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ABSTRACT

John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton created images of themselves to attempt to gain position in the New World colonial undertaking, and each uses techniques of specific genres to bolster those images. However, each demonstrates a different degree of self-fashioning.

John Smith collects and republishes texts much like Richard Hakluyt did back in England. However, Hakluyt's collections just reproduced texts, while Smith mixed others' writings about his colonial activities with his own work, creating a hybrid text with Smith as the subject. Smith's emphasis upon individual effort mirrors one level of humanistic achievement that Europeans of his era were starting to value.

Roger Williams' writings reflect his desire to establish an ideal society in New England, and A Key Into the Language of America shows the overall structure of that society. Later, Williams' emphasis shifts toward the specific characteristics of an ideal religious community. By carefully detailing the traits of an ideal society, Williams represents himself as the person best able to establish and maintain such a community. In moving from one religious identity to the next--Puritan, Separatist, Baptist, Seeker--Williams demonstrates the range of possibilities for New World self-fashioning.
Thomas Morton’s anti-puritan satire contains a reverence for classical models contrasting him with his Puritan adversaries and revealing him as a precursor of neo-classicism. Within that model, however, Morton ultimately fails as a self-fashioner. Because parts of his *New English Canaan* satirize his persecutors, Morton spends more time fashioning his adversaries than himself. Morton initially wants readers to see him as a moderate man. However, the actions of the Puritans against him cause Morton to abandon moderation and move into personal satiric attacks. Morton only partially adapted several different models of satire in attacking the Puritans, underscoring the uncertainty inherent in the self-fashioning process.

Studying self-fashioning in these three colonial writers makes it possible to assemble a more complete picture of English colonialism. It also provides a framework for similar studies of New World colonists from other European nations, with the goal of making colonial studies a more comparative enterprise.
In Ben Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), the main Puritan character, and thus the main target of Jonson’s satire, is named Zeal-of-the-Land Busy. According to William P. Holden, Jonson’s attack on Busy, and by extension all Puritans, "was centered on the immoderation of the Puritan and the old charge of preciseness" (140-41).¹ Throughout the play, Jonson focuses on how busy Busy is with his attempts to impose his brand of scrupulous morality upon others. At one point, Busy goes to a local fair, where he finds himself in an argument with a puppet. Busy argues that the puppet with which he disputes is "an abomination: for the male, among you, putteth on the/apparel of the female, and the female of the male" (V, v, 92-93).² The puppet asserts that both it and its fellow puppets "have neither male/nor female amongst us" (V, v, 97-98), which the puppet proves by lifting its skirt and giving a "plain/ demonstration" (V, v, 100-101) of its genderless nature. Despite the puppet’s lack of gender, it still is able to fashion itself as it chooses to, whether it plays Dionysus, Antigone, or any other character. The puppet can be fashioned into a variety of roles depending upon the scene it is to enact, because as a genderless character, the puppet is not constrained by rules that might thwart the self-fashioning of a human. In much the
same way, citizens in seventeenth-century England took advantage of sweeping societal changes and the concomitant lack of embedded rules governing those changes to fashion themselves into a variety of roles.

One important factor in determining precisely how Jonson's puppet fashions itself is the role of language in the productions at the fair. Whether the puppet becomes Dionysus and portrays an ancient fertility ritual or presents itself as Antigone and acts out the tragic events of the house of Thebes, it is most able to fashion itself into whichever role it plays because it takes on the language of that role. For a puppet, the variety of roles is limited only by the depth of the language skills of the puppetmaster. Audiences could be convinced that the puppet was an ancient Roman citizen or a contemporary English politician if the puppet demonstrated a realistic grasp of the language of either of those two groups of people. The "self"-fashioning the puppet does, therefore, is linked to the language it uses.

If the metamorphosis of English society afforded many an occasion to fashion themselves in advantageous ways that would not have been allowable before, the New World colonial frontier of the early seventeenth century multiplied this opportunity considerably. The Englishman, and especially the English writer, who had his feet on American soil was virtually an allegory of the newly
empowered self of seventeenth-century England. The New World writer faced experiences that few others had experienced, and even the few that had experienced it did not possess interpretative frameworks that were able to help them accurately conceptualize what they were experiencing. Within that conceptual confusion, Captain John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton all demonstrate to varying degrees how generic conventions and the manipulation of language can impact upon a writer's notions and representations of self.

