when one would imagine most attention would be diverted towards the indigenous people of Virginia after the deaths of 347 settlers – members of the Virginia Company still considered the Spanish a formidable and dangerous threat. Although not explicitly mentioned by name, we see that the Spanish specter still loomed, prompting a call for continued vigilance. Assuming the accepted preconception of the English settlers that the Native Americans were uncivilized, and therefore inferior, the group of “Enemies of equall condicon in Armes and und^rstanding, and more mightier in power” that the Company speaks of can only mean the Spanish. Once again, the Company stressed watchfulness; “We thinke it yo^r dutie,” advised Company officials in London, “to stand always vppon yo^r guard, and prepared for defence as much as yo^u may.”⁷⁸ These fears were well deserved; unbeknownst to the English, the Spanish ambassador to London, Don Pedro de Zúñiga

⁷⁶ John Clark, “Declaration,” in *Jamestown Narratives*, 546.

⁷⁷ Percy, “A Trewe Relacyon,” 280.

⁷⁸ Virginia Company to the Governor and Council in Virginia, 7 October 1622 in *RVC Vol. III*, 684-5.

repeatedly urged King Philip III to wipe out the settlement in the same fashion the Spanish utilized against the French at Fort Caroline in 1565.⁷⁹

Conclusion

Reformed beliefs provided a framework for interpretation by which the early modern English observed the world around them. This belief system was resplendent with fears concerning heavenly election, eschatology, and most importantly the agency of the Devil on Earth. In particular, English Reformed beliefs of the Devil came to encompass not only the Antichrist himself, but also Roman Catholics and the Iberian empire. English dealings with each perceived representation of the Antichrist in the Old World – such as the failed invasion of the Armada in 1588 and the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 – led to the development of a discourse of fear that was transplanted to the New World.

In Virginia, English belief that Catholics and Spaniards acted as agents of the diabolical persisted. Yet these groups were, at the very least, familiar to early modern Englishmen. Another, more unfamiliar group – the Native Americans – also played an important perceived role within the Antichrist corporation, and will be subject of the next chapter.

⁷⁹ William Kelso, Jamestown: The Buried Truth (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006), 40-43. For more on the Spanish annihilation of Fort Caroline in Florida, see Elliott, Empires of the Atlantic World, 10 and Alan Taylor, American Colonies: The Settlement of North America (New York: Penguin, 2001), 77.

Chapter II

“To satisfy Crewell hunger”

For two years, the Jamestown project struggled to sustain itself. Between 1607 and 1609, colonial leaders acknowledged that success lay in the colonists' ability to establish satellite settlements near Jamestown; Captain John Smith went to great lengths to explore the surrounding areas of the Chesapeake.¹ The first attempt at English colonial sprawl focused upon Nansemond, a village located approximately five miles from the junction of the Nansemond and James Rivers.² This attempt failed, although the English forcibly procured a “great store of maize” to supplement their barren food stores.

The English officer left in charge at Nansemond, Captain Martin, returned to Jamestown, allowing Lieutenant John Sicklemore – also referred to as John Ratcliffe – to assume command in his absence. This decision proved disastrous. Within days, “dyvrs of his men to the number of seaventene,” mutinied, taking flight from Nansemond to nearby Kecoughtan. Those seventeen were never heard from again. The English settlers who decided to stay at Nansemond fared no better. According to George Percy, most of the English “weare fownd also slayne wth their mowthes stopped full of Breade

¹ For an in-depth descriptions of Smith's Chesapeake travels, see John Smith's Chesapeake Voyages, 1607-09, eds. Helen C. Rountree, Wayne E. Clark, and Kent Mountford (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008), 75-135.

² *Ibid.*, 132.

beinge donn as it seamethe in Contempte and skorne that others mighte expecte the Lyke when they should come to seeke for breade and reliefe amongste” the Native Americans. What happened to these men can be considered tame when compared to their leader’s fate. “Liefenantt SICKLEMORE” was taken alive, then “bowned unto a tree naked wth a fyre before” him. In addition the being burned alive, “his fleshe was skraped from his bones wth mussel shelles” by Indian women. After they finished Sicklemore’s disembowelment, “his face [was] throwne into the fyre.”³

The fate of Lieutenant Sicklemore and the other English colonists under his command did not represent an isolated incident. Anglo-Amerindian relations continued to strain under the pressure provided by the American environment. While the wilderness has been a subject of various studies in colonial New England, its effects on England’s first successful colony in the Americas have been overlooked. Fear of the wilderness – including its inhabitants, the Native Americans – manifested itself as an arm of the Antichrist corporation introduced last chapter. In addition to the Spanish and Catholic anxieties felt by settlers in colonial Jamestown, the indigenous population represented the agents of the diabolical that English colonists encountered most often.

This chapter will examine the phenomenon of English misconceptions of the Indians, explaining how the Indians’ origin story (or lack thereof), religious beliefs and

³ George Percy, “A Trewe Relacyon of the Pcedeings and Ocurrentes of Momente wch have hapned in Virginia from the Tyme Sr Thomas GATES was shippwrackte upon the BERMUDES ano 1609 untill my depture outt of the Country wch was in ano Dñi 1612,” *Tyler’s Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* 3, no. 4 (1922): 263-266 accessed via Virtual Jamestown, <<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1063>>; See also *Jamestown Narratives: Eyewitness Accounts of the Virginia Colony, the First Decade: 1607-1617*, ed. Edward W. Haile (Champlain, VA: Roundhouse, 1998), 502-504.

cultural practices, and the overall breakdown in their relations with white settlers contributed to the idea of the Native American as an agent of the diabolical. Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra points to the attack of 1622 as the galvanizing moment for this ‘satanic Indian’ discourse; while I do not discount the effects of Opechancanough’s attack (which will be commented on in Chapter III), I argue that this association was made in the minds of the English much earlier, as early as the English arrival in Virginia in 1607. This discourse contributed to the “starving time” period at Jamestown over the winter of 1609-10.⁴ Equally addressed are the other environmental and cultural causes of the “starving time,” especially Edmund Morgan’s assertion that English gentility provided a definitive cause for this winter of misery.

Wilderness and Expectation

The concept of wilderness – which resists easy definition – remains the subject of scholarly debate. Roderick Nash has taken the discussion out of the temporal world, arguing, “Wilderness was a state of mind – a perceived rather than an actual condition of the environment.”⁵ English perceptions of the wilderness lacked uniqueness and fit into a general pattern that persisted in Europe until the nineteenth century. J. R. Short points to three elements in particular that contributed to this European fear of the

⁴ Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra, Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550-1700 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), 28. For religiously-influenced Spanish misperceptions of the indigenous peoples of the Americas, see Fernando Cervantes, The Devil in the New World: The Impact of Diabolism in New Spain (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).

⁵ Roderick Nash, Wilderness and the American Mind, 3rd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 1.

wilderness: the fear manifested itself “in societies with a sky-centered religion that has replaced an earth-based animism;” this fear “involved and reflected a fear of those living in the wilderness” who by definition “were not part of the social order;” and a “fear of the effects of the wilderness on individuals exposed to its influence.”⁶ To a large extent, the settlers’ religious beliefs helped shape this state of mind; parallels were drawn between the wilderness and what man faced upon earth, “a compound of his natural inclination to sin, the temptation of the material world, and the forces of the evil.”⁷

The Virginia landscape, while at times a cause for wonder (John Smith once wrote in amazement that under a full forest canopy “a man may gallop a horse amongst these woods”), also proved a source of anxiety.⁸ John Canup has argued that the disparity between the natural environment of the New World and the “familiar landscape of England” deeply troubled English settlers.⁹ Even before the English settlers arrived in 1607, the preconceived notions of what life in Virginia would present had laid the foundations for anxiety or – at the very least – disappointment. How did this happen? The answer lies in the fact that many English armchair travelers repeatedly touted the New World as a new Eden.¹⁰ In terms of sustenance, the wilderness of Virginia

⁶ John Rennie Short, Imagined Country: Environment, Culture and Society (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2005), 8-9.

⁷ Nash, Wilderness, 17-8.

⁸ John Smith, “A Map of Virginia” (1612), in The Complete Works of Captain John Smith (1580-1631) vol. I., ed. Philip L. Barbour (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 162.

⁹ John Canup, Out of the Wilderness: The Emergence of an American Identity in Colonial New England (Middleton, CONN: Wesleyan University Press, 1990), 4.

¹⁰ For more on this idea of Virginia as Eden, see James Horn, “The Conquest of Eden: Possession and Dominion in Early Virginia,” in Envisioning an English Empire: Jamestown and the Making of the North Atlantic World, eds. Robert Appelbaum and

appeared to provide plenty for the settlers.¹¹ George Percy reported that Virginia was home to “the goodliest cornfields that ever was seen in any country,” where stalks “sprang a man’s height from the ground.” He also noted that Virginia yielded “many goodly and fruitful trees, as mulberries, cherries, walnuts, cedars, cypress, sassafras, and vines in great abundance.”¹²

The waterways of Virginia were advertised to be just as bountiful as the land. In describing an Indian settlement approximately twenty-five miles upriver from Jamestown, Gabriel Archer states the town “is full of pearl muscles [mussels].”¹³ Archer also drew allusions to the northern English settlement of Newfoundland when describing the James as an aquatic cornucopia:

The main river abounds with sturgeon very large and excellent good, having also at the mouth of every brook and in every creek both store and exceeding good fish of divers kinds; and in the large sounds near the sea are multitudes of fish, banks of oysters, and many great crabs rather better in taste than ours, one able to suffice four men. And within

John Wood Sweet (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2005), 25-48 and Stephen Adams, The Best and Worst Country in the World: Perspectives on the Early Virginia Landscape (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001), 116-123.

¹¹ Gordon M. Sayre points to the economic aims of colonization as a reason for the inordinate amount of descriptions of the New World’s natural environment in English literature. “...the lesser emphasis that the English colonists placed on exploration resulted in fewer texts combining exploration and ethnography, and the greater potential for agriculture meant more attention to the plants and landforms of the mid-Atlantic coast.” See Sayre, Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 5.

¹² Percy, “Observations gathered out of a discourse of the plantation of the southern colony in Virginia by the English, 1606 Written by that honorable gentleman, Master George Percy,” in Jamestown Narratives, 93, 98.

¹³ Gabriel Archer, “A relation of the discovery of our river from James Fort into the main, made by Captain Christopher Newport, and sincerely written and observed by a gentleman of the colony,” in Jamestown Narratives, 103.

sight of land into the sea we suspect at time of year to have a good fishing for cod as both at our first entering we might perceive by palpable conjecture, seeing the cod follow the ship...¹⁴

Reports of Virginia as a 'land of plenty' continued in England throughout the first decades, even as settlers faced extreme adversity in the New World.

Descriptions of the New World such as those penned by Percy, Smith, and Archer were not without precedent. The first Virginia experiments headed by Sir Walter Raleigh produced a similar array of vivid accounts of plenty. Upon arriving at Roanoke Island, Arthur Barlowe relayed his belief that "in all the world the like abundance is not to be found." The island itself, according to Barlowe, "smelt so sweet and strong a smel, as if we had bene in the midst of some delicate garden abounding with all kinde of odoriferous flowers."¹⁵ Ralph Lane, governor of Roanoke's first settlement attempt from August 1585-June 1586, shared similar sentiments. "We have discovered the maine [land]," Lane wrote to Richard Hakluyt in 1585, "to bee the goodliest soile under the cope of heaven."¹⁶

¹⁴ Ibid., 119. For more on the English efforts at Newfoundland, see Peter E. Pope, Fish into Wine: The Newfoundland Plantation in the Seventeenth Century (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

¹⁵ Arthur Barlowe, The First Voyage to Roanoke. 1584. The First Voyage Made to the Coasts of America, with Two Barks, wherein Were Captains M. Philip Amadas and M. Arthur Barlowe, Who Discovered Part of the Countrey Now Called Virginia, anno 1584. Written by One of the Said Captaines, and Sent to Sir Walter Raleigh, Knight, at Whose Charge and Direction, the Said Voyage Was Set Forth (Boston, 1894) accessed via the University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill digitalization project, "Documenting the South," <<http://docsouth.unc.edu/nc/barlowe/barlowe.html>>.

¹⁶ Ralph Lane to Richard Hakluyt, 3 September 1585, in The First Colonists: Documents on the Planting of the First English Settlements in North America, 1584-1590, eds. David B. Quinn and Alison M. Quinn (Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources Division of Archives and History, 1982), 22.

The most influential work to emerge out of the Roanoke voyages – and later shape the ideas of English transplinters to Virginia – was Thomas Hariot’s A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia, first printed with the iconic engravings of Theodor de Bry in 1590. Hariot began his report by admonishing those who slandered the colony upon their return to England. Some of this Hariot chalks up to simple greed; “many that after golde and silver was not to[o] soone found, as it was by them looked for, had little or no care of any other thing but to pamper their bellies.” Foreshadowing the arguments put forward by Edmund Morgan nearly four hundred years later in American Slavery, American Freedom, Hariot also points to the genteel nature of the settlers as a reason for their misery: “Because there were not to be found anie English cities, nor such faire houses, nor at their owne wish any of their olde accustomed daintie food, nor any soft beds of downe or fethers.” Hariot then proceeds to list an inventory of victuals that appear in great volume at Roanoke; corn, peas, beans, and gourds appeared in such ample supplies that the Native Americans “in some places of the countrey notwithstanding they have two harvests.” To drive the point home, Hariot mentions specifically of the “infinet store” of walnuts; to illustrate the multitude of animals inhabiting the area, he points to the fact that the populations of entire native towns make “mantles of the furre.”¹⁷

Yet the descriptions of the natives, and the accompanying engravings based upon John White’s watercolors, proved most fascinating to English readers. Native Americans represented both the most intriguing and dangerous part of the environment

¹⁷ Thomas Hariot, A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia (New York: Dover, 1972), 6, 15, 18, 19.

in the New World. Hand-in-hand with the English fascination of encountering an entire people for the first time also came an inherent distrust of the Indians, as evidenced by the English linking of the natives with the Antichrist corporation. This link was not irrational, and the fate of the colonists who attempted to settle in Roanoke offered a premise for this English fear of the Indians in Jamestown.

Roanoke

The first Roanoke settlement attempt ended within a year.¹⁸ Even though initially welcomed by the Indian leader Wingina, the colonists' inability to provide for themselves strained relations with the natives. Governor Ralph Lane, expecting provisions from Wingina – provisions that the Indian chief did not have – expected foul play. Leaving the English settlement on Roanoke Island, Lane surprised Wingina on the mainland, killing the chief and his advisors. Not surprisingly, the Anglo-Indian relationship failed to improve. After Sir Francis Drake arrived days later (without any intention of resupplying the colony) Lane decided to abandon it altogether.

Weeks passed and Richard Greenville finally arrived with the supplies the first colonists so desperately needed. Arriving at the deserted colony, Greenville faced a dilemma; although ordered by Sir Walter Raleigh to leave one hundred-fifty men at Roanoke, Greenville now reconsidered. The fact that Lane and his men had left must

¹⁸ For more on the Roanoke experiments, see Karen Ordahl Kupperman's seminal work on the subject, Roanoke: The Abandoned Colony (Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1984). See also Seth Mallios, The Deadly Politics of Giving: Exchange and Violence at Ajacan, Roanoke and Jamestown (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006), 58-79 and Edmund S. Morgan, American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia (New York: Norton, 2003), 25-43.

have been shocking, and he had no knowledge that most of the colonists were safe with Drake. So “after some time spent therein, not hearing any newes of them, and finding the places which they inhabited desolate yet unwilling to lose possession of the Countrie which Englishmen had so long helde,” Greenville decided to leave behind a small force of fifteen to secure the location until a later date.¹⁹

Those fifteen souls were not forgotten. In fact, the third English attempt to settle the region had every intention of checking on those men before moving north to settle in the Chesapeake. Unfortunately, this group of fifteen became the first “lost colonists” from Roanoke. Paying for the transgressions committed by Lane, who by this point safely arrived in England, Greenville’s fifteen met immediate hostility from the native Roanoacs and Secotans. Nine of Greenville’s fifteen found a way to escape, and later joined up with four Englishmen who were left behind by Lane during his hasty departure. As far as we know, these thirteen traveled to “a little island on the right land of [the] entrance into the harbor of Hatorask,” opposite Roanoke Island.²⁰

For those thirteen colonists, the historical trail runs cold. During the final attempt to settle Roanoke, a group of one hundred-ten under the leadership of John White – he of the watercolor fame – searched for the composite group left behind by both Lane and Greenville. They found none of them, “nor any signe that they had bene there, saving onely we found the bones of one of those...which the Savages had slaine long

¹⁹ “Richard Hakluyt, “Narrative of the 1586 Virginia Voyage,” in The First Colonists, 86.