Together, Smith, Williams, and Morton represent three variations on the theme of self-fashioning in the New World. Smith, by focusing on the New World achievements of an individual, namely himself, demonstrates one level of the increasing stature of the individual that was evolving in seventeenth-century England. His self-fashioning pushes in one main direction, that of advancing his cause within the colonial companies in England. To achieve that goal, Smith gathers together a variety of accounts of his colonial experiences and uses them to create a specific image of himself. This form, borrowed from Hakluyt, implies a market-oriented culture whose perspective Smith then applies to himself, which turns Smith into a commodity, whose value can only increase when Smith appears to be very valuable to the continued survival of the colony. Although Roger Williams also focuses his self-
fashioning in one main direction—toward the establishment of an ideal religious community in the New World with himself as the person to establish and run such a community—he does so while presenting a wide range of self-conceptions throughout his life. Because of that range, Williams shows the multitude of opportunities for self-creation available in seventeenth-century New England. Thomas Morton also presents himself in a variety of roles in his New English Canaan. However, his self-fashioning revolves around classical models, particularly satire, and that emphasis anticipates the classicism which was soon to sprout and flourish in both England and its North American colonies in the eighteenth century. Most particularly, Morton represents himself as the victim of the excesses of the New England Puritans.

Part of the motivation for these authors to fashion themselves was the chance for advancement within their respective societies. For John Smith, advancement is manifested in his being allowed to return to the New World after his return from Jamestown in 1609. In Smith's view, colonization of the New World allows him the opportunity to move beyond the circumstances of his birth into new and more powerful positions within colonial organizations. Because Smith was repeatedly unsuccessful in his attempts to return to the New World, he used the writings he published from 1612 onward to promulgate a view of himself
as indispensable to the survival of Jamestown's initial planting, thus attempting to make himself appear to be rather valuable to other groups attempting similar plantings on New World soil. To develop and reinforce that image, Smith used the techniques of Richard Hakluyt, whose large-scale collections of travel texts showed Smith how to compile a range of writings by a number of different writers in order to present a specific ideology to readers. In Hakluyt's case the ideology is pro-England, and in Smith's case it is pro-Smith.

In an approach quite different from Smith's, Roger Williams viewed the colonies as his opportunity to establish a pure church that tolerated religious liberty and was completely separated from the Church of England, and he viewed his writings as the means to that end. We can see in Key Into the Language of America Williams's version of a utopic society, while his later writings, particularly The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution, represent a version of utopia much more sharply focused upon religious matters. Once Williams received a charter for the Providence Plantation, which occurred largely because of his efforts in the Key, he used his later writings to present the specifically religious nature of the colony he established. Such a construction implies that Williams, as the person delineating a society's religious ideals, would
be the best person to establish and maintain that ideal in a colony.

Thomas Morton uses his *New English Canaan* as a vehicle to secure political favor and advancement from authorities back in England. In a move similar to John Smith's, Morton attempts, in Books I and II of *New English Canaan*, to demonstrate his value to England's colonial activity in general and to the well-placed backers of that activity in particular by presenting himself as an expert on the commodities available in the New World as well as on the local natives. Once Morton had established this version of himself in his readers' eyes, he worked in Book III to secure revocation of the Massachusetts Bay charter, thus gaining stature in the eyes of Archbishop Laud and other Royalists back in England, by presenting and satirizing the excesses of the Puritans in New England.

*****

John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton all work to achieve their goals through a process known as self-fashioning, which Stephen Greenblatt defines as "the cultural system of meanings that creates specific individuals by governing the passage from abstract potential to concrete historical embodiment" (3-4). Greenblatt's work focuses on several Renaissance writers, including Spenser, Wyatt, More, and Shakespeare, and he discusses those writers' works—and the authors' self-
fashionings--within the cultural contexts at work during specific events in the authors' lives. For instance, he reads Thomas More's works as a "complex interplay" of "the crafting of a public role and the profound desire to escape from the identity so crafted" (13), or, in effect, as responses to More's shifting positioning relative to English authority. Greenblatt presents ten characteristics of the self-fashioning he studies:

1. None of the figures inherits a title, an ancient family tradition or hierarchical status that might have rooted personal identity in the identity of a clan or caste.

2. Self-fashioning for such figures involves submission to an absolute power or authority situated at least partly outside the self--God, a sacred book, an institution such as church, court, colonial or military administration.

3. Self-fashioning is achieved in relation to something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile. This threatening Other--heretic, savage, witch, adulteress, traitor, Antichrist--must be discovered or invented in order to be attacked and destroyed.

4. The alien is perceived by the authority either as that which is unformed or chaotic (the absence of order) or that which is false or negative (the demonic parody of order).

5. One man's authority is another man's alien.

6. When one authority or alien is destroyed, another takes its place.

7. There is always more than one authority and more than one alien in existence at a given time.

8. If both the authority and the alien are located outside the self, they are at the same time experienced as inward necessities, so that both submission and destruction are always already internalized.
9. Self-fashioning is always, though not exclusively, in language.

10. The power generated to attack the alien in the name of the authority is produced in excess and threatens the authority it sets out to defend. Hence self-fashioning always involves some experience of threat, some effacement or undermining, some loss of self (9).

Greenblatt views self-fashioning as a function of power relations. However, his model sets up a rigid relationship between self, authority, and alien where the self cannot truly be either authority or alien. For example, a seventeenth-century Catholic bishop might find himself giving a homily to his parishioners where he refers to the Pope as authority and to the Protestants as alien. The bishop’s relation to both is pretty securely fixed. The main limitation of such an approach to power relations and to presentations of selfhood is that it ignores the actual fluidity of relationships that Greenblatt implies in his point six.

My own model allows for this fluidity by presenting a range of incidents in each of my subjects’ lives and demonstrating the shifting selves writers present in response to those incidents. In this conception, the manner of self-fashioning one undertakes is determined by the nature of the relationship between the self-fashioner and those around him. For instance, a Catholic bishop would demonstrate a very different attitude toward the Pope than toward parishioners within his diocese. In the first
case, the bishop is certainly not the authority figure, while in the second instance, the bishop is the person who is perceived to have authority. The self projected by the bishop is necessarily different on each occasion, largely depending upon the level of power he perceives himself as having in a given relationship.

As one's level of perceived power changes and as a person's position shifts from authority to alien and back again, the self projected also shifts appropriately. However, Greenblatt strives to present specific self-formations for each of his subjects, even as he simultaneously notes the impossibility of such a project. He avoids criticism of this apparent contradiction by noting in his Epilogue that "the Renaissance figures we have studied understand that in our culture to abandon self-fashioning is to abandon the craving for freedom, and to let go of one's stubborn hold upon selfhood, even selfhood conceived as a fiction, is to die" (257). Greenblatt, then, sees the writers he studies as needing to create a self even as they recognize (or ignore) the fictionality of selfhood. A useful extension of Greenblatt's argument would refer to the fashioned self as one that only appears to be a concrete embodiment, and that only at a specific historical moment, because the self relative to others and relative to surrounding contexts was/is always in flux and transition. Therefore, in this
study I will discuss the experimental, and, ultimately, fictional self-formations presented by John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton without arguing for the primacy of any one of them.

Although any person's self-fashioning can be viewed as fictional because of the contingencies and contexts surrounding any formation of self, John Smith, Roger Williams and Thomas Morton all attempt to provide us with representations of themselves that each appears to want readers to believe is a realistic presentation of self—a function of each person's writing utilitarian works. It is not clear in any of these cases whether the fiction is consciously or unconsciously presented. Nevertheless, each man's formations of self are necessarily fictional, for they are at least partly determined by the conventions of the genre each uses to advance that fashioned self. Every fashioned self is fictional in the sense that it is made up based on the image of himself a person advances. Each writer selectively presents information about himself in the attempt to mold our perceptions about him, in much the same way Hayden White asserts that nineteenth-century historiographers did in their varying versions of history.

However, subjects writing about the New World have a fluidity of approach that others can only dream of. Smith, Williams, and Morton take a reactive stance regarding the shifting nature of presenting a self to others. Roger
Williams, for example, shifts between criticizing the natives and criticizing the English as he sets forth his principles of an ideal society.