²⁰ The Roanoke Voyages, 1584-1590: Documents to Illustrate the English Voyages to North America under the Patent Granted to Walter Raleigh in 1584, vol. II, ed. David Beers Quinn (London: Hakluyt Society, 1955), 528. The location of Hatorask is explained in David Stick, The Outer Banks of North Carolina, 1584-1958 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 19.

before.”²¹ Less than a month after the attempt to resettle got underway, White decided to return to England in order to guarantee a steady flow of provisions. Like Greenville’s fifteen before, White’s transplanted group has become a historical riddle. Unable to return for three years courtesy of the Anglo-Iberian naval war, White found the colony deserted upon his arrival. Before he returned for England in 1587, White had left explicit instructions – “to carve over the letters or name a Crosse ✕ in this forme” – in case the settlers left behind came under duress and needed to relocate. He found no such mark, although on one of the posts at the fort’s entrance “in fayre Capitall letters was graven CROATOAN without any crosse or signe of distresse.”²²

John White interpreted this ambiguous message as evidence that the colonists moved to the area occupied by the Croatoans, a group considered hospitable by the English. There is, of course, no way of knowing whether or not White’s hypothesis proved correct, but there remains enough evidence not to completely discount his interpretation either. The possibility that the English settlers integrated into the surrounding native nations may explain George Percy’s observation of a child amongst the Virginia Algonquians “about the age of ten years which had a head of perfect yellow and a reasonable white skin.”²³ This interpretation is but one possibility regarding the fate of the “Lost Colonists,” which remains unknown.²⁴

²¹ John White, “Narrative of the 1587 Virginia Voyage,” in The First Colonists, 97-8.

²² John White, “Narrative of the 1590 Virginia Voyage,” in The First Colonists, 126.

²³ Percy, “Discourse,” in Jamestown Narratives, 96.

²⁴ For further discussion on the historical riddle of the “Lost Colonists”, see David Beers Quinn, England and the Discovery of America, 1481-1620 (New York: Knopf, 1974), 432-481.

Indian Practices and Early Modern English Demonism

If nothing else, the Roanoke experiments made it abundantly clear to the English that the indigenous peoples of Virginia were a group to be reckoned with. It comes as no surprise that the Native Americans were lumped together with Catholics and Spaniards as agents of the diabolical, specifically the arm of the Antichrist corporation that the Jamestown settlers would encounter – and fear – the most. The English quickly recognized this “Indian-as-diabolical” connection, because many aspects of the Powhatan religion fit into the Protestant discourse the English settlers brought with them to Virginia. English misconceptions of native Algonquian culture fueled English fears.

Unlike the English, whose monotheistic Protestant faith emphasized personal involvement by God with a group of elect, the Powhatan Indians “believed in a pantheon of deities.”²⁵ Of this group of native gods and spirits, the English believed the deity referred to as Okeus or Okee took precedence in Powhatan religion. For no other reason than the Powhatans’ lack of belief in a Judeo-Christian doctrine, the English believed Okeus to be the Devil. William Strachey, in his Historie of Travell, summarizes: the Native Americans’ “chief god they worship is no other indeed than the devil, whom they make presentments and shadow under the form of an idol, which they entitle Okeus, and whom they worship as the Romans did their hurtful god Vejovis [Jupiter], more for fear of harm than for hope of any good.”²⁶

²⁵ Helen C. Rountree, “Powhatan Priests and English Rectors: World Views and Congregations in Conflict,” American Indian Quarterly 16, no. 4 (1992): 490.

²⁶ William Strachey, “The Historie of Travell into Virginia Britannia,” in Jamestown Narratives, 645.

Indeed, the English believed the Native Americans exhibited similar abilities to those of witches in the Old World. At least once, English colonists believed themselves bewitched by the natives. In 1611, Sir Thomas Dale led an English search party up the James to the Falls, near Powhatan's seat of power, in contradiction to the Indian leader's strict instructions forbidding such a trip. When the English settled to camp for the night, they became entranced after "a strange noise was heard coming out of the corn...like an Indian *hip! hip!* with an *oho oho!*" For a good seven to eight minutes, the English "could speak nothing but *oho oho,*" stumbling over themselves. Dale's men eventually "awaked out of a dream" and began searching for whomever hexed them, yet found no one in the surrounding areas. This frightening episode convinced the Reverend Alexander Whitaker, the most prominent English divine to accompany the first group of colonists to Virginia, "that there be great witches among" the Native Americans who were "very familiar with the devil."²⁷

While the English tabbed Okeus, or the Devil, as the Indians' primary deity, they also acknowledged that the Native Americans worshiped other entities. In particular, the English observed the Indians target the sun for worship. The rituals of reverence the Indians performed for the sun seemed, to the English, little more than demonic conjurations or witchcraft. Observing one such ritual, George Percy wrote that in an effort to pray, the Indians made "many devilish gestures with a hellish noise, foaming at

²⁷ Alexander Whitaker to William Crashaw, London, 1611 in Jamestown Narratives, 549-550.

the mouth, staring with their eyes, wagging their heads and hands in such a fashion and deformity as it was monstrous to behold!”²⁸

Virginia Algonquians believed Okeus – like Satan, according to early modern Protestants – wielded control over the weather. Strachey drew this parallel, explaining that when displeased, Okeus “strikes their [Native Americans] corn with blastings, storms, and thunderclaps.”²⁹ To the English, this was not unfamiliar diabolic behavior. Strachey also attributed the shipwreck of Sir Thomas Gates’ vessel the *Sea Venture* off the coast of Bermuda – known as “the Devil’s Islands” – to the work of Satan.³⁰ The islands received such a title due to their extreme weather; according to Strachey, sea navigators avoided the archipelago “often afflicted and rent with tempests – great strokes of thunder, lightening, and rain in the extremity of violence.”³¹ The concept that Satan influenced the weather would continue for the English in the New World. Almost a century after the *Sea Venture*’s shipwreck, Cotton Mather wrote that Satan commanded “much of the magazine of heaven” with “fiery meteors, thunder and lightening” in colonial New England.³²

²⁸ Percy, “Discourse,” in Jamestown Narratives 98-9.

²⁹ Strachey, “Historie of Travell,” in Jamestown Narratives, 646.

³⁰ For more on the *Sea Venture*’s stop in Bermuda, see Ivor Noël Hume, Wreck & Redemption: William Strachey’s Saga of the Sea Venture and the Birth of Bermuda in a Newly Discovered Manuscript (Hampton: Port Hampton Press, 2009) and Peter Linebaugh & Marcus Rediker, The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000), 8-35.

³¹ Strachey, “A True Reportory of the wrack and redemption of Sir Thomas Gates, knight, upon and from the Islands of the Bermudas; his coming to Virginia, and the estate of the colony then, and after under the government of the Lord La Warre. July 15, 1610. Written by William Strachey, esquire,” in Jamestown Narratives, 392.

³² Quoted in Cañizares-Esguerra, Puritan Conquistadors, 125.

If the English believed that Okeus was the New World representation of Satan, it was natural for them to assume that the Powhatans worshiped the Devil. Alexander Whitaker, a preacher who received his M.A. from Cambridge in 1604, arrived in 1611 at Virginia with Sir Thomas Dale. Having preached at Henrico (“fourscore miles” upriver from Jamestown) for little more than a year, Whitaker wrote a sermon that was quickly published by the Virginia Company of London.³³ In his Good Newes from Virginia, Whitaker explains that the Indians “serve the devil for fear, after a most base manner, sacrificing sometimes (as I have here heard) their own children to him.”³⁴

Powhatan cultural practices also contributed to the English misconception of the natives as diabolical, in particular the *huskanaw* ritual, a Powhatan initiation ceremony involving young men.³⁵ To reach manhood, older boys partook in the *huskanaw* in order to “concentrate their energies for the good of society as a whole” while also securing their personal status among their brethren.³⁶ The English interpreted the ceremony in a different way: as a “yearly sacrifice of children.” William White, one of the original 1607 settlers about whom we know little, described what he termed the “Blake Boys Ceremony.”³⁷ After days of ritual preparation, the young Powhatans were sent away,

³³ Robert Johnson, quoted in Charles E. Hatch, The First Seventeen Years: Virginia, 1607-1624 (Williamsburg: Virginia 350th Anniversary Celebration Corporation, 1957), 51.

³⁴ Alexander Whitaker, “Good News from Virginia” (1613), in Jamestown Narratives, 731.

³⁵ For more on the *huskanaw*, see Ben C. McCary, Indians in Seventeenth-Century Virginia (Williamsburg: Virginia 350th Anniversary Celebration Corporation, 1957), 62-5.

³⁶ Rountree, “Powhatan Priests,” 489.

³⁷ What exactly is meant by this title remains up for interpretation – when White writes “blake”, does he mean “black” or “blank?” This is difficult to ascertain; those awaiting initiation were painted white (using Edward Haile’s equation “blank” = white), but the rest

the whereabouts and condition of the boys a mystery to the English. When confronted by the English over the whereabouts of the young Indians, a *werowance* replied that one of two destinies befell them. Some were kept in the wilderness “till nine moons were expired,” others suffered a worse fate; “the Okee, or devil, did suck the blood from their left breast who chanced to be by his lot, till they were dead.”³⁸ The Powhatan *werowance* defended this cultural practice, explaining that the sacrifice was necessary to ensure a bountiful harvest for the Powhatans. These children did not, in fact, fall victim to a blood-sucking death courtesy of Satan, but the erroneous correlation between the Devil and Okeus was strengthened in the minds of the English.

Henry Spelman, an English boy who spent two years living amongst the Indians, asserted that the Patawomeck of Virginia sacrificed children as well, although the ritual he described appears to be a different ceremony than the *huskanaw* portrayed by White. According to Spelman, native priests formed “a great circle of fire in which, after many observances in their conjurations, they make offer of 2 or 3 children to be given to their god.” Okeus’ selection was recognized when the priests heard “a noise out of the circle.” After the selection, the child was bound and “cast into the circle of fire.” Presumably, Spelman’s relation that the Indians “depart[ed] merrily” from this ceremony would not have assuaged English anxieties.³⁹

of the participants “were black like devils, with horns and loose hair.” See note in Jamestown Narratives, 138.

³⁸ William White, “The Blake Boys Ceremony,” in Jamestown Narratives, 138-140. See also Strachey, “The History of Travel,” in Jamestown Narratives, 646.

³⁹ Henry Spelman, “Relation of Virginia, 1609,” in Jamestown Narratives, 486-7.

In warfare, Native Americans did indeed torture and kill captives; they would not have understood this as “human sacrifice” *per se*, but more so as an execution of one’s enemies.⁴⁰ The English, taken aback by these “heathen” practices, reserved fear that they too would be subject to human sacrifice in the early years of the colony. In a section of his 1608 True Relation devoted to Native American religion, John Smith recorded concern that he may be the subject of such a fate. Misinterpreting the natives’ hospitality for treachery, Smith writes, “So fat they fed me that I much doubted they intended to have sacrificed me to the *quiyoughquosicke*, which is a superior power they worship.”⁴¹ These English fears are encapsulated in the gruesome fate of George Casson. White reports, “one George Casson was sacrificed as they thought to the devil, being stripped naked and bound to two stakes with his back against a great fire. Then they did rip him and burn his bowels, and dried his flesh to the bone, which they kept above ground in a by-room.”⁴²

One of the mitigating factors in the English settlers’ misconceptions of the Native Americans as agents of the diabolical can be traced to the ambiguity regarding the origins of the natives. Conjectures abounded; the idea that the Native Americans

⁴⁰ McCary, Indians in 17th Century VA, 42-44. See also Sayre, Les Sauvages Américains, 296-304.

⁴¹ John Smith, “A True Relation of such occurrences and accidents of note as hath hap’ned in Virginia since the first planting of that colony which is now resident in the south part thereof, till the last return from thence. Written by Captain Smith, one of the said colony, to a worshipful friend of his in England,” (1608), in Jamestown Narratives, 163-4.

⁴² White, “Black Boys,” in Jamestown Narratives, 141.

descended from the Lost Tribes of Israel proved popular, especially in the 1630s-40s.⁴³ Later, in the 1670s, Daniel Gookin promulgated what became known as the ‘Scythian’ theory, maintaining that the Indians of the Americas originated in the northeast parts of Asia.⁴⁴ These speculations served more the purpose of convenience than anything else. As stated by Lovejoy, these conjectural origin stories “placed the American natives within the biblical framework that ordered the lives of seventeenth century Christians besides accounting for the whereabouts of the Lost Tribes.”⁴⁵

Ceremony and Captivity

English misconceptions of the Native Americans extended towards most aspects of Indian life. During feasts – supposedly times of celebration – the English perceived Indian dancing as diabolic. While the stamping and “antic tricks” of these ceremonies elicited commentary from English observers, the audio of Indian rituals resulted in most English allusions to the demonic. George Percy relates that during dances, Indians made “noise like so many wolves or devils.”⁴⁶

The most famously misperceived ceremony in the narrative of colonial Jamestown continues to be John Smith’s ‘capture’ and subsequent ‘rescue’ by the Powhatan princess Pocahontas. Smith’s writings further illustrate English fears of

⁴³ Canup, Out of the Wilderness, 71. Gary Nash points out that over a century later, James Adair made the same argument in his The History of the American Indians... (London, 1775); see Nash, “The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind”, The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series 29, no. 2 (1972): 225.

⁴⁴ Canup, Out of the Wilderness, 71.

⁴⁵ David S. Lovejoy, “Satanizing the American Indian”, The New England Quarterly 67, no. 4 (1994): 604.

⁴⁶ George Percy, “Discourse,” in Jamestown Narratives, 92.

human sacrifice and descriptions of the Native Americans as members of the Antichrist corporation. During his time in captivity, and the corresponding travels through Tsenacommacah with his Powhatan captors, Smith repeatedly describes the Native Americans as diabolic. Smith's descriptions come more than a decade before the more widely recognized "satanization" of the Indians by the Puritan settlers of colonial New England.⁴⁷

In December 1607, a group of Powhatans captured the English captain near the Chickahominy River. Brought before Opechancanough, Smith avoided execution by offering the Indian leader a compass. Smith's own words, written in third person, give the tension most justice: "within an houre after they tyed him [Smith] to a tree, and as many as could stand about him prepared to shoot him, but the King [Opechancanough] holding up the Compass in his hand, they all laid down their Bowes and Arrowes."⁴⁸

Following this narrow escape, Opechancanough took Smith to the Indian town of Rasawek, where the English captain observed a ritual dance. Like the rituals previously described, the Indians formed a ring, then partook in "dauncing in such severall Postures." Here, Smith draws his first parallel between the Native Americans as diabolic during his time in captivity. As the ritual unfolded, Smith described the Indians as "singing and yelling out such hellish notes and screeches." It may not be out of the question to speculate that Smith's observation of the Indians' upper extremities as "painted red, with Oyle and *puccon* (a vegetable dye) mingled together" would draw

⁴⁷ Lovejoy, "Satanizing the American Indian," 603-621.

⁴⁸ John Smith, "The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles" (London, 1624) in The Complete Works of Captain John Smith, 1580-1631, Vol. II, ed. Philip L. Barbour (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1986), 147.

parallels to the flames of perdition – belief in which was sustained throughout the Protestant Reformation and especially in England.⁴⁹ While the dance ended with a feast, Smith's short time at Rasawek was not without further danger. The day after he sent correspondence to Jamestown explaining his condition, an Indian threatened to kill him in retribution for Smith having earlier killed the Indian's father. Fortunately for Smith, a guard intervened on his behalf.