The deconstructive tone of Greenblatt's assertions underscores the uncertainty of his subjects' positions, and my study allies itself most closely with Greenblatt's on this point. Each subject position a writer creates for himself is necessarily relative to how others position themselves, how they perceive the author, and how the author perceives himself relative to those others. Beyond this, though, a writer living in the colonial moment, particularly in the New World, finds himself faced with a bewildering array of constantly shifting and always relative subject positions. Thomas Morton, for example, found himself excoriated by the leaders of both Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth. At the same time, however, he had the favor of Sir Ferdinando Gorges and others back in England, and Morton was able to convince the English court to revoke the Massachusetts Bay charter and have the colony placed under the command of a Royal Governor. In this situation, we see Morton in two very different roles at the same time—gadfly to those in Massachusetts Bay and politically connected petitioner for the interests of himself and Gorges, or engaged at once (but in different ways) with both alien and authority, to borrow Greenblatt's terminology.
If we accept the relativity of one's self-positioning(s), we must also accept that a single particular conception of self cannot stand metonymically for the entire individual. Greenblatt's assertions regarding the relativity of subject positionings, because those positionings are so often conveyed in language, seem to anticipate more recent developments in literary theory. We have learned from several theorists that every subject position we assume is relative both to our own historical moment at the time of our assuming it and to others' perceptions of that assumption. Mikhail Bakhtin, for instance, contends that an utterance—and, by extension, a subject position one assumes via language—has no meaning until the moment of utterance. While this may be an obvious point, it bears noting further that the utterance's meaning is dependent upon its complete historical context. In other words, an interpreter of any utterance finds the most accurate sense of its meaning when the social and historical contexts of the utterance are taken into consideration during the interpretative process. For my purposes here, there are two main levels of context to be considered: those operating in England and those working in the New World. In this dissertation, I expect to complicate and expand Greenblatt's points about the relativity of self-fashioning by using them to discuss writers in the New World colonial arena and to move toward
the beginnings of a colonialist history of selfhood in the English New World.

On one level, the self-fashioning achieved by writers in the New World colonial arena is much like the self-fashioning achieved by the colonizers' contemporaries back in England. Both colonizer and stay-at-home English citizen fashion themselves in relation and in opposition to those around them. However, those who fashioned themselves in the New World not only added an additional layer of potentially oppositional relationships—the structures of colonial development and administration—they also were forced to fashion themselves in the midst of a vast land of riches and unusual people that they did not have the language to conceptualize adequately. In other words, the New World presented colonizers with the challenge of representing new lands, new peoples, new commodities, new selves, and new ideas, but there were as yet no rules in place governing how writers should convey all this newness to audiences back in Europe.

Another complication in reading the works of Smith, Williams, and Morton as documents of self-fashioning lies in considering the audience toward which each writer targets his fashioning. Each wrote works with the expectation of publishing them—the only exception being Smith's *True Relation*—which indicates that they expected a wide and general readership in England. Nonetheless,
audience plays an important role in determining what model of self an author would present. Each writer's texts generated specific responses from specific people, all of whom had the ability to further or hinder the advancement of Smith, Williams, or Morton. While it is not the goal of this project to discuss my subjects' intended audiences, I plan to discuss the specific effects their texts had on those readers whose responses we can glean from history, with the goal of demonstrating at least one level of effect Smith's, Williams', and Morton's self-fashionings achieved.

Colonialist writers use a rhetorical strategy that Peter Hulme asserts is the main trope of colonial discourse, whereby "the topic of land is dissimulated by the topic of savagery" (3). In other words, one might generally expect a colonial discourse to focus largely upon the land being colonized and the commodities available there for the colonizing country's use. What colonial discourse actually presents, however, is often a text wherein civilization and savagery are continually opposed to each other. While I concur with Hulme's analysis of colonial discourse, I believe that discourse performs an even more vital function. Colonial discourse masks the topic of the self under what we normally expect to find in it, discussions of land and of savagery, and it allows for experimentation with selfhood while Greenblatt's paradigm does not because it attempts to focus on specific self-
formations in a land with rigidly defined power structures already in place. Colonialist discourse masks selfhood under its other topics because so many colonizers, despite their protestations of loyalty to the King, the colony, the local administration or other authority figures, see the colonies as opportunities to create their own identities, often apart from--while still living within--their colony and that colony's identity as a whole. While I will discuss John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton in terms of specific self-formations, I do not claim that those representations are permanent, nor do I assert that they are the only possibilities available to them. On the other hand, Greenblatt focuses readers on the concrete nature of the self-fashioning he presents, and he implies that the fashioned selves he presents represent the main possibility available to the fashioner when he asserts that self-fashioning "creates specific individuals by governing the passage from abstract potential to concrete historical embodiment" (3-4). But in the colonies, the passage does not coincide with what self-fashioning was judged to be. Instead, I want to point out here that the specific self-formations are experimentations, because each formation is a writer's reaction to the forces at work around him at the time of composition of a particular work. Self-fashioning, then, can be viewed as the passage from one experimental embodiment of self to another.
Colonial discourse, an effect of power relations and repression, is not primarily about colonialism. Instead, it is more about the individual colonial writer struggling to assert himself in the face of repressive mechanisms—the local governing council in Virginia, the local church in Massachusetts Bay, or the promoters of economic development in that same colony—that continually work to engulf and direct the colonial writer's public and private senses of selfhood. However, this study will not be an explication of repressive mechanisms at work in the English colonial New World. A more pertinent focus is upon how individual colonial writers respond to those mechanisms and how those responses are manifestations of different modes of self-conception. In the face of the various repressive mechanisms, the writers' experiments with selfhood, and the tension between the freedom of the colonial arena and the restrictions brought on by a writer's choice of language and genre, colonial writers cannot always fashion one specific and easily definable public "self." Instead, they adapt a variety of positions and are never able to claim one specific position as definitive.

For instance, in Chapter 2 of his *A Key Into the Language of America*, Roger Williams notes how he has "travelled with neere 200. of them [the natives] at once, neere 100. miles through the woods" eating the native dish of "parch'd meal" (11). In this example, we see one
version of "self" that Williams sees himself fulfilling in
the New World--exercised expert on his native subjects.
Later Williams relates the story of a man who has a vision
which the man assumes is of his death. Williams uses this
opportunity to inform the natives about his God and about
how they would not need to fear death with access to that
God. Apparently, Williams' proselytizing achieves its
intended effect, because many of the natives cried out "Oh
when will you come againe, to bring us some more newes of
the God?" (21). Through this story, Williams shows himself
being a missionary to the natives, a role quite different
from that of expert on native lifeways. Since we never get
a clear sense of which aspect of his public life Williams
intends to focus upon, we can only read his shifting self-
positionings as reflections of the range of possible selves
the colonial writer could assume or as presentations of
aspects of Williams' public persona.

The range of possibilities is large but not totally
unlimited. The paradigm espoused by the leaders of a
particular colony often became the touchstone for
determining which types of experimentations with selfhood
would be allowed or encouraged in that colony. For
instance, many colonists fled the religious persecution
they suffered in other colonies by settling in Rhode
Island, where that colony's founder and first leader, Roger
Williams, worked to create an environment of freedom of
conscience, or soul liberty. Williams' own life demonstrates the imperative position soul liberty played in his fledgling colony—he "experiments" with different manifestations of his religious self, moving from Puritan to Separatist to Baptist sympathizer to Seeker during the course of his life—and his life demonstrates a practice of the freedoms he tried to extend to his fellow colonists. Therefore, any Rhode Islander who might attempt to present ideas antithetical to Williams' regarding religious freedom would likely be censured by the authorities, if not arrested and punished.

By asserting that Smith, Williams, and Morton experiment with various self-formations in the attempt to secure or maintain a place in society, I do not mean to imply that there is one certain place for them in their respective societies. Because these writers' self-formations are experimental rather than completed and absolute, it is impossible to assert one single place for them. Though Captain John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton all use colonial discourse in experimenting with their own unique conceptions of self, each takes a different tack in the experimentation process. Smith begins his writing career with a largely traditional promotionalist presentation of his role within the overall activities at Jamestown. However, once he is returned to England due to injuries suffered in a suspicious gunpowder
accident in 1609, nearly all of Smith's attempts to return to the New World--the place where he believes himself most able to gain land, status, and respectability--are unsuccessful.\(^8\) In response, Smith uses his later writings as vehicles to expand his discussion of his role in Jamestown, moving toward presenting himself as utterly vital to the colony while also presenting his survival skills as desirable to future expeditions. He achieves these goals in two main ways. First, Smith attempts rhetorically to raise his status in his readers' eyes. Throughout his writings, Smith subtly promotes himself to a status above that which English society would normally allow him to reach. Though the son of a yeoman, Smith inserts his name among those of Jamestown's gentlemen when cataloging, for example, the members of an expedition up the James River. When this rhetorical status raising does not meet his needs, Smith brings into play another experimental strategy, one that might be referred to as anthologizing. In his later writings, particularly the \textit{Generall Historie} of 1624, Smith compiles others' accounts of his activities and incorporates them into his own text. Normally, one might expect an anthology to provide a broader picture of general activities during English exploration, as several of Richard Hakluyt's texts do. However, Smith uses others' words about \textit{him} and \textit{his activities} in Jamestown to produce a document that is much
like a large research paper about John Smith, written by John Smith. The Smith that is exposed to readers through his texts is a man of decisive action who would benefit the entire colony.