Taken on a seven-day march from Rasawek through Tsenacommacah, Smith found himself at the Indian village of Pamunkey. Audience to another ritual, Smith describes his experience in his 1624 Generall Historie. In the beginning of the ceremony, Smith comes face-to-face with a conjuror "painted over with coale," who – like his native brethren in Rasawek – "had a hellish voyce." This "great grim fellow" was later joined by "three more such like devils" who "rushed in with the like [antic] tricks, painted halfe blacke, halfe red." These four "fiends" were joined by "three more as ugly as the rest."⁵⁰ Feasting lasted three days, followed by more perceived conjurations involving corn and wheat. While Smith maintained that this ceremony was some type of rite of diabolical divination, recent scholarship has proposed that this ceremony "is better understood as a ritual of redefinition," by which the Powhatans recognized the

⁴⁹ Smith, "Generall Historie," 147-8. On Reformed beliefs of Hell, see Jean Delameau, Sin and Fear: The Emergence of a Western Guilt Culture, 13th-18th Centuries (New York: Saint Martin's Press, 1990), 517 and Peter Marshall, "Fear, purgatory, and polemic in Reformation England," in Fear in Early Modern Society, eds. William G. Naphy and Penny Roberts (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 150-166.

⁵⁰ Smith, "Generall Historie," 149.

entrance of the Jamestown colony into a symbiotic relationship with the larger Tsenacommacah territory.⁵¹

After this episode in Pamunkey, Smith was taken to Rappahanock and then to Werowocomoco, the seat of Powhatan's paramount chieftaincy. Here, at Werowocomoco, unfolded the most famous episode in colonial American history. Two large stones were brought before Powhatan, and the climax of Smith's captivity followed. The Indians – “as many as could layd hands on him” – restrained the Captain and brought him to the stones, placing his head upon one of them, “ready with their clubs to beate out his braines.” At the very last moment – “when no intreaty could prevaile” – the princess Pocahontas took Smith's “head in her armes, and laid her owne upon his to save him from death.”

Even though Pocahontas spared his life, Smith's captivity would last two more days. In this final episode of his captivity, Smith, again describes his native captors as diabolical:

Powhatan having disguised himselfe in the most fearefullest manner he could, caused Captaine Smith to be brought forth to a great house in the woods, and there upon a mat by the fire to be left alone. Not long after, from behinde a mat that divided the house, was made the most dolefullest noyse he ever heard; then Powhatan, more like a devill than a man, with some two hundred more as blacke as himself came unto him...⁵²

But instead of finding himself in another life-threatening situation, Smith was informed of his new status among the Native Americans – friend – and given instructions to finalize

⁵¹ Frederic W. Gleach, Powhatan's World and Colonial Virginia: a Conflict of Cultures (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 114.

⁵² Smith, “Generall Historie,” 151.

this arrangement. Smith received instructions to go to Jamestown and subsequently send Powhatan gifts that included cannon and a grindstone. In return, Smith received the territory of Capohowasick and the Algonquian name of Nantaquoud. Frederic Gleach has interpreted this series of events as a ritual adoption through which Smith – and by association, the entire Jamestown colony – transitioned “from English outsider to Anglo-Powhatan.”⁵³

Even after having been bestowed a new name and land for occupation, the English captain did not completely comprehend the significance of his ordeal. It remains worth noting that even though Smith knew the outcome of his captivity while writing his four accounts – a captivity that ended with renewed hope for peaceful relations between the Algonquians and the English – he still painted the Indians in a demonic light. This may have been simple rhetoric; another reason why he maintained such perceptions after his experiences in Virginia (his Generall Historie was published in 1624, fifteen years after his return to England) was the prevailing misconception that Native Americans functioned as agents of the Antichrist. Indeed, Smith’s prolific career as an author contributed to the promulgation of this idea.

“We are starved!”

The winter of 1609-1610 – referred to by Captain John Smith as “the starving time” – was the most fearful episode in early colonial Virginia.⁵⁴ A miserable scene of life within

⁵³ Gleach, Powhatan’s World, 120.

⁵⁴ Captain John Smith: A Select Edition of His Writings, ed. Karen Ordahl Kupperman (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 130.

the fort emerges from contemporary writings. According to George Percy, hunger drove the colonists – who were “so Leane that they Looked Lyke Anotamies Cryeing owtt we are starved We are starved” – to “make shifte wth vermine as doggs Catts Ratts and myce.” When these foodstuffs became spent, the English turned to the forest; “some weare inforced to searche the woodes and to feede upon Serpents and snakes and to digge the earthe for wylde and unknowne Rootes.”⁵⁵ Archeological evidence offers proof of the dire situation; faunal remains of animals rarely consumed by Europeans, such as vipers, musk turtles, dogs, and horses compose the biomass recovered from the fort.⁵⁶ The situation proved so desperate that some colonists turned to a practice that had helped fuel their fear of the Indians – cannibalism. Both Smith and Percy write of a group that dug up and consumed a slain Native American.⁵⁷

The most famous recorded instance of English cannibalism in Virginia involved a man named Collins who murdered his pregnant wife.⁵⁸ After he killed her, Collins “Ripped the childe outt of her woambe and threw itt into the River,” then chopped his wife to pieces. Collins “salted her for his foode” before being discovered, and only

⁵⁵ Percy, “A Trewe Relacyon,” 267-9. “Anotamies” are corpses that shriveled down to skeleton (see note in Jamestown Narrative, 507).

⁵⁶ Cary Carson et al., “New World, Real World: Improvising English Culture in Seventeenth Century Virginia,” The Journal of Southern History 74, no. 1 (2008), 31-88, especially 39-41.

⁵⁷ Percy, “A Trewe Relacyon,” 267-9. See also Smith, “The Generall Historie,” in Jamestown Narratives, 340.

⁵⁸ This was not the first case of English cannibalism in the New World. In 1536, an English vessel at New Foundland ran out of victuals and one member of the crew “killed his mate while he stooped to take up a roote for his relief, and cutting out pieces of his body whom he had murdered, broiled the same on the coals and greedily devoured them.” See Richard Hakluyt in The English Literatures of America, 1500-1800, eds. Myra Jehlen and Michael Warner (New York: Routledge, 1997), 90-91.

admitted to the deed after having been “hunge by the Thumbes wth weightes att his feete a quarter of an howere.”⁵⁹ Collins was “burned for his horrible villainy,” but the memory of his crime persisted.⁶⁰ In his usual fashion, the Captain John Smith pondered this occurrence: “now whether shee was better roasted, boyled or carbonado’d, I know not, but of such a dish as powdered wife I never heard of.”⁶¹

At least one death during the “starving time” was attributed to providence. As a result of his unhappy situation, a certain Hughe Pryse publically abandoned his faith, walking “openly into the market place Blaspheameinge exclameinge and cryeing owtt that there was noe god. Alledgeinge that if there were A god he wolde not suffer his creatures whom he had made and framed to indure those miseries And to Pishe [perish] for wante of foods and sustenance.” Much like any cautionary tale found in John Foxe’s Acts and Monuments or Thomas Beard’s Theatre of God’s Judgments, Pryse’s disrespect towards God led to his immediate downfall. Hours after his rant, Pryse and a companion – “A Butcher A corpulent fatt man” – decided to take their chances in the wilderness surrounding the fort. Whether Pryse and his companion intended to simply search for edible roots and herbs or plead with the Indians for sustenance, we cannot know. What is known is that Pryse and his fellow risk-taker were both slain by the

⁵⁹ Percy, “A Trewe Relacyon,” 267.

⁶⁰ According to Sir Thomas Gates, the reason why Collins killed his wife was not out of hunger, but because he “mortally hated his wife;” see The Council in Virginia, “A True Declaration of the estate of the colony in Virginia, with a confutation of such scandalous reports as have tended to the disgrace of so worthy an enterprise,” (London, 1610), in Jamestown Narratives, 473-4. See also Virginia General Assembly, “The Answer of the General Assembly in Virginia to a ‘Declaration of the state of the colony in the 12 years of Sir Thomas Smith’s government’ – exhibited by Alderman Johnstone and others, 20 February 1624,” in Jamestown Narratives, 913.

⁶¹ Kupperman, ed., Captain John Smith, 130. “Carbonado’d” means “to grill”.

Native Americans. The Almighty's displeasure with Pryse became evident to all who observed the heretic's expired body. George Percy explained that God's "indignacyon was showed upon PRYSES Corpes wch was Rente in pieces wth wolves or other wylde Beasts And his Bowles Torne outt of his boddy." On the other hand, his non-blasphemous companion, the "fatt Butcher not lyeinge Above sixe yards from him was fownd altogether *untouched* onely by the Salvages Arrowes whereby he Receiaved his deathe."⁶²

Environmental Factors

Even without the presence of the Native Americans, the natural environment of the Tidewater region seemed to resist English attempts at conquest.⁶³ The English selected the island on the James for settlement because of the ease by which their ships could be secured as well as the natural defenses provided against the Spanish; little did they know their selection could not have been worse. Utilizing bald cypress tree-ring reconstruction, David Stahle concluded that the settlers of the Jamestown project had the "monumental bad luck" of arriving in 1607, during the driest seven-year period in 770 years. The colonists both expected and were instructed to secure food from the native population, but this dry spell surely contributed to the Indian's unwillingness to sustain the English.⁶⁴

⁶² Percy, "A Trewe Relacyon," 269 (emphasis added).

⁶³ Kent Mountford, Robert L. Lippson, and Alice Jane Lippson, "The Chesapeake Environment in the Early Seventeenth Century," in Smith's Chesapeake Voyages, 1-24.

⁶⁴ David W. Stahle et al., "The Lost Colony and Jamestown Droughts," Science 280 (April 1998): 564-567.

The geographic location of the settlement itself compounded the dry environment. In addition to the land being too dry to yield sufficient crops, Jamestown was situated where the waters of the James could not help the settlers. A less than ideal setting for *terra firma* agriculture, Jamestown's brackish water also proved "not sufficiently saline to support edible shellfish," exacerbating food shortages.⁶⁵

Filth that did not wash away facilitated recurrent epidemics. Jamestown's position at the salt-fresh water transition level transformed the location into a concentration point for pathogenic river-born organisms. Carville Earle convincingly argued that contaminated river water during the summer months spread typhoid, dysentery, and salt poisoning. Making matters worse, these particular afflictions offer only "limited immunity" to those who contract (and survive) them. Even though some colonists experienced a form of "seasoning" upon arrival in the New World, "they were not particularly immune to future epidemics of typhoid, dysentery, or salt poisoning."⁶⁶

In the early modern era, most Englishmen adhered to the belief of "ecological harmony," maintaining that groups of people were best suited for their particular home environment.⁶⁷ The Hippocratic theory of the four humors formed the foundation of this belief. The humors no longer remained in balance once a person took up residence in a new environment, and this imbalance resulted in poor health. Notable was the "bloody

⁶⁵ Dennis Blanton, "Jamestown's Environment" on Virtual Jamestown, <http://www.virtualjamestown.org/essays/blanton_essay.html>.

⁶⁶ Carville Earle, "Environment, Disease, and Mortality in Early Virginia," in The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society, eds. Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 96-125.

⁶⁷ Kupperman, "Fear of Hot Climates and the Anglo-American Colonial Experience," The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series 41, no. 2 (1984): 203.

flux” that affected many early settlers in Virginia. Englishmen maintained that the flux, known today as chronic diarrhea, resulted from both insufficiently ground maize and the body’s attempt to correct humoral balance by depositing blood in one’s stool.⁶⁸

The importance of humoral maintenance proved a popular topic in early modern English writings. In order to attract prospective settlers, one of the goals of the generation of armchair travelers that emerged in England during the early modern era was to “assure readers that their countrymen did not degenerate completely after exposure to Virginia’s environment.”⁶⁹ In 1610 William Crashaw wrote, “Our brethren in Virginea... do not complaine of any alteration caused by distemper of the Climate.”⁷⁰ Three years later, the Reverend Alexander Whitaker reiterated these assertions. “The aire of the Countrey,” Whitaker wrote back to an audience in England, “is very temperate and agreeth well with our bodies.”⁷¹

What the colonists ate affected their health, both physically and psychologically. The switch from a protein dominated diet – in the seventeenth century, the English consumed over 140 pounds of meat per person a year – to a maize-centric diet was not insignificant.⁷² Karen Kupperman notes that scientific tests have proven that a maize-centric diet close to what the colonists most likely ingested greatly alters tryptophan levels. This change lowers the amount of serotonin within one’s system, and results in

⁶⁸ Kupperman, “Apathy and Death in Early Jamestown,” The Journal of American History 66, no. 1 (1979): 33.

⁶⁹ Canup, Out of the Wilderness, 11.

⁷⁰ William Crashaw, “A Sermon Preached in London” (London, 1610), quoted in Canup, Out of the Wilderness, 11.

⁷¹ Whitaker, “Good Newes from Virginia,” in Jamestown Narratives, 741.

⁷² Virginia DeJohn Anderson, Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 58.

increased sensitivity to pain.⁷³ This only further exaggerated pangs of hunger that culturally the English were not used to. The notion of perfect health via balance of the body's four humors was contingent upon a regulated diet. Because of this belief, the concept of tolerating hunger became taboo; Englishmen and women simply did not 'go hungry.' In fact, the possibility of hunger many have been more frightening than the actual hunger experience itself. Robert Appelbaum argues that the fear of going hungry was "real enough to play a significant role in the subsequent development of colonial policy," especially in how the English interacted with the Native Americans.⁷⁴ These cultural beliefs about English hunger spilled over into commentary on native eating habits. The English associated long feasts with gluttony – William Strachey remarked that "it is strange to see how their [Indians'] bodies alter with their diet" – failing to recognize the lack of a means to preserve food for any extended period of time.⁷⁵ Undoubtedly, reports of Virginia as a veritable Eden contributed to this fear, the reality faced by colonists proving contrary to the words of travel propagandists.

This fear of hunger grew out of anxiety regarding the timely arrival of supplies, never an exact science. A ship's arrival was contingent upon favorable weather conditions, pirates and the Spanish. Moreover, settlers had reason to fear supplies – if they arrived at all – may have already spoiled by the time of their arrival in the Chesapeake. One can only imagine the disappointment of the colonists in Jamestown

⁷³ Kupperman, "Apathy and Death," 33.

⁷⁴ Robert Appelbaum, "Hunger in Early Virginia: Indians and English Facing Off Over Excess, Want, and Need," in Envisioning an English Empire: Jamestown and the Making of the North Atlantic World, eds. Robert Appelbaum and Robert John Sweet (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press: 2005), 195-215; quote 215.

⁷⁵ Strachey, "The History of Travel," in Jamestown Narratives, 637.

after the arrival of the *Abigail*. Having dealt with the brackish waters of the James and the everyday battle of securing fresh water, the reality that the *Abigail's* cargo wound up including nothing more than a batch of “stinking beer” surely proved disheartening, because alcohol represented one of the few familiar forms of sustenance.⁷⁶

To deal with the physical acclimatization to Virginia, Englishmen often took the precaution – perhaps too often at times, as explained later in Chapter III – of consuming alcohol. Whether in the form of beer, punch, cider, wine, or *aqua vitea* alcohol had its advantages, providing a healthier alternative than drinking water. Yet consumption of bad batches of beer – either not fully fermented, or like the *Abigail's* aforementioned “stinking beer” – could result in a condition called the “Gripes” or the “dry bellyache” that caused “exquisite pain.”⁷⁷

If alcohol was not available via supply ships, then the colonists simply had to ferment their own. The Virginia heat – an antagonist the colonists combated most of the year – thwarted many of these self-brewing attempts. During the summer months, the temperature proved too hot for malt-making, while the price of imported barley proved another impediment. As for wine, until proven vintners from France arrived at the request of the Company on London, the overall cost and hot climate of Virginia stymied wine production.⁷⁸ Even with French aid, the product could not overcome the climate;

⁷⁶ Kupperman, “Apathy and Death,” 35.

⁷⁷ Kupperman, “Fear of Hot Climates,” 222. Richard S. Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 306.

⁷⁸ Kupperman, “Fear of Hot Climates,” 228.

diseases killed imported varieties of grapes and the native vine species proved inferior in quality.⁷⁹

Experiments in fermentation represented just one of many ways by which the English dealt with the Virginia environment. The location of the Jamestown settlement proved hard to overcome. At Jamestown, the colonists lacked fresh water and the ability to successfully cultivate foodstuffs. The absence of a balanced diet and the consistent possibility of disease contraction embodied the concerns of the settlers. Yet external environmental factors were not the only causes of the “starving time;” social factors within the “emotional community” at Jamestown also contributed to the English miseries during the winter of 1609-10.