Roger Williams' writings differ from Smith's in two main regards. First, while Smith's writings rely on rhetorical manipulation to fashion a self, Williams' works employ devices from a specific literary genre, the utopia, to facilitate his self-fashioning. Secondly, Williams' writings can be seen more as manifestations of what Williams would become rather than of what he was earlier, as Smith's writings were. *A Key Into the Language of America*, in this view, is read as Williams' attempt to gain favor with colonial authorities back in England in order to secure a patent for the Rhode Island plantation after his ejection from Massachusetts Bay. He does this using the conventions of the utopian tradition which had been in vogue in England since the publication of Thomas More's *Utopia* in 1516. While he presents a detailed account of native lifeways, Williams uses those discussions to present various aspects of life in an ideal society. Since neither native nor Englishman is represented as fully perfect in Williams' utopic vision, he can switch his criticisms from one to the other depending upon which group represents a particular ideal action. By presenting the best of both societies, Williams gains favor with the Crown, as his text
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implies that Rhode Island was (or could be) the ideal society he describes in the *Key*. Williams’s later writings narrow the focus of his utopian thought to strictly religious concerns. As Williams clarifies and reiterates his positions in response to John Cotton’s attacks and criticisms, we can see Williams detail his religious opinions, while also using them to refine his objections to John Cotton’s beliefs.

Differently from Smith and Williams, our sole record of Thomas Morton’s textual experiments with selfhood appear in a somewhat condensed version, in a single work: *New English Canaan*. In the three books of that text, Morton tries on the roles of expert on the natives, promoter of the New World, and social satirist. While Morton certainly could assume all three of these roles simultaneously, he is unable to do so within the confines of the text. In *New English Canaan*, Morton seems to be unsure how to present the public Thomas Morton, as his text often circles back over previously covered territory and occasionally contradicts itself. Morton’s uncertainty stems, in part at least, from the vehemence with which the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay authorities pursued and prosecuted him. The multiplicity and the intensity of his persecutions made it difficult for Morton to know precisely to whom he should address his text, because he was unsure from whom he might need assistance, much less who might grant it. An Anglican
in a land of Puritans, a Royalist in a land of people seeking less royal control, an accused pagan in a land of Christians, a trader of munitions with the natives in a land where a majority of the settlers eschewed such trade, Morton found himself in a constant whirl of shifting subject positionings—shifting due both to his own efforts and to others' portrayals of him.

His *New English Canaan* represents two different levels of self-fashioning. In Books I and II, Morton, much like Roger Williams, presents detailed information on the natives and their customs and habits. He also provides an in-depth accounting of the commodities available in the New World, thus presenting himself as an authority on the new land. In Book III, however, we find Morton's most persistent self-fashioning as he turns his attention to the satiric tradition in circulation in England during his lifetime. In that section, we see Morton the Anglican presenting the excesses of the Puritans in an attempt to score satiric points with the English antagonists of the Puritans and against those who persecuted Morton in New England, which Morton believed would help sway royal opinion against the colony. The fact that the New England authorities were successful in subsuming Morton's sense of selfhood into their own formation of him is more a testimony to their persistence in controlling him than to his failure as a shaper of his selfhood. Morton tried to
shape others' shapings of himself (both the Crown's representatives in England and his adversaries in New England), but he was only partially successful in that attempt. Clearly he failed to effectively fashion an enduring version of himself in New England, but Morton succeeded in doing so back in England, as can be seen in his successful court challenge to the Massachusetts charter and in the close relationship he developed with Sir Ferdinando Gorges. Because Morton constantly shifts positioning just to stay afloat, he represents perhaps the strongest sense of the fluidity of self-fashioning.