Social Factors

In addition to all these environmental obstacles, Edmund Morgan points to other reasons why the English experienced a “starving time.” Poor direction of the colony, the character of the immigrants, and an engrained sense of cultural superiority contributed to the “world of miseries” of the third winter the English spent in the Chesapeake.⁸⁰

Little doubt remains that poor organization and direction in Jamestown facilitated the “starving time.” Perhaps more so than any other episode in early colonial Virginia, the winter of 1609-10 demonstrates the importance and ingenuity of Captain John Smith. Infighting was – and continued to be – a problem that both the colony in Virginia and the Company in London experienced up until the dissolution of the Virginia

⁷⁹ Roderick Philips, A Short History of Wine (London: Penguin, 2001), 162.

⁸⁰ Morgan, American Slavery, American Freedom, 71-90.

Company of London in 1624.⁸¹ Captain Smith fell victim to infighting in 1609, resulting in a gunpowder explosion that “very shrewdly burned him,” leaving him incapacitated.⁸² “So grevievous were his wounds” that Smith needed to return immediately to England for treatment.⁸³ He never returned to Virginia. The lack of Smith’s presence left a notable power vacuum that remained until the delayed arrival of Sir Thomas Gates the spring of 1610. After Smith’s departure for England, Powhatan placed the fort under siege and the colony withered without a leader able to control the English as well as deftly deal with the surrounding natives.

Morgan also argued that the genteel nature of the immigrants who settled Jamestown factored into the unfolding of the “starving time.” Morgan points to the group of settlers that arrived in Jamestown as his evidence. The English group of transplanted was disproportionately comprised of gentlemen, a number that he puts at “six times as large a proportion of gentlemen [as] England had” during the early seventeenth century. Morgan maintained this presented a problem in two regards: first, gentlemen were not expected to have manual skill sets, and even if they did, were not expected to utilize them; second, personal attendants accompanied these gentlemen to the New World, adding to the already disproportionate number of English either

⁸¹ Wesley Frank Craven, Dissolution of the Virginia Company: The Failure of a Colonial Experiment (New York: Oxford University Press, 1932). For more on Smith’s own frustrations regarding intrigue, see Kupperman, “English Perceptions of Treachery, 1583-1640: The Case of the American ‘Savages’,” The Historical Journal 20, no. 2 (1977): 283.

⁸² Percy, “A Trewe Relacyon,” 264.

⁸³ Kupperman, ed., Captain John Smith, 126.

incapable or unexpected to partake in ordinary labor.⁸⁴ Even though we later see requests for more diverse supply groups – such as John Pory’s 1620 letter to Sir Edwin Sandys, in which Pory asks the company to reevaluate “y^e eleccion of yo^r people,” requesting fewer gentlemen and more “tradesmen, husbandmen, and true laborers” – the gentlemen question would remain a problem because the Company in London proved incapable of turning away neither a willing traveler nor the money in each gentleman’s coffers.⁸⁵

This sense of gentility provides a foundation for another reason outlined by Morgan, the collective English sense of superiority. Put succinctly, the English attempted to prove their superiority in spite of their failures. The most drastic avenue undertaken by the English to accomplish this included all-out assaults upon Indian settlements, which resulted in the burning of Indian cornfields. This provides one of the many historical ironies found in the history of colonial Virginia, because the English were explicitly instructed by the Virginia Company to “trade with them [Indians] for Corn and all Other lasting Victuals if [they] have any.”⁸⁶ Even though the English relied upon native stores of corn for their survival, they continued to burn Indian cornfields. Every English governor in Virginia, from Ralph Lane to Sir Thomas Gates, employed a policy of intimidation to ensure that the English procured food supplies. Worse still, the

⁸⁴ Morgan, American Slavery, American Freedom, 84.

⁸⁵ John Pory to Sir Edwin Sandys, 12 June 1620 in Records of the Virginia Company of London, vol. III, ed. Susan M. Kingsbury (Washington D.C.: US Government, 1933), 301.

⁸⁶ Virginia Company of London, “Instructions from the Virginia Company to the First Settlers, November 1606,” in A Documentary History of Virginia, 1606-1700, Revised Edition, ed. Warren G. Billings (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 23.

colonists refused to plant their own corn, for – as Morgan rationalized – planting corn was not what the English had come to Virginia to do.⁸⁷

All this talk of gentility leads to a logical question: would not basic survival instincts have trumped conceptions of gentility amongst the English during the winter of 1609-10? Mere rationale would dictate so. The notion that a gentleman in Jamestown could not perform ordinary survival functions is dubious at best. Jamestown was founded in the midst of a period in English history during which gentlemen-soldiers dominated both politics and the public imagination (think, for example, of the célébrité enjoyed by Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Francis Drake). If any group that composed the early modern English social hierarchy was capable of providing for themselves via hunting, it was the gentility. Hunting was a “prerequisite of gentlemen and aristocrats,” even if the act was considered as a sport and not as a “subsistence activity.”⁸⁸ In fact, in 1605 Parliament with the approval of James I passed the Game Act, restricting hunting to the wealthy.⁸⁹ In reality, the disproportionately large number of gentlemen equipped Jamestown with a cohort more than capable of providing foodstuffs.

Why, then, did the English remain within the confines of James Fort when a number of their group possessed the faculties and skill-sets necessary to provide for themselves? I argue that fear compelled the starving colonists to stay put, fear of what outside the palisades offered a worse alternative than remaining within the fort. The English believed heathens that fit into a larger context of an Antichrist corporation

⁸⁷ Morgan, American Slavery, American Freedom, 90.

⁸⁸ Anderson, Creatures of Empire, 60.

⁸⁹ Roger B. Manning, Hunters & Poachers: A Social and Cultural History of Unlawful Hunting in England, 1485-1640 (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993), 58-63.

surrounded them, and the experiences between the two groups did nothing to allay these English fears.

It bears worth repeating that from the very beginning, Anglo-Indian relations were sour. On 26 April 1607 – the same day the English entered the “Bay of Chesupioc” – the English were ambushed. Native Americans besieged a small exploratory party trying to return to their ship. At the moment of boarding, Indians “creeping upon all fours from the hills like bears, with their bows in their mouths” attacked the English. The Indians did not relent until “they had spent their arrows,” and at least two Englishmen were hurt, including Captain Gabriel Archer.⁹⁰

Native antagonisms of the English continued during the first year of transplantation. A month after the English’s first arrival into the Chesapeake – during which time most of the colony’s leadership was exploring the Bay with Captain John Smith – a large Indian force of approximately two hundred “gave a very furious assault” to James Fort which “endured hot about an hour.”⁹¹ The natives advanced as far they could, shooting through the settlers’ tents (the fort had yet to be completed) in the process wounding more than ten and killing two.⁹² Four members of the colony’s council were among the hurt, and President Wingfield himself escaped serious injury when one of the Indian arrows “shot clean through his beard.” Were it not for the shots fired from the English ships, which apparently “daunted” the Indian assailants, the fort may have

⁹⁰ Percy, “Discourse,” in Jamestown Narratives, 90.

⁹¹ Archer, “A Relation,” in Jamestown Narratives, 115.

⁹² There is a discrepancy among contemporary records of this event. Gabriel Archer recorded that the natives “hurt us 11 men whereof one died after – and killed a boy” whereas John Smith recorded that after he returned the day after the attack he “found 17 men hurt and a boy slain by the savages.” See Jamestown Narratives, 115, 224.

been overrun.⁹³ Days later, on 30 May, the Indians struck again. One gentleman, Eustace Clovell, fell victim to the Indian attack. According to Gabriel Archer, Clovell was “stragglng without the fort” when he became the target of natives “lurking in the thickets and long grass.” Clovell was besieged, yet able to run back to the fort – with six arrows lodged in him - sounding the alarum with screeches of, “Arm! Arm!” Clovell survived for eight days before finally succumbing to his wounds.⁹⁴

With these experiences in their minds, it is little wonder that few left the fort and risked sharing the fate of Clovell or of members of Captain John Martin’s food-trading mission, who ended up “sacrifysed And that their Braynes weare cutt and skraped outt of their heads wth mussel shelles.”⁹⁵ English fears of the Indians – and they expected hostility from them – facilitated the unfolding of the “starving time.”⁹⁶

Conclusion

A wealth of factors contributed to the “starving time.” The environment the English encountered in the Chesapeake did not live up to expectations, and proved a poor fit for raising crops but a prime location to breed disease. English misinterpretations of the Native Americans evoked the idea that the inhabitants of the New World served as

⁹³ Seth Mallios argues that this first assault upon James Fort was the culmination of repeated English non-adherence to Algonquian socioeconomic standards; see Mallios, The Deadly Politics of Giving, 81-3.

⁹⁴ Archer, “A Relation,” in Jamestown Narratives, 115-6.

⁹⁵ Percy, “Trewelacyon,” 263.

⁹⁶ For English expectations, see Nash, “The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind,” The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series 29, no 2 (1972): 198-230. Kupperman points to accepted social norms in early modern England to explain why the English believed the Native Americans would act belligerent; see “English Perceptions of Treachery,” 266.

agents of the Antichrist, based upon observations of Indian rituals and practices. An English sense of cultural superiority may have been a factor in the development of these misconceptions, but was not the ultimate cause of death for the English settlers in the winter of 1609-10. The fear these settlers experienced proved most costly. Paralyzed by the possibility that death awaited them outside the palisades of James Fort, English colonists stayed put, further worsening their unfortunate condition.

A number of English survived that winter, but fear would remain a prominent component of life in colonial Virginia. Fear of each previously touched-upon division of the Antichrist corporation remained, influencing actions taken within the colony between 1610 and 1622. In addition to this anxiety towards the diabolical, a palpable fear of God's vengeance persisted. Chapter III will examine how providence influenced attempts to eliminate moral infractions, and how these concerns manifested themselves within statutes issued from the colony's administration.

Chapter III

“So full of misery and misgovernment”

The English venture in Virginia persevered through the “starving time” winter, but as late as May 1610 serious questions remained regarding the sustainability of the Jamestown project. The outlook was bleak; even the excitement of the unexpected arrival of Sir Thomas Gates – feared lost because of a delay occasioned by a shipwreck in Bermuda – could not overcome the colonists’ present condition. False Hope may as well have been the name of one of the hundred-fifty weary passengers in Gate’s fleet. With the colony teetering on the brink of collapse, the newly arrived Gates summoned a meeting with the leaders of the administration he was sent to replace. The volatile state of Anglo-Algonquian relations was exacerbated by the fact provisions could not be extended “above 16 days after 2 cakes a day.” In the words of Sir Thomas West, Lord De La Warr, “there could be no readier course thought on than to abandon the country.”¹ The Jamestown project was over; the English colonial experiment had failed.

Solemnly, the colonists packed up their belongings and prepared for the long journey back to England. The motley departing fleet – including the *Discovery*, the *Virginia*, and the rebuilt *Deliverance* and *Patience* – planned on sailing north, “to make

¹ The Governor and Council in Virginia to the Virginia Company of London, 7 July 1610 in Jamestown Narratives: Eyewitness Accounts of the Virginia Colony, The First Decade: 1607-1617, ed. Edward Wright Haile (Champlain, VA: RoundHouse, 1998), 457-8.

for the New found Land,” with hopes of meeting up with English fishing ships before finally crossing the Atlantic for home.² Gates decided against razing James Fort, still holding out hope that “honneste men as ourselves may come and inhabitt here.”³

Gates’ decision proved wise. Almost as soon as the fleet departed, one of the ships’ captains “espyed A boate makeinge towards us.” This messenger boat included a certain Captain Bruster, bearing unbelievable news: Sir Thomas West had entered the Chesapeake just days before and currently anchored his fleet at Algernon’s Fort. “Many gentlemen of quallety And thre[e] hundrethe men besydes greate store of victewles municyon and other Provissyon” travelled with West.⁴ Resupplied with manpower and provisions, the fleet turned around and made haste for James Fort. The Jamestown project was not over; the English colonial experiment had not yet failed.

In time, the colony would be resuscitated, but Jamestown remained an anxious outpost in the New World. This chapter will illustrate how the colonists’ Reformed belief system continued to influence English perceptions in the New World after the harrowing winter of 1609-10. A piety-infused discourse of fear contributed to the emergence of two expressions of interpretation regarding English experiences between 1610 and 1622:

² William Strachey, “A True Reportory of the wrack and redemption of Sir Thomas Gates, knight, upon and from the Islands of the Bermudas; his coming to Virginia, and the estate of the colony then, and after under the government of the Lord La Warre. July 15, 1610. Written by William Strachey, esquire,” in Jamestown Narratives, 426.

³ George Percy, “A Trewe Relacyon of the Pcedeings and Ocurrentes of Momente wch have hapned in Virginia from the Tyme Sr Thomas GATES was shippwrackte upon the BERMUDES ano 1609 untill my depture outt of the Country wch was in ano Dñi 1612”, Tyler’s Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine 3, no. 4 (1922): 269-270 accessed via Virtual Jamestown, <<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1063>>; See also Jamestown Narratives, 508.

⁴ Percy, “A Trewe Relacyon,” 270.

events were either attributed to the agency of the Devil, or as a result of providential judgment. Efforts to stave off the machinations of the early modern English conception of the Antichrist included the communal efforts at moral control instigated by West's deputy general, Sir Thomas Dale (who arrived in May 1611) as well as continued attempts at exportable commodity diversification. On an individual basis, colonists struggled to maintain control of their innermost thoughts from the influence of the Devil. English reactions to the Indian attack of 1622 attributed the event to divine will. These incidents testify to the continued implementation of a discourse of fear based upon English Reformed beliefs.

Lawes Martiall

Lord De La Warr inherited a derelict colony. Sir Thomas Gates decided to let James Fort stand but, given its state, a wiser man might have razed the fort. Even having been previously informed of "the heavy news of a worse condition" experienced at Jamestown while at Algernon's Fort, William Strachey's report describing the state of affairs upon his arrival exudes disbelief and melancholy. Strachey found the settlement in disrepair, with "the palisadoes torn down, the ports open, the gates off from the hinges, and empty houses." These houses were something to behold, decrepit courtesy of colonists who would rather pilfer the house of a dead neighbor than "step into the woods a stone's cast off from them to fetch other firewood," more afraid of the Indians outside the fort than the miseries within.⁵

⁵ Strachey, "A True Reportory" in Jamestown Narratives, 419.

A clearer picture about the state of the fort comes into focus upon examination of Sir Thomas Dale's plan to rejuvenate the colony. After consultation with members of the Council, Dale outlines "many businesses necessary, and almost every one essential." The building program initiated under his administration included "the reparation of the falling church, and so of the storehouse, a stable for our houses, a munitions house, a powder house, a new well,... a sturgeon house,... and a smith's forge." The sheer number of projects, "which required much labor and many hands," illustrated the sorry condition of the English colony.⁶

Into this disarray stepped Sir Thomas Dale with his Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, which represented a rigorous authoritarian effort to clean up the colony. History has not looked kindly upon Dale. Edmund Morgan explained the "arbitrary rigor" that characterized Dale's Lawes by utilizing Dale's little "pretense of gentle government" to laud an earlier colonial leader, Captain John Smith, based on the fact that Smith accomplished more reform and productivity without resorting to Dale's tactics.⁷ Although the settlement in Virginia survived, Karen Ordahl Kupperman discounts Dale's "regime" because "it did not flourish."⁸ To an extent, these critiques are not unwarranted, although we should remember that Dale did not act independently, nor was he alone in his ideas of harsh punishment. One of Dale's contemporaries, future Council member

⁶ Sir Thomas Dale to the Council of Virginia, 25 May 1611 in Jamestown Narratives, 523.

⁷ Edmund S. Morgan, American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia (New York: Norton, 2003), 79-80.

⁸ Karen Ordahl Kupperman, "The Beehive as a Model for Colonial Design," America in European Consciousness, 1493-1750, ed. Kupperman (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 272-292, quote from 280.

Ralph Hamor, proved more forgiving. Believing the ends justified any means, Hamor vouched for Dale, describing the deputy governor as having “not been tyrannous, nor severe at all.” “Indeed,” explained Hamor, “the offenses have been capital, and the offenders dangerous, incurable members, for no use so fit as to make examples to others.”⁹ The fact remains that the Virginia Council instructed Dale, a former captain of infantry in the Netherlands and career officer, to proceed “by Martiall Lawe accordinge to yo^r comission as of most dispatch and terror and fittest for this government.”¹⁰

To this end, Dale accomplished what he set out to do with a policy of strict law enforcement. In order to combat the problem of desertion that characterized the early stages of the “starving time,” one of the Lawes declared “No man or woman, (upon paine of death) shall runne away from the Colonie, to Powhatan, or any savage Weroance else whatsoever.”¹¹ Before long, implementation of this statute sent shock waves throughout the colony. After the initial settlement and construction of the fort at Henrico up the James River, a group of Dale’s men “beinge Idle and not willeinge to take paynes did Runne Away unto the Indyans.” The English recaptured many, and as

⁹ Ralph Hamor, “A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia” (London, 1615), in Jamestown Narratives, 822-3.

¹⁰ Virginia Council, “Instrucons orders and constitucons...to Sir Thomas Gates knight Governor of Virginia,” May 1619 in Records of the Virginia Company of London, vol. III, ed. Susan M. Kingsbury (Washington D.C.: US Government, 1933), 15 (Henceforth referred to as RVC Vol. III).

¹¹ William Strachey, For the Colony in Virginea Britannia. Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, &c. (London, 1612), 17 accessed via Virtual Jamestown, © 1999-2007 Crandall Shiflett <<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1056>>. Another account of Dale’s harsh treatment of the colonists can be found in “A Brief Declaration of the plantation of Virginia during the first twelve years, when Sir Thomas Smith was governor of the Company, and down to the present time. By the Ancient Planters now remaining alive in Virginia,” (1624), in Jamestown Narratives, 900.

proscribed by the law, Dale executed the perpetrators “in A moste severe mannor.” George Percy summarized: “Some he apointed to be hanged Some burned Some to be broken upon wheles, others to be staked and some to be shott to death.”¹² Colonists who stole from “the store of any commodities” faced similar punishments.¹³ Upon the discovery of a group “w^{ch} Robbed the store” during a period of profound hunger – the Ancient Planters (the group of colonists who migrated to Virginia before 1616) later complained that under Dale, the “misery throughout the whole colony and the scarcity of food was equal” – the deputy governor ordered the thieves “to be bownd fast unto Trees and so sterved them to deathe.”¹⁴

Lawes Morall

While commentary abounds regarding the severe nature of the Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, the religious regimen inherent in them proved impossible to ignore. The first ten articles largely dealt with the maintenance of a godly atmosphere within the “sacred cause” that Virginia represented. The Lawes’ emphasis on a pious life thus urged the colonists “to have a care that the Almighty God bee duly and daily served.” This included listening to sermons and “frequent Morning and Evening praier” to attain “exemplar” lives. Any actions contrary to these ends met harsh punishment; offenses against the Ten Commandments such as murder and other “detestable sins” were

¹² Percy, “A Trewe Relacyon,” 281.

¹³ Strachey, Lawes Divine, 13.

¹⁴ Percy, “A Trewe Relacyon,” 281. The Ancient Planters of Virginia, “A Brief Declaration” in Jamestown Narratives, 901.

outlawed “upon paine of death.”¹⁵ In particular, the gamut of moral reform initiated under Sir Thomas Dale hoped to address two disorderly actions: lack of attendance at divine worship, and the problem of blasphemy.

Dale’s authoritarian Lawes placed the preservation of the sanctity of the Sabbath in the hands of the captain of the watch. Strachey reported that a soldier who assumed this responsibility, “it shall be his duety to see that the Saboath be no waies prophaned, by any disorders, gaming, drunkenness, intemperate meeting, or such like... in the streets or within the houses.” Absence from daily “divine Service... upon the first Towing of the Bell” meant the loss of a day’s rations, whipping, or a stay in “the Gallies for six Moneths,” depending on previous infractions. A colonist repeatedly caught partaking in disorderly recreations, such as breaking the “Sabbath by any gaming, publique, or private abroad or at home” faced the death penalty after repeated transgressions. Religious leaders in Virginia, like the services they led, were to receive respect from the colonists. Disrespect towards clerics – either preachers or ministers – was to result in “the offender...openly whipt three times” in addition to asking “publike forgiveness in the assembly of the congregation” over the course of three Sabbaths.¹⁶

Repeated swearing and blaspheming resulted in more cruel chastisements. A colonist accused for the first time faced an ambiguous “severe punishment.” The second instance a colonist took the Lord’s name in vain, he would be forced to suffer a bodkin – a short dagger – “thrust through his tongue.” The third infraction was the last; the Lawes

¹⁵ Strachey, Lawes Divine, 11-2. See also Spreading the Gospel in Colonial Virginia: Sermons and Devotional Writings, ed. Edward L. Bond (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books for the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 2004), 4.

¹⁶ Strachey, Lawes Divine, 10-12, 41.

prescribed that “for the third time so offending, he shall be brought to a martiall court, and there receive censure of death for his offense.”¹⁷

Higher moral standards were reserved for a soldier in Jamestown during the implementation of the Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall. Soldiers had piety drilled into everyday life, with the intention of their behavior providing an example for the rest of the colony. Disorderly conduct was discouraged; instructions to privates stressed restraint “from dicing, carding, and Idle gaming” in an effort to eliminate the “procuring of enemies, questions, brawles, and a thousand following inconveniences.” Orders forbade soldiers from consuming excesses of both food and drink. In earlier statutes, a soldier “must bee no blasphemer nor swearer, for such... is contemptible to God and the world.” In all, these Lawes hoped to instill within a soldier a “constant resolution.” The model soldier in Jamestown “ought to be diligent, carefull, vigilant and obedient, and principally to have the feare of God.” Rigorous adherence to these statutes would help the spiritual and physical protection of both individual and community, for a soldier “thus religiously armed, fighteth more confidently and with greater courage, and is thereby protected through manifold danger, and otherwise unpreventable events.”¹⁸

In one of the many paradoxes of colonial Virginia, one sees in the implementation of Dale’s Lawes the wielding of fear as a political tool in order to quell other fears regarding the preservation of the colony. Authorities believed that greater piety – which could be achieved through strict observance of the divine worship schedule, as well as the avoidance of swearing – would afford the comfort of God’s protection. The idea that

¹⁷ Ibid., 11.

¹⁸ Strachey, Lawes Divine, 58.

the Almighty watched over the Jamestown project as “principall friend and defender” proved consistent with the discourse of the English as a chosen people – the heirs of Israel – that shaped the early modern English national character.¹⁹ In order to ensure the dutiful vigilance of God over the colonists, a movement of moral reform emerged.

Lawes Divine and the Reformation of Manners

Most of the stipulations and statutes proclaimed in the Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall can also be placed in the larger context of the Reformation of Manners taking place in England during this time. This movement, described by Alexandra Walsham as a “cluster of interrelated campaigns to alter moral standards and behavior,” targeted a variety of practices, including drunkenness, swearing, Sabbath breaking, idleness, and disorderly recreations.²⁰ English communities in crisis, whether in the Old or New Worlds, exercised these programs through what Paul Slack has termed “the Puritan language of collective paranoia.”²¹ The end result was a discourse conveying “an urgent sense that personal, communal, and national salvation was inextricably linked with the effective expression of disorder, impropriety, and crime.”²² Dale’s Lawes and later attempts to facilitate moral stabilization by both the Council in Virginia and Virginia

¹⁹ William Crashaw, A Sermon Preached in London before the right honorable the Lord Lavvare, Lord Gouvernour and Captaine Generall of Virginea (London, 1610), i2 accessed via Early English Books Online database <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99844721>.

²⁰ Alexandra Walsham, Providence in Early Modern England (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 135.

²¹ Paul Slack, Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England (New York: Longman, 1988), 149-152.

²² Walsham, Providence in Early Modern England, 138.

Company in London are contributions to the larger discourse of moral regulation inherent in the Reformation of Manners.

In late July – early August of 1619, the General Assembly convened at Jamestown, with John Pory transcribing the meeting minutes for Company officials in London. In his report, we see the strictness that came to embody Dale's Lawes continued in the first representative governing body in North America, albeit to a lesser degree. Regarding moral offenses, Pory wrote the English transplanners were ordered to avoid "Idleness, Gaming, drunkenes, and excesse in apparell."²³ Nearly two years later, the Company stressed vigilance from the acting governor towards disorderly recreations, cautioning him to "bee Carefull now in the begining to suppressse too much gaming and above all things y^e odious vice of drunkenes."²⁴

The moral infraction of intoxication proved such a common problem that in 1621 the House of Lords passed "An Act for the represeinge of the odious and loathsome sinne of Drunkenesse." Based upon various correspondences, the House concluded that God perceived alcohol to be a crime against the colony. Even with the passage of earlier legislation, the House recognized that "Drunkenesse is little abated, but still continewed." After directing an attempt to control this "loathsome sinne" – brewers were not to eclipse a certain alcohol-by-content percentage – a virulent diatribe ensued, with the House of Lords identifying drunkenness as

²³ John Pory, "A reporte of the manner of proceeding in the General assembly convened at James City," 29 July-4 August 1619 in RVC Vol. III, 164.

²⁴ Virginia Company, "Instructions to the Governor and Council of State in Virginia," 24 July 1621 in RVC Vol. III, 469.

...beinge the roote and foundacon of many other enormous sinnes, as bloudshed, stabbinge, muther, swearinge, fornicacon, adultery, and such like, to the great Dishonor of God, and of our Nation, the overthrow of many good Arts, and Manuall Trades, the disabling of many workemen, and the generall impoverishinge of many good subjects abusivley wasting the good Creatures of God.²⁵

Morally, room for alcohol abuse did not exist for Englishmen on either side of the Atlantic. Why, then, was drunkenness such a common occurrence? One can point to the composition of the settlers – which included substantial numbers of criminals, landless vagrants, indentured servants, and homeless children – as an explanation.²⁶ Another explanation may be related to fear-induced psychosis. The effects of alcohol represent another plausible explanation; colonists drank simply as a form of escape from the harsh realities of their situation.

Regardless of the House of Lords' efforts, instances of inebriation remained common. In the absence of quality vines for wine and barley for beer, colonists improvised. Some experimented with their own fermentations, such as the experiment of a certain "M^r Russell" who attempted brewing his own drink alternative. Russell's "artificiall wyne" consisted of "a vegetable w^{ch} there growes plentifully w^{thout} any manner

²⁵ House of Lords, "An act for the represinge of the odious...sinne of Drunkenesse, and for Preventinge the onordinate Consuminge of Corne," 14 February 1620/21 in RVC Vol. III, 427-9.

²⁶ See also Bernard Bailyn, The Peopling of British North America: An Introduction (New York: Vintage, 1988), 20-43; April Lee Hatfield, Atlantic Virginia: Intercolonial Relations in the Seventeenth Century (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 60-85; James Horn, Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth Century Chesapeake (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 24-68 and "Servant Emigration to the Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century" in The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society, eds. Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 51-85.

or charge or labour in plantinge.” Indeed, Russell accomplished this feat, utilizing “sassaphras and licoras” which he “boyled in water.”²⁷ No records survive describing the taste of Russell brew.

The widespread abuse of alcohol within the colony prompted Governor Sir Francis Wyatt to take action, issuing a proclamation on 21 June 1622 against the act of excessive imbibing of “hot waters.” Drunkenness could result in varying punishments, dependent upon the perpetrator’s place within Virginia’s developing social hierarchy.²⁸ “If anie gentleman or other above the degree of a Servieant shalbe found Drunke and so accused,” they faced a fine of five pounds sterling. The monetary penalty for a freeman cost forty shillings. A tenant paid a lesser fine – twenty shillings – but also had to endure being “sett in the stocks twelve houres.” Repeat offenders fared worse; anyone found to “persist in this most odious vice” became subject to “a more seveare Censure by the Goveʹnor & Counsell.”²⁹ Later in the seventeenth century, the crusade against drunkenness would spread to the northern British colonies. The iconic Cotton Mather, writing in response to those that supplied the native population with alcohol, stated

²⁷ “Mr. Russell’s Project Touching Artificial Wine in Virginia” in RVC Vol. III, 366-7.

²⁸ Many have commented on the development of Virginia’s social hierarchy. See Horn, Adapting to a New World; Morgan, American Slavery, American Freedom; Anthony S. Parent Jr., Foul Means: The Formation of a Slave Society in Virginia, 1660-1740 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003) especially 9-104; Rhys Isaac, The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); George M. Frederickson offers an interesting Weberian perspective on race and early American society in “Colonialism and Racism: The United States and South Africa in Comparative Perspective” in The Arrogance of Race: Historical Perspectives on Slavery, Racism and Social Inequality (Middleton, CONN: Wesleyan University Press, 1988), 216-235, especially 224-5.

²⁹ Sir Francis Wyatt, “Proclamations” in RVC Vol. III, 658-9.

simply, “The man who does make *himself Drunk*, does make himself a Beast.”³⁰ In the early modern world, the English combated drunkenness in the hopes of maintaining a healthy relationship with God.

In addition to drunkenness, another moral infraction came under fire via gubernatorial proclamation during the summer of 1622: swearing. Governor Wyatt attributed swearing to the colony’s late misfortunes, “y^t being one & y^e greatest Cause of pulling down y^e wrath of God vpon” the English in Virginia. The proclamation called for the master of each household to maintain the piety within. Should the master himself be caught “offending in swearing,” he “shall pay for everie oath one pound of the best Marchentable tobacco.” Repeat offenders were not subject to merely adding to the proverbial swear-jar with tobacco, but “to be indited at y^e sessios & wthout any favor showne vnto him wth a red hott Iron to be burnt in y^e tongue.”³¹

Ironically, the colony’s only viable economic export – tobacco – was condemned under the auspices of the Reformation of Manners. Opposition to tobacco cultivation had a long history even before English colonization attempts in the Chesapeake.³² Almost a decade before John Rolfe’s first successful planting of the sweet Orinoco leaf

³⁰ John Canup, Out of the Wilderness: The Emergence of an American Identity in Colonial New England (Middleton, CONN: Wesleyan University Press, 1990), 34. For more on the movement for moral reform in colonial New England, see Richard P. Gildrie, The Profane, the Civil, & the Godly: The Reformation of Manners in Orthodox New England, 1679-1749 (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994) and Richard J. Ross, “Puritan Godly Discipline in Comparative Perspective: Legal Pluralism and the Sources of ‘Intensity’,” The American Historical Review 113, no. 4 (2008): 975-1002.

³¹ Wyatt, “Proclamations,” in RVC Vol. III, 659.

³² Excellent introductions to tobacco in Virginia can be found in Horn, Adapting to a New World, 141-6 and Morgan, American Slavery, American Freedom, 108-130.

strain in Virginia, King James I penned a work damning the plant. In his A Covnterblaste to Tobacco, James pinpoints tobacco as the root of many of the problems England faced in the early seventeenth century. “Surely in my opinion,” the King writes, “there cannot be a more base, and yet hurtfull, corruption in a Countrey, then is the vile use (or rather abuse) of taking Tobacco in this Kingdome.” Fancying himself the “Phisician of his Politicke,” James urged the English to abandon “so vile and stinking a custom” that – he reminds his audience – was a product born from “beastly Indians, slaves to the Spaniards.” James unknowingly foreshadowed the message of modern medicine with his attack on the leaf. The King argued for the health risks inherent in smoking, pointing out that the practice upsets the equilibrium of the “foure Complexions” (humors).³³ James also insinuated the demonic influences of the plant, pointing out that the smoke tobacco exudes when burned may as well be the fumes of hell.³⁴

With the growing affinity for tobacco on both sides of the Atlantic also came a growing realization that the plant might be the *only* viable commodity in Virginia. Abraham Piersey wrote an apologetic letter to Sir Edwin Sandys in May 1621 admitting that Virginia “is not provyded of any good thing, Tobacco excepted.”³⁵ Prioritizing moral

³³ King James I, A Covnterblaste to Tobacco (London, 1604) accessed via Google Books

<http://books.google.com/books?id=EasUAAAAYAAJ&dq=Counterblaste%20to%20tobacco%20James%20I&lr=&as_brr=1&pg=PA1#v=onepage&q=&f=false>.

³⁴ Jorge Cañizares-Esquerra, Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550-1700 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), 130.

³⁵ Abraham Piersy to Sir Edwin Sandys, 24 May 1621 in RVC Vol. III, 454. An interesting examination of why tobacco became so popular can be found in Jordan Goodman, “Excitania: Or, how Enlightenment Europe took to soft drugs,” in Consuming Habits: Global and Historical Perspectives on How Cultures Define Drugs, eds. Goodman, Paul E. Lovejoy, & Andrew Sheratt (New York: Routledge, 1995). See also

purity over the possible economic windfall in cultivation, James continued his crusade against tobacco. Speaking directly to the Virginia Company, the King called for the expulsion of the crop and the cessation of “the planting of Tobacco,” which contributed “to the disgrace of the Countrey, and detriment of the colony.”³⁶

The King went so far as to cut off the exportation of tobacco completely, prompting extreme distress among colonial entrepreneurs. In early 1621, Governor George Yeardley forwarded to the Company in London a petition from the colonists “of the distressed Collonye in Virginea” against James’ measure “prohibiting our Importacon of tobacc^o.” Virginia’s monoculture is alluded to in the petition, as the colonists claim tobacco as “the onely Comodity which wee have had hitherto meanes to rayse toward the aparelling of o^r Bodyes and other needful supplem^{ts}.” In doing so, the colonists raise the fact that this measure would redound to their ultimate downfall at the hands of their seemingly diabolical Indian neighbors. Unlike their sovereign in London – at least regarding tobacco – the colonists tied economic success to the glory of God, and viewed any hindrance in attaining these ends as a victory for the Almighty’s enemies. The colonists pleaded with King James, imploring his “Princlie Compassion...either to revoke that Proclamacon, and to restore vs to our ancient

Brian Cowan, The Social Life of Coffee: The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005) 8.

³⁶ Treasurer, Council, and Company for Virginia, “A Broadside,” 17 May 1620 in RVC Vol. III, 278.

liberty, or otherwise to send for us all home; and not to suffer the Heathen to triumph over vs and to say: Where is now their God?"³⁷

The Reformation of Manners that occurred during the first two decades of settlement at Jamestown can be interpreted as attempting to achieve two interrelated ends. First, moral reform and socially reinforced piety aided in maintaining the favor of God. Social crusades such as those against drunkenness, blaspheming, and the expansion of tobacco cultivation may also be interpreted as efforts to combat the earthly manifestations of the Devil, who was connected with each of these moral transgressions. Put another way, the English undertook these precautions out of a fear of both God's wrath and the agency of the Devil. The next section will specifically highlight how commodity diversification – the cultivation of silk instead of tobacco – ordered by King James served as a means to both combat the diabolic influences of the leaf in both the Old and New Worlds and an English attempt to retain divine favor.

A Silky Solution?

In order to expedite the replacement of tobacco with a more morally acceptable commodity, King James I enthusiastically supported the research and implementation of silk cultivation throughout the English Empire. James' 1607 Instructions for the Increasing of Mulberry Trees and the Breeding of Silk Worm for the Making of Silk called for government officials at all levels – lords lieutenant, deputy lieutenants, justices of the peace – to make the trees available for sale to English landowners. This proved difficult,

³⁷ Sir George Yeardley and the Council in Virginia to the Earl of Southampton and the Council and Company for Virginia, London, 21 January 1620/21 in RVC Vol. III, 424-5.

considering no variety of mulberry – whether black, white, or red – was native to the isle. Fortunately for James’ initiative, red mulberry was part of Virginia’s native flora, and apparently the finest in the world.³⁸ Testimonies about Virginia’s landscape describe the native mulberries as “the tallest and broadest that ever they saw in any country.”³⁹ After this exciting realization, efforts to establish silk works in the colony gained momentum, and importation of silkworms began in earnest in 1613.

Despite early failures, Englishmen continued to promote Virginia’s prospects as a fruitful location for silk cultivation. In 1620, John Pory wrote that “silke” remained a “marvelous hopefull comodity in this Country, [Virginia] beinge as many mulbery trees as in Persia, or in any other parte of y^e world besides.”⁴⁰ Reality did not measure up to enthusiasm and effort. Little more than a year after Pory’s hopeful correspondence, Sir Edwin Sandys reported to John Ferrar the failure of the year’s silk harvest. “This yeare,” lamented Sandys, “as for all other things, hath proved very unkyndlie for o^r Silke wormes: who have wrought themselves into Coes [cocoons], & afterward dyed.”⁴¹ Captain Thomas Nuce posited a reason for the lack of successful silk cultivation: the overall busyness of the growing season. According to Nuce, harvest time occurred “at

³⁸ Linda Levy Peck, Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth Century England (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2005), 93-103.

³⁹ John Bonoil, His Maiesties gracious letter to the Earle of South-Hampton, treasurer, and to the Councill and Company of Virginia heere commanding the present setting vp of silke works, and planting of vines in Virginia (London, 1622), 73 accessed via Early English Books Online database <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99844759>.

⁴⁰ John Pory to Sir Edwin Sandys, 12 June 1620 in RVC Vol. III, 303.

⁴¹ Sir Edwin Sandys to John Ferrar, 5 November 1621 in RVC Vol. III, 512.

such a season as wee are busiest about our corne: so as no man but he that means to starve will once looke after” his silkworms.⁴²

A series of letters in 1622 illustrate King James’ determination to diversify the economy by undertaking initiatives “belonging to the Silke Art.” James himself ordered the Company in London to “take speedy order, that our people [in Virginia], vse all possible diligence in breeding Silkewormes, and erecting Silkeworkes, and that they rather bestow their travell in compassing this rich and solid Commodity, then in that of Tobacco; which besides much vnnecessary expence, brings with it many disorders and inconveniences.”⁴³ James was not alone in his efforts to stave of the machinations of the Antichrist in the New World. Ironically, the man who jumpstarted the colonial tobacco industry that the King so thoroughly detested – John Rolfe – wound up waging his own internal battle with the Devil in Virginia.

John Rolfe and Demonism in the New World

The experiences of John Rolfe’s life deserve a larger historiography than they currently enjoy. Rolfe’s life parallels the early history of the Jamestown settlement; the two seem intertwined. The son of John Sr. and Dorothea was shipwrecked in Bermuda along with Sir Thomas Gates, and his first wife gave birth to the first English child in the island’s history. His 1612 successful planting of a merchantable strain of tobacco places Rolfe in opposition to the efforts undertaken to facilitate a Reformation of Manners in colonial

⁴² Captain Thomas Nuce to Sir Edwin Sandys, 27 May 1621 in RVC Vol. III, 457.

⁴³ James I to the Virginia Company, London, 9 July 1622 in RVC Vol. III, 662.

Virginia, during which tobacco fell under Crown attack.⁴⁴ John Rolfe also provides the starkest example of the mental torment felt by some settlers in response to perceived insidious assaults of the mind by the Antichrist.

In a letter to Sir Thomas Dale, Rolfe revealed his fears regarding his attraction to the Powhatan princess Pocahontas. Within his request of support from the governor, Rolfe explains the temptation, the “passions of [his] troubled soule” that wracked his conscience as he strove to compartmentalize and separate his true feelings and intentions from those placed by the Devil. The uncertainty of the actual source of Rolfe’s feelings – were they his? or seeds planted by the ‘father of lyes’? – resulted in “many passions and sufferings... dailey, hourelly...and in sleepe indured.” Rolfe never doubted the source of his fear; the Devil caused his high anxiety. “Oftentimes with feare and trembling,” he explained, “I have ended my private controversie with this: surely these are wicked instigations, hatched by him who seeketh and delighteth in mans destruction.” According to Rolfe, only “fervent praiers” kept him “preserved from such diabolical assaults.”⁴⁵

John Rolfe looked to scripture for guidance. Evidence of Protestant typology is found in Rolfe’s comparisons of his own feelings towards Pocahontas and the sons of Levi taking “strange wives,” questioning if his intentions to marry the Powhatan princess would color him unfaithful in the eyes of God.⁴⁶ Rolfe’s anxiety was also consistent with early modern English demonism epitomized by 2 Corinthians 11:14: “for Satan himself

⁴⁴ Hamor in A Documentary History of Virginia, 1606-1700, Revised Edition, ed. Warren G. Billings (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 44.

⁴⁵ Rolfe in Documentary History of VA, 270-4.

⁴⁶ In his letter Rolfe alludes to The Book of Ezra 10:2.

is transformed into an angel of light,” which cautioned the godly against “the potential dangers inherent in that which might appear beneficial or harmless.”⁴⁷

Yet, like a true Puritan confident in his election, Rolfe did not despair in his mental anguish. Indeed, Rolfe’s reaction proved typical of other early modern Protestants; he saw the providential undertones of his conflicted condition. Instead of the “wicked instigations” of Lucifer, Rolfe – convinced of his piety – considered his feelings towards Pocahontas “the worke of God.”⁴⁸ Utilizing Nathan Johnstone’s research, Rolfe’s reaction appears to have been normal early modern English behavior. “Without diminishing the distress caused by temptation,” argues Johnstone, “many [Protestants] were prepared to recognize a value in the experience, and accepted that it afforded them some measure of spiritual insight, into their own condition and God’s intentions for humanity.”⁴⁹ Rolfe’s belief in the inherent good of his marriage to Pocahontas comes across powerfully; he adamantly declared his “chiefest intent and purpose” to be nothing less than “for the good of this plantation, for the honour of our countrie, for the glory of God, for [his] owne salvation, and for the converting to the true knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, an unbelieving creature.”⁵⁰ Rolfe’s justifications were not only directed towards his own misgivings but also towards a variety of audiences: the Virginia Company in London, his governor Sir Thomas Dale, and not

⁴⁷ Nathan Johnstone, The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 177.

⁴⁸ Rolfe in Documentary History of VA, 271.

⁴⁹ Johnstone, Devil and Demonism in EME, 110.

⁵⁰ Rolfe in Documentary History of VA, 271.

least of all, the Jamestown colonists, most of whom Rolfe realized held strong prejudices against Indians.

John Rolfe's marriage to Pocahontas in 1614 ushered in an era of stability in Anglo-Algonquian relations; the years under Dale's Lawes had been characterized by "intermittent warfare."⁵¹ English expansion continued gradually and efforts at mutual cultural incorporation gained steam.⁵² Under the governorship of George Yeardley "the planting of a college for the training up of the Children of those Infidels in the true Religion moral virtue and Civility" began in earnest at Henrico, and the new leader of the paramount chieftaincy seemed receptive to the overtures of Protestant leaders in Virginia.⁵³ All signs pointed towards Jamestown flourishing as a colony. Then came the attack.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Kupperman, Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 223.

⁵² Virginia DeJohn Anderson argues that English husbandry practices played a significant role in westward expansion; see Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 75-140.

⁵³ Virginia Company, "Instructions to Governor Yeardley," 18 November 1618 in RVC Vol. III, 102.

⁵⁴ An accepted term to describe the events of 22 March 1622 has been debated and still bears further review. The event is widely referred to in contemporary literature as a 'massacre,' a term that Benjamin Woolley explains had parallel religious significance to the term 'holocaust' today for Protestants in early modern England, especially after the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacre of French Huguenots in 1572; see Woolley, Savage Kingdom: The True Story of Jamestown, 1607, and the Settlement of America (New York: Harper Collins, 2007), 396. Frederic Gleach believes a more appropriate term would be 'coup,' a swift and sudden attack not intended for the complete annihilation of the English settlers in Virginia; see Gleach, Powhatan's World and Colonial Virginia: A Conflict of Cultures (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 4, 158. J. Frederick Fausz utilizes the term 'uprising,' pointing out that the Algonquians – at least by royal statute – were subjects of the English Crown; see Fausz, "The Powhatan Uprising of 1622: A Historical Study of Ethnocentrism and Cultural Conflict" (PhD diss., The College of William and Mary, 1977).

Nightmares Realized: 22 March 1622

A universally accepted reason for the events of 22 March 1622 remains elusive, but most historians cite the impetus gained by Opechancanough after the death of another well-respected Native American leader, Nemattanew, at the hands of the English. One of the earliest English commentators of the event, Captain John Smith, deemed Nemattanew's death important enough for inclusion in his 1624 Generall Historie.⁵⁵ Later historians have affirmed Smith's belief, although disagreement exists over the degree to which Nemattanew's death influenced Opechancanough's decision to attack the English. J. Frederick Fausz considers the Indian leader's death "the crucial catalyst," based upon the timing of the attack. Fausz points to the immediacy of the attack – a mere two weeks separated the English killing of Nemattanew and the attack on English settlers – as well as to the fact that Opechancanough "ignored Powhatan custom and precedent in warfare" based upon the "tidewater subsistence cycle" in his orders to assault the English.⁵⁶ Frederic Gleach maintains the death of Nemattanew constituted "but one element in determining the attack."⁵⁷ Gleach also discounts Fausz's assertion of the attack as a desperate retaliation, citing the adoption of new names – "reflecting new positions or status" – by both Opechancanough and his brother Itoyatan the

⁵⁵ John Smith, "The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles" (London, 1624) in The Complete Works of Captain John Smith (1580-1631), vol. II, ed. Philip L. Barbour (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1986), 293.

⁵⁶ Fausz, "Powhatan Uprising," 359.

⁵⁷ Gleach, Powhatan's World, 157.

previous year as evidence that Indian leadership had been planning an attack for some time.⁵⁸

Regardless of the amount of time for preparation, the Powhatan assault upon the colony proved well choreographed. According to Edward Waterhouse, a colonist and secretary for the Virginia Company, the Indians came unarmed, and utilizing the English colonists' "owne tooles and weapons, eyther laid downe, or standing in their houses, they basely and barbarously murthured, not sparing eyther age or sexe, man, woman, or child."⁵⁹ The attack occurred so suddenly, Waterhouse noted, "that few or none discerned the weapon or blow that brought them to destruction." In all, "there fell vnder the bloody and barbarous hands of that perfidious and in humane people... three hundred forty seven" colonists.⁶⁰

Perhaps more horrifying was the mutilation of the bodies that took place during the attack. Waterhouse described the scene as a second murder: the Indians, "making as well they could, a fresh murder" supposedly continued in "defacing, dragging, and mangling, the dead carcasses into many pieces." The Native Americans reportedly

⁵⁸ Fausz, "Powhatan Uprising," 356; Gleach, *Powhatan's World*, 156-7.

⁵⁹ Edward Waterhouse, "A Declaration of the State of the Colony and Affaires in Virginia. With a Relation of the Barbarous Massacre in the time of peace and League, treacherously executed by the Natiue Infidels vpon the English, the 22 of March last," London, 1622 in *RVC Vol. III*, 551. Andrew Lynall, 'Waterhouse, Sir Edward (1535–1591),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) accessed online via (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28810>).

⁶⁰ An alphabetical list of the English killed on 22 March 1622, updated from the list gathered by Edward Waterhouse, can be found in Appendix B of Fausz, "Powhatan Uprising," 588-600.

carried “some parts” of the bodies “away in derision, with base and brutish triumph.”⁶¹ Archeological evidence unearthed at Martin’s Hundred – the English settlement closest to the location of Nemattanew’s death – shows that the Native Americans scalped their English victims.⁶² Waterhouse portrayed the Indians as having acted less than human and more as a “Viperous brood” and “miscreants” who “put on a worse and more vnnaturall brutishnesse.”⁶³

In an effort to further cast the English as unsuspecting victims – and by contrast, the Native Americans in a demonic light – for his audience across the Atlantic, Waterhouse specifically detailed the end met by George Thorpe, one of the more enthusiastic supporters of the evangelization of the Algonquians. Thorpe arrived in 1620, spearheading the effort to establish a college for the Indians. His plan to take Indian children away from their parents and raise them with a proper English education can be considered cultural evangelization in the eyes of the colonists; from a native viewpoint, these efforts amounted to cultural genocide.⁶⁴ Thorpe also went to great lengths in his attempts to convert Opechancanough, who assumed the native leadership mantle following the death of Powhatan in 1619. In fact, Thorpe believed himself

⁶¹ Waterhouse, “Declaration,” in RVC Vol. III, 551. For further discussion on English interpretations of ‘barbarity’ see also Gordon M. Sayre, Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 258-304 and Timothy Fitzgerald, Discourse on Civility and Barbarity: A Critical History of Religion and Related Categories (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 193-230.

⁶² Ivor Noël Hume, Martin’s Hundred (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991), 288-291.

⁶³ Waterhouse, “Declaration,” in RVC Vol. III, 551, 553.

⁶⁴ Edward L. Bond, Damned Souls in a Tobacco Colony: Religion in Seventeenth Century Virginia (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2000), 76-7.

successful in this charge, based upon the Indian chief's theological interrogations of him as well as the state of amiable relations enjoyed by both groups; Opechancanough "held the peace concluded so firme, as the Skie should sooner fall than it dissolve." Waterhouse implies that Thorpe's efforts at proselytization contributed to him being targeted and made an example of, for the Native Americans "not only willfully murdered him, but cruelly and felly, out of devillish malice, did so many barbarous despights and foule scornes after to his dead corpses, as are vnbeffiting to be heard by any civill eare." From the English point of view, George Thorpe represented an emissary, not an enemy, a friend and ally to the Indians. After news of the attack reached England, an outraged audience anointed Thorpe "a glorious Martyr" who died for the Jamestown project.⁶⁵

Waterhouse's conclusion echoed the popular sentiment of the time. The agency gained by the Antichrist through the Native Americans had been a popular notion since initial settlement; English on both sides of the Atlantic had reported for years that the Indians recognized the Devil, "whom they worship for feare." Not surprisingly, writers casted blame for the attack at the feet of the Devil, further demonstrating English fears of the agency held by the Antichrist in the New World. "The true cause of this surprise," Waterhouse proclaimed, "was most by the instigation of the Devill."⁶⁶

Providence and 1622

The Devil did not represent the only supernatural explanation for the Indian attack of 1622. Contemporary sources pointed to providence in their search for a reason why

⁶⁵ Waterhouse, "Declaration," in RVC Vol. III, 550, 553.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 553-556.

almost three hundred-fifty colonists lay dead as a result of the “late vnhappy accident.”⁶⁷ A perceived sense of providential misfortune was not lost upon the surviving settlers. In a letter written to Company officials in London immediately following the attack, the Council in Virginia identified the attack as a product of God’s judgment. “Itt hath pleased God for ou^r manyfo[ld] sins, “ explains the Council, “to laye a most lamentable Afflictione vppon this Plantacon, by the trecherie of the Indyans.”⁶⁸ Governor Sir Francis Wyatt shared these sentiments, reminding the colonists he was charged to protect that the English “must wth all humbleness of mind, acknowledge the iust hand of God to have fallen vppon vs for o^r Sines.”⁶⁹

In a response to “the great Massacre executed on o^{ur} people in Virginia,” the Company in London admonished the colonists for their impropriety while echoing the general tenor of the Reformation of Manners. Company officials acknowledged the attack as an act of providence, yet squarely placed the blame upon the colonists. “It is the heavie hand of the Allmightie God for the punishment... and yo^r transgressions,” the Company coldly responded to the news from Virginia, emphasizing – among other moral transgressions – “the neglect of the Devine worship.” The Company in London instructed that unless drastic action was undertaken to remedy these faults the colonists would find themselves without “God’s proteccon.”⁷⁰ This was not the first admonition regarding the colonists’ attendance at worship events. In May 1620, to ensure that the

⁶⁷ Waterhouse, “Declaration,” in RVC Vol. III, 541.

⁶⁸ Council in Virginia to the Virginia Company in London, April 1622 in RVC Vol. III, 612.

⁶⁹ Governor in Virginia, “A Commission to Sir George Yeardley,” 10 September 1622 in RVC Vol. III, 678.

⁷⁰ Treasurer and Council for Virginia to the Governor and Council in Virginia, 1 August 1622 in RVC Vol. III, 666-7.

settlers avoid provoking “the Divine indignation,” a broadside instructed colonists to collectively prioritize “attending the Divine worship.”⁷¹ The overall lack of ministers in the colony compounded the uninspiring attendance problem. Despite overtures by the Company promising to provide for any wants, by 1620 only three ministers and two deacons could be found in Virginia, and by 1640 the number had only increased to five to ten ministers.⁷² A letter dated 11 September 1621 to the colony’s governor relates “there is great want of worthie ministers in Virginia,” and that the Company in response sent one cleric “m^r Thomas White” to resolve this dilemma.⁷³ Furthermore, the Anglican Church did not assign a bishop to the colonies in North America, instead placing them under the diocesan authority of the Bishop of London. The English in colonial Virginia found themselves with little spiritual leadership throughout most of the first two decades of settlement.

Early modern Englishmen and women viewed the Indian attack through two religiously tinted lenses. Some saw the attack as further proof of the diabolical nature of the Native Americans in Virginia. As God’s chosen people, the inheritors of Israel, the English acknowledged their countrymen at home and abroad would be targeted by the various appendages of the Antichrist. The “bloody crueltie of the Heathen Natives” was simply the latest in a long line of diabolical assaults against England that included the

⁷¹ “A Broadside” in RVC Vol. III, 275.

⁷² Bond, Damned Souls in a Tobacco Colony, 115. Horn, Adapting to a New World, 385. Horn states that after an initial burst of enthusiasm, qualified and respected ministers failed to be recruited in sufficient numbers to keep pace with population growth and the spread of English settlement (385).

⁷³ Virginia Council and Company to Governor and Council in Virginia, 11 September 1621 in RVC Vol. III, 506.

attempted invasion of the Armada in 1588 and the Gunpowder Plot of 1605.⁷⁴ Others interpreted the attack quite the opposite; the Indian assault was not a demonic demonstration against the godly, but in fact the result of the Almighty's displeasure with the English nation. No matter how 22 March 1622 was interpreted, it would forever change the course of history in colonial Virginia.

The Legacy of 1622

The turning of the calendar from March to April brought with it a seismic change in colonial policy. To an extent, an English strategy of theocratic morality – which, according to Edmund Morgan, “never excluded war, terror, and slaughter of the innocent as a means of extending religion and religious morality” – became the norm.⁷⁵ Abandoning efforts of accommodation, the English now espoused an agenda of aggression and seclusion, all in the name of “God himself, to whom this great work in our intent is principally consecrated.”⁷⁶

In his Declaration of the State of the Colony and Affaires in Virginia, Edward Waterhouse articulated some of the reasons why the English should retaliate against the Native American perpetrators. Drawing a parallel between the colonists and the Spartan Agesilaus, deceived in the classical Battle of Leuctra against Thebes, Waterhouse reminded his audience that the “betraying of innocency never rests

⁷⁴ “Commission to Yeardeley,” in RVC Vol. III, 678.

⁷⁵ Morgan, The Genuine Article: A Historian Looks at Early America (New York, Norton, 2004), 30.

⁷⁶ Virginia Company to the Governor and Council in Virginia, 7 October 1622 in RVC Vol. III, 684.

unpunished.”⁷⁷ Foreshadowing the institution that would embody life in the Deep South until the nineteenth century, Waterhouse called for the enslavement of the natives. The Indians “may now most iustly be compelled to servitude and drudgery,” explained Waterhouse, so that English settlers of any and all rank “may imploy themselves more entirely in their Arts and Occupations.”⁷⁸ The irony of these statements should not be discounted. In the sixteenth century, the Spanish claimed the right of a “just war” if Indians refused to convert to Christianity and accept Spanish hegemony by agreeing to the *requerimiento*, a speech act that established dominion.⁷⁹ The English historically attributed to the Spanish – via *la leyenda negra* – such mayhem as they planned to unleash upon the Virginia Indians as they took an about-face in their relations with the Algonquians.

Another reason for this shift towards a policy of aggression – simple convenience – dominated the writings of the secretary of the Virginia Company. Adhering to bluntness and eschewing the usual superfluity that characterizes his writing, Waterhouse matter-of-factly stated that “the way of conquering them is much more easie than of civilizing them by faire means.” To accomplish this end, the colonists received a “new, large, & Princely supply of Munition and armes, out of his Maiesties owne stores in the Tower.” In this vein, the treasurer and council in London, in a letter dated 1 August 1622, advised the colonists to attack the Indians “from time to time,” as

⁷⁷ Waterhouse, “Declaration,” in *RVC Vol. III*, 556. The classic biography of Agesilaus remains Plutarch’s *Parallel Lives*; see *The Age of Alexander* (New York: Penguin, 1973), 25-68.

⁷⁸ Waterhouse, “Declaration,” in *RVC Vol. III*, 558.

⁷⁹ Alan Taylor, *American Colonies: The Settling of North America* (New York: Penguin, 2001), 58.

well as “surprisinge them in their habitations, intercepting them in their hunting, burninge their Townes, demolishinge their Temples, destroyinge their Canoes, plucking vpp their weares, carying away their corn, and depriving them of whatsoever may yeeld them succo^r or relief.”⁸⁰ The time for understanding had passed, the English now engaged in a *de facto* policy of “total war.”⁸¹

Conclusion

The struggles and anxieties of the first two years of the Virginia colony did not thaw with the spring of 1610. Questions regarding the influence of the Antichrist corporation in the New World persisted, and efforts to keep these diabolical machinations at bay corresponded with attempts at home in England to facilitate an overhaul of moral behavior. The post-“starving time” administration’s implementations of the Lawes Divine, Morall & Martiall reflected these sentiments, as well as actions taken to steer the colony away from tobacco monoculture. Colonists continued to fear both the fury of God and the insidious plots of the Devil, and saw diabolic manipulations manifested in the indigenous population. The ‘satanization’ of the Native American in Virginia did not symbolize a rash reaction to the events of late March 1622. The fearful ire produced as a result of the Indian attack simply reiterated the long-standing English misperceptions of the Amerindians as a diabolic presence in the New World. This English perception of a diabolical presence in Virginia also extended towards Catholics and the Spanish.

⁸⁰ Waterhouse, “Declaration,” in RVC Vol. III, 557-560; Treasurer and Council for Virginia to the Governor and Council in Virginia, 1 August 1622 in RVC Vol. III, 672.

⁸¹ Howard Zinn, A People’s History of the United States (New York: Perennial, 1999), 12.

These perceptions embodied a discourse of fear shaped by the Reformed beliefs the English transplanted to the New World.

Conclusion

England in the early modern period was a country in transition. With transition comes uncertainty, and this atmosphere of anxiety heavily influenced English views of both self and other. An era of colonization in England emerged out of an era of reformation. English expansion would bring these Reformed views across the Atlantic to a New World. And while these beliefs aided in buoying downtrodden spirits, acting as a source of calming reassurance, they also helped create and sustain fears that continually wracked troubled minds.

The tenets of early modern English Protestantism provided a fair share of fears. Eschatology permeated English culture, and for many the question was not *if* the end of days would occur during their lifetimes, but *when*. This uncertainty over the Final Judgment contributed to fears regarding one's election, the end destination of one's predestined fate. This was not yet the era of Boyle and the clockwork universe created and observed from a distance by God. Early modern Englishmen believed the Almighty had the providential ability to smite down any blasphemer should He deem it an appropriate and just punishment. Not only was the Lord a palpable entity in everyday life, but so too was his dark nemesis.

Belief in the Devil's multiple avenues of agency led to a discourse epitomized by the "Antichrist corporation." Satan could assume either his physical appearance by his own efforts or the form of a familiar with the aid of a witch. Instead of a temporal presence, the Devil also insidiously entered the minds of the godly and planted sinful schemes. Often, fear proved not to be aimed at "the father of lies" himself, but his abundance of earthly agents. Catholic uprisings in Ireland and the failed attempt to blow up both Parliament and King in 1605 resulted in an almost obligatory Reformed fear of papists domestically. Continental Catholics, especially the Iberians who dared to sail the Armada with the intent of conquest in 1588, were also viewed as agents of the diabolical.

The English who immigrated to Virginia transplanted these fears regarding the Antichrist corporation. The Devil's influence knew no bounds, and he continued his attacks on English minds across the Atlantic, causing doubt in the righteousness of one's own intentions. Catholics, whether discreet with their convictions or so blatant that they smelt "too much of Rome," continually found themselves the objects of their neighbors' anxieties. While the Spanish never attacked Jamestown outright, ships sailing under Philip III's banner pestered English supply lines, and some Spanish soldiers found their way to the fort's jail cells. At least two Spanish spies were sentenced to death.

The New World provided another perceived form of agency for the Devil in the form of Virginia's native populace. The Native Americans posed as theological antagonists for the English settlers. English misconceptions of Indian cultural and

religious practices further promulgated these assumptions. In English eyes, Indian worship of Okeus was tantamount to Devil-worship. Native customs such as the *huskanaw* and traditional dances, as well as the Indians' overall appearance, added to English misconceptions. English fears of the natives had contributed to colonists' miseries during the "starving time" winter of 1609-10 and records of the ancient planters and early adventurers contained rhetoric of the Indian as diabolical as early as the first days of settlement in 1607.

As such, the Virginia Algonquian was 'satanized' well before the attack upon English settlements in late March 1622. And while many English believed the "late unhappy accident" to have been perpetrated by agents of the diabolical, commentators also interpreted the assault as an act of providence, resulting from repeated moral transgressions on both sides of the Atlantic. Fearing further providential wrath, efforts were undertaken to reform morality, aimed at such vices as neglect of worship, swearing, smoking, and drunkenness.

The ordeal of the first two decades of the settlement at Jamestown saw the rise of a discourse of fear that would shape subsequent English colonial attempts. In New England, King Philips' War cemented the idea of the Native American as diabolical for later generations and Bacon's Rebellion yielded similar results in Virginia. Efforts in New England to establish a "city upon a hill" filled with godly Englishmen prompted further reformations of manners. English fears of continental Catholics shifted focus from the Spanish in Florida to the French on the Saint Lawrence and the upper Great Lakes. The creation of a negative reference point by which the English measured themselves would

later manifest itself in white relations with African slaves. This discourse of fear found its origins in early modern England and was first utilized in the New World at Jamestown.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anonymous. 1901. "Two Tragical Events". *The William and Mary Quarterly, First Series*. 9, no. 4: 203-214.
- Barlowe, Arthur. *The First Voyage to Roanoke, 1584 The First Voyage Made to the Coasts of America, with Two Barks, Wherein Were Captains M. Philip Amadas and M. Arthur Barlowe, Who Discovered Part of the Countrey Now Called Virginia, Anno 1584*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: Academic Affairs Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2002.
<<http://docsouth.unc.edu/nc/barlowe/menu.html>>.
- Batman, Stephen. *A Christall Glasse of Christian Reformation: Wherein the Godly May Beholde the Coloured Abuses Used in This Our Present Tyme. Collected by Stephen Bateman Minister*. London: Press of J. Day, 1569. Early English Books Online. <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99850586>.
- Barbour, Philip L., ed. *The Complete Works of Captain John Smith (1580-1631)*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1986.
- Billings, Warren M., ed. *The Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century: A Documentary History of Virginia, 1606-1700*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Bond, Edward L., ed. *Spreading the Gospel in Colonial Virginia: Sermons and Devotional Writings*. Lanham, Md: Lexington Books, 2004.
- Bonoeil, John. His Maiesties gracious letter to the Earle of South-Hampton, treasurer, and to the Councill and Company of Virginia here commanding the present setting vp of silke works, and planting of vines in Virginia. London. 1622. Early English Books Online. <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99844759>.
- Brown, Alexander, ed. *The Genesis of the United States; A Narrative of the Movement in England, 1605-1616*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Co, 1891.
- Crashaw, William. *A Sermon Preached in London before the right honorable the Lord Lavvare, Lord Gouvernor and Captaine Generall of Virginea*. London. 1610. Early

English Books Online. <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99844721>.

Cressy, David, and Lori Anne Ferrell, eds. *Religion and Society in Early Modern England A Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Foxe, John, and John N. King, ed. *Foxe's Book of Martyrs: Select Narratives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Gibson, Marion, ed. *Witchcraft and Society in England and America, 1550-1750*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Gifford, George. *A Discourse of the Subtill Practises of Devilles*. The English experience, its record in early printed books published in facsimile, no. 871. Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1977.

Haile, Edward Wright, ed. *Jamestown Narratives: Eyewitness Accounts of the Virginia Colony, the First Decade, 1607-1617*. Champlain, Va: RoundHouse, 1998.

Hakluyt, Richard. *A Discourse Concerning Western Planting, Written in the Year 1584*. Cambridge [Mass.]: John Wilson and Son, 1877.

———. *Voyages to the Virginia Colonies, a Modern Version*. London: Century, 1986.

Harriot, Thomas. *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*. Rosenwald Collection reprint series. New York: Dover Publications, 1972.

James. *A Covnterblaste to Tobacco*. London. 1604. Google Books. <http://books.google.com/books?id=EasUAAAAYAAJ&dq=Counterblaste%20to%20tobacco%20James%20I&lr=&as_brr=1&pg=PA1#v=onepage&q=&f=false>.

———. *Daemonologie*. London, 1597. Project Guttenberg. <<http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/25929>>.

Jehlen, Myra, and Michael Warner. *The English Literatures of America, 1500-1800*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Kupperman, Karen Ordahl, ed. *Captain John Smith: A Select Edition of His Writings*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

A Packe of Spanish Lyes, Sent Abroad in the World: First Printed in Spaine in the Spanish Tongue, And Translated Out of the Originall. Now Ripped Vp, Vnfolded, and by Just Examination Condemned, As Conteyning False, Corrupt, and

Detestable Wares, Worthy to Be Damned and Burned. The English experience, its record in early printed books published in facsimile, no. 487. Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1972.

Percy, George. 1922. "A Trewe Relacyon of the Pcedeings and Ocurrentes of Momente wch have hapned in Virginia from the Tyme Sr Thomas GATES was shippwrackte upon the BERMUDES ano 1609 untill me depture outt of the Country wch was in ano Dñi 1612." *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine Volume III*, no. 4: 260-281. Virtual Jamestown. <<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1063>>.

Quinn, David B. *The Roanoke Voyages, 1584-1590; Documents to Illustrate the English Voyages to North America Under the Patent Granted to Walter Raleigh in 1584.* Works issued by the Hakluyt Society, 2d ser., no. 104. London: Hakluyt Society, 1955.

Quinn, David B., and Alison M. Quinn, eds. *The First Colonists: Documents on the Planting of the First English Settlements in North America, 1584-1590.* Raleigh: North Carolina Dept. of Cultural Resources, Division of Archives and History, 1982.

Smith, John. *A map of Virginia.* London: Press of J. Barnes, 1612. Early English Books Online. <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99857046>.

Strachey, William. *For the Colony in Virginea Britannia. Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, &c.* London. 1612. Virtual Jamestown. <<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown-browse?id=J1056>>.

Virginia Company of London, and Susan M. Kingsbury, ed. *The Records of the Virginia Company of London.* 4 Volumes. Washington: G.P.O., 1906-35.

Secondary Sources

Adams, Stephen. *The Best and Worst Country in the World: Perspectives on the Early Virginia Landscape.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001.

Anderson, Fred, and Andrew Cayton. 2009. "The Problem of Authority in the Writing of Early American History". *The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series*. 66, no. 3: 467-494.

Anderson, Virginia DeJohn. *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

- Appelbaum, Robert, and John Wood Sweet, eds. *Envisioning an English Empire: Jamestown and the Making of the North Atlantic World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.
- Bailyn, Bernard. *The Peopling of British North America: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage Books, 1988.
- Barbour, Philip L. 1962. "Captain George Kendall: Mutineer or Intelligencer?" *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*. 70, no. 3: 297-313.
- Baumgartner, Frederic J. *Longing for the End: A History of Millennialism in Western Civilization*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Blanton, Dennis. 1999-2000. "Jamestown's Environment." Virtual Jamestown © Crandall Shiflett. <http://www.virtualjamestown.org/essays/blanton_essay.html>.
- Block, Sharon. *Rape and Sexual Power in Early America*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Bond, Edward L. *Damned Souls in a Tobacco Colony: Religion in Seventeenth-Century Virginia*. Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 2000.
- Bridenbaugh, Carl. *Jamestown, 1544-1699*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Brown, Kathleen M. *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- . 1999-2000. "Women in Early Jamestown." Virtual Jamestown © Crandall Shiflett. <http://www.virtualjamestown.org/essays/brown_essay.html>.
- Bourke, Joanna. *Fear: A Cultural History*. Emeryville, CA: Shoemaker Hoard, 2006.
- Branquinho, João, ed. *The Foundations of Cognitive Science*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- Cañizares-Esguerra, Jorge. *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550-1700*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.

- Canup, John. *Out of the Wilderness: The Emergence of an American Identity in Colonial New England*. Middletown, Conn: Wesleyan University Press, 1990.
- Carson, Cary, Joanne Bowen, Willie Graham, Martha McCartney, and Lorena Walsh. 2008. "New World, Real World: Improvising English Culture in Seventeenth-Century Virginia". *The Journal of Southern History*. 74, no. 4: 31-88.
- Cervantes, Fernando. *The Devil in the New World: The Impact of Diabolism in New Spain*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Chorley, E. Clowes. 1930. "The Planting of the Church in Virginia". *The William and Mary Quarterly, Second Series*. 10, no. 3: 191-213.
- Cowan, Brian William. *The Social Life of Coffee The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Cox, John D. *The Devil and the Sacred in English Drama, 1350-1642*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Craven, Wesley Frank. *The Virginia Company of London, 1606-1642*. Jamestown 350th Anniversary historical booklet, no. 5. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1970.
- Cressy, David. *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Damasio, Antonio R. *Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain*. New York: Putnam, 1994.
- . *The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the Making of Consciousness*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1999.
- Darwin, Charles, Paul H. Barrett, Richard Broke Freeman, and Francis Darwin. *The Works of Charles Darwin*. Vol. 23, *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. New York: New York University Press, 1989.
- Davis, Richard Beale. *Literature and Society in Early Virginia, 1608-1840*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973.
- Delumeau, Jean. *Sin and Fear: The Emergence of a Western Guilt Culture, 13th-18th Centuries*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.
- Demos, John. *Entertaining Satan: Witchcraft and the Culture of Early New England*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2004.

- Descartes, René. *Descartes: Selected Philosophical Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580*. 2nd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Dunn, Richard S. *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Ekirch, A. Roger. *At Day's Close: Night in Times Past*. New York: Norton, 2005.
- Elias, Norbert, Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom, and Stephen Mennell. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- Elliott, John H. *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America, 1492-1830*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Fausz, J. Frederick. "The Powhatan Uprising of 1622: A Historical Study of Ethnocentrism and Cultural Conflict." PhD diss., The College of William and Mary, 1977.
- Fitzgerald, Timothy. *Discourse on Civility and Barbarity: A Critical History of Religion and Related Categories*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Ford, Worthington Chauncey. 1924. "Captain John Smith's Map of Virginia, 1612". *Geographical Review*. 14, no. 3: 433-443.
- Fredrickson, George M. *The Arrogance of Race: Historical Perspectives on Slavery, Racism, and Social Inequality*. Middletown, Conn: Wesleyan University Press, 1988.
- Gaukroger, Stephen, ed. *The Soft Underbelly of Reason: The Passions in the Seventeenth Century*. Routledge studies in seventeenth-century philosophy, 1. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Gildrie, Richard P. *The Profane, the Civil, & the Godly: The Reformation of Manners in Orthodox New England, 1679-1749*. University Park, Pa: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994.

- Gleach, Frederic W. *Powhatan's World and Colonial Virginia: A Conflict of Cultures*. Studies in the anthropology of North American Indians. Lincoln, Neb: University of Nebraska Press, 2000.
- Glover, Lorri, and Daniel Blake Smith. *The Shipwreck That Saved Jamestown: The Sea Venture Castaways and the Fate of America*. New York: Henry Holt and Co, 2008.
- Godbeer, Richard. *The Devil's Dominion: Magic and Religion in Early New England*. Cambridge. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Goodman, Jordan, Paul E. Lovejoy, and Andrew Sherratt, eds. *Consuming Habits: Global and Historical Perspectives on How Cultures Define Drugs*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- , ed. *New World Encounters*. Representations books, 6. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Gross, Daniel M. *The Secret History of Emotion: From Aristotle's Rhetoric to Modern Brain Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society Under the Tudors*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Hall, David D. *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England*. New York: Knopf, 1989.
- Hartz, Louis. *The Liberal Tradition in America; An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1955.
- Hatch, Charles E. *The First Seventeen Years, Virginia, 1607-1624*. Williamsburg, Va: Virginia 350th Anniversary Celebration Corporation, 1957.
- Hatfield, April Lee. *Atlantic Virginia: Intercolonial Relations in the Seventeenth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Horn, James. *Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

- . 1999-2000. "Leaving England: The Social Background of Indentured Servants in the Seventeenth Century." Virtual Jamestown © Crandall Shifflett. <http://www.virtualjamestown.org/essays/horn_essay.html>.
- Hudson, Carson O. *These Detestable Slaves of the Devill: A Concise Guide to Witchcraft in Colonial Virginia*. Haverford, PA: Infinity, 2001.
- Hunt, Walter K. "Anglo-Spanish Relations During the Early Years of Elizabeth I, 1558-1574." M.A. thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1974.
- Huizinga, Johan. *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Isaac, Rhys. *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Johnstone, Nathan. *The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England*. Cambridge studies in early modern British history. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Kammen, Michael G. *People of Paradox; An Inquiry Concerning the Origins of American Civilization*. New York: Knopf, 1972.
- Kelso, William M. *Jamestown, the Buried Truth*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006.
- King, John N. *Foxe's "Book of Martyrs" and Early Modern Print Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Kupperman, Karen Ordahl, ed. *America in European Consciousness, 1493-1750*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- . 1979. "Apathy and Death in Early Jamestown". *The Journal of American History*. 66, no. 1: 24-40.
- . 1977. "English Perceptions of Treachery, 1583-1640: The Case of the American 'Savages'". *The Historical Journal*. 20, no. 2: 263-287.
- . 1984. "Fear of Hot Climates in the Anglo-American Colonial Experience". *The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series*. 41, no. 2: 213-240.

- . *Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- . *The Jamestown Project*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.
- . *Roanoke, the Abandoned Colony*. Savage, Md: Rowman & Littlefield, 1984.
- Lefebvre, Georges. *The Great Fear of 1789: Rural Panic in Revolutionary France*. New York: Pantheon, 1973.
- Linebaugh, Peter, and Marcus Rediker. *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.
- Lovejoy, David S. 1994. "Satanizing the American Indian". *New England Quarterly*. 67, no. 4: 603-621.
- Lutz, Catherine. 1986. "Emotion, Thought, and Estrangement: Emotion As a Cultural Category". *Cultural Anthropology*. 1, no. 3: 287-309.
- Malament, Barbara C. and William J. Bouwsma. *After the Reformation: Essays in Honor of J. H. Hexter*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980.
- Mallios, Seth. *The Deadly Politics of Giving: Exchange and Violence at Ajacan, Roanoke, and Jamestown*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006.
- Mancall, Peter C., ed. *The Atlantic World and Virginia, 1550-1624*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- . *Hakluyt's Promise: An Elizabethan's Obsession for an English America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Maltby, William S. *The Black Legend in England; The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558-1660*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1971.
- Manning, Roger B. *Hunters and Poachers: A Social and Cultural History of Unlawful Hunting in England, 1485-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- McCary, Ben C. *Indians in Seventeenth Century Virginia*. Williamsburg: Virginia 350th Anniversary Celebration Corp, 1957.

- Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*. New York: Norton, 2003.
- . *The Genuine Article: A Historian Looks at Early America*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 2004.
- Miller, Perry. 1948. "The Religious Impulse in the Founding of Virginia: Religion and Society in the Early Literature". *The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series*. 5, no. 4: 492-522.
- Naphy, William G., and Penny Roberts, eds. *Fear in Early Modern Society*. Studies in early modern European history. New York: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Nash, Gary B. 1972. "The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind". *The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series*. 29, no. 2: 197-230.
- Nash, Roderick. *Wilderness and the American Mind*. 3rd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Newman, Lindsey M. "‘Under and Ill Tongue’: Witchcraft and Religion in Seventeenth Century Virginia." M.A. thesis: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2009.
- Noël Hume, Ivor. *Martin's Hundred*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991.
- . *Wreck & Redemption: William Strachey's Saga of the Sea Venture and the Birth of Bermuda in a Newly Discovered Manuscript*. Hampton, Va: Port Hampton Press, 2009.
- Norton, Mary Beth. 1984. "The Evolution of White Women's Experience in Early America". *The American Historical Review*. 89, no. 3: 593-619.
- . *In the Devil's Snare: The Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002.
- Oatley, Keith. *Emotions: A Brief History*. Blackwell brief histories of psychology. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2004.
- Oberg, Michael Leroy. *The Head in Edward Nugent's Hand: Roanoke's Forgotten Indians*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Oldridge, Darren. *The Devil in Early Modern England*. Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2000.

- Pagden, Anthony. *Lords of all the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France C. 1500-C. 1800*. New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Parent, Anthony S. *Foul Means: The Formation of a Slave Society in Virginia, 1660-1740*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Paster, Gail Kern, Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson, eds. *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Peck, Linda Levy. *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Pestana, Carla Gardina. *Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.
- Phillips, Roderick. *A Short History of Wine*. London: Penguin, 2001.
- Plutarch. *The Age of Alexander: Nine Greek Lives*. New York: Penguin, 1973.
- Pope, Peter Edward. *Fish into Wine: The Newfoundland Plantation in the Seventeenth Century*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Prinz, Jesse J. *Gut Reactions: A Perceptual Theory of Emotion*. Philosophy of mind series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Quinn, David Beers. *England and the Discovery of America, 1481-1620*. New York: Knopf, 1974.
- Quitt, Martin H. 1995. "Trade and Acculturation at Jamestown, 1607-1609: The Limits of Understanding". *The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series*. 52, no. 2: 227-258.
- Reddy, William M. *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Roberts, Clayton, David Roberts, and Douglas R. Bisson. *A History of England*. Vol. I. *Prehistory to 1774*. 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2009.
- Robin, Corey. *Fear: The History of a Political Idea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

- Rolls, Edmund T. *Emotion Explained*. Series in affective science. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Roper, L. H. *The English Empire in America, 1602-1658: Beyond Jamestown*. Empires in perspective. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009.
- Ross, Richard J. 2008. "Puritan Godly Discipline in Comparative Perspective: Legal Pluralism and the Sources of "Intensity". *The American Historical Review*. 113, no. 4: 975-1002.
- Rountree, Helen C. *Pocahontas Powhatan Opechancanough: Three Indian Lives Changed by Jamestown*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005.
- . 1992. "Powhatan Priests and English Rectors: World Views and Congregations in Conflict". *American Indian Quarterly*. 16, no. 4: 485-500.
- Rountree, Helen C., Wayne E. Clark, Kent Mountford, eds. *John Smith's Chesapeake Voyages, 1607-1609*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- . *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- . 2002. "Worrying About Emotions in History". *American Historical Review*. 107, no. 3: 821-845.
- Sams, Conway Whittle. *The Conquest of Virginia: the Third Attempt, 1610-1624 ; Virginia Founded Under the Charters of 1609 and 1612*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1939.
- Sayre, Gordon. *Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Short, John R. *Imagined Country: Environment, Culture, and Society*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 2005.
- Slack, Paul. *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England*. Themes in British social history. London: Longman, 1988.

- Spalding, Thomas Alfred. *Elizabethan Demonology; An Essay in Illustration of the Belief in the Existence of Devils, and the Powers Possessed by Them, As It Was Generally Held During the Period of the Reformation, and the Times Immediately Succeeding; with Special Reference to Shakespeare and His Works*. Folcroft, Pa.: Folcroft Press, 1970.
- Stachniewski, John. *The Persecutory Imagination: English Puritanism and the Literature of Religious Despair*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Stahle, David W., Malcolm K. Cleaveland, Dennis B. Blanton, Matthew D. Therrell, and David A. Gay. 1998. "The Lost Colony and Jamestown Droughts". *Science*. 280: 564-567.
- Stearns, Carol Zisowitz. *Anger: The Struggle for Emotional Control in America's History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Stearns, Peter N. *American Fear: The Causes and Consequences of High Anxiety*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Stearns, Peter N., and Carol Z. Stearns. 1985. "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards". *The American Historical Review*. 90, no. 4: 813-836.
- Stick, David. *The Outer Banks of North Carolina, 1584-1958*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.
- Tate, Thad W., and David Ammerman, eds. *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1979.
- Taylor, Alan. *American Colonies: The Settlement of North America*. New York: Penguin Books, 2001.
- Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de, *Democracy in America*. ed. Richard Heffner. New York: Signet Classic, 2001.
- Tyrrell, Ian. 1991. "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History". *The American Historical Review*. 96, no. 4: 1031-1055.

- Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Walzer, Michael. 1963. "Puritanism As a Revolutionary Ideology". *History and Theory*. 3, no. 1: 59-90.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the "Spirit" of Capitalism and Other Writings*. eds. Peter Baehr, and Gordon C. Wells. Penguin twentieth-century classics. New York: Penguin Books, 2002.
- Wingfield, Jocelyn R. *Virginia's True Founder: Edward Maria Wingfield and His Times, 1550-1631*. North Carolina: Book Surge, 2007.
- Woolley, Benjamin. *Savage Kingdom: The True Story of Jamestown, 1607, and the Settlement of America*. New York: HarperCollins, 2007.
- Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States, 1492-Present*. New York: Perennial Classics, 2001.