The New World colonial complication of Greenblatt's assertions is particularly applicable to the cases of Captain John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton, even as it can be studied in many other colonizing writers. These three men continually experience shifts in their positions relative both to authorities and aliens, depending upon at which stage in their lives and within which larger contexts we consider them. The constant movement between subject positions forces Smith, Williams, and Morton to experiment with a variety of self-conceptions in their writings, in the attempt both to carve out a niche for themselves in the colonies and to combat the forces in their respective colonies working to undermine each writer's sense of self--forces, in Roger Williams' case, like John Cotton, who engaged in a bitter and ongoing
dispute with Williams, wherein Cotton consistently attempted to promote the religious and political ideas of the Bay leaders while discrediting Williams’ positions.

By now it should be evident that the approach to colonial writers I propose here could as well be taken toward writers other than John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton. Although each of them is an outsider in his respective colonial society (and often in England too), one might, for example, easily discuss self-fashioning in an "insider" like John Winthrop. On at least one level, Winthrop views his identity as closely related to his office. Throughout his *Journal*, Winthrop refers to himself as the "Governor" rather than as a first-person "I." Despite giving the appearance of effacing himself, of negating the "I," Winthrop’s ploy actually allows him to discuss himself even more than he might otherwise have been able to do. Although we repeatedly see references to Winthrop in the *Journal*, he could just as easily argue that he was merely presenting the events of Massachusetts Bay’s early years.

*****

England’s period of New World colonialism provides an even greater opportunity for writers to self-fashion than seventeenth-century life in England does. For example, while seventeenth-century England was still evolving toward a society with new ways of thinking and new methods for
determining the rules of the society, life in the New World allowed a colonizer greater freedom to create his own rules, his own society, his own image of self to be presented to others. This is true because there were few established rules for writing about what one encountered in the New World, be it land, people, resources, or self-awareness. As colonizers wrote about their experiences for audiences back in England, those writers both described the New World and formed images of it and themselves in many different ways. Writers may have presented the New World as a vast uninhabited land, ripe for Englishmen to conquer, or they might have presented it as a field of native souls crying out for the Christianizing influence of the missionary. Furthermore, many writers presented themselves as authorities on the commodities available in this vast land, while others demonstrated their knowledge as authorities on the native peoples the English encountered.

The New World colonial situation shows itself as a major force for the destabilization of selfhood by appearing to allow unlimited freedom to the New World writer for striking out in new directions--particularly regarding experimentations in selfhood--but then undercutting that apparent freedom through a structurally forced need constantly to reinvent oneself in response to those who preferred to maintain their version of society, whether in England or the New World. In addition to
allowing writers the space to construct themselves, the imperial frontier, as Mary Louise Pratt makes clear, forces writers to construct and to reconstruct themselves continually, for upon that frontier, "Europeans confront not only unfamiliar Others but unfamiliar selves" (121). The tension inherent in such a formulation manifests itself in the variety of ways writers choose to fashion themselves in their writings. Smith, Williams, and Morton utilize the conventions of three different literary genres--the anthology or collection for Smith, utopia for Williams, and anti-Puritan satire for Morton--in their various self-formations, and that reflects a certain level of anxiety among them about a "proper" way to self-fashion. While there may already exist in the seventeenth century something of a tradition of self-fashioning writers, as Greenblatt points out to us, there certainly is not a codified set of rules for how that fashioning should be done. At the same time, Smith, Williams, and Morton find themselves in the New World, a place where--though there is a corpus of writings about it already--there is no consensus as to the vastness of the land, its possibilities for England and the English people, or the ways in which it should be conceived of or written about. This uncertainty leaves the individual colonial writer grasping for ways to fashion a self in his writings.
The model of colonialism articulated by Eric Cheyfitz in *The Poetics of Imperialism* revolves around the concept of translation, usually of the colonial world or the natives of the colonial region. For Cheyfitz, "the driving force of Anglo-American imperialism in the New World" is discovered in "the scene in which an orator through the power of eloquence 'civilizes' 'savage' humanity" (xx). In other words, as the orator (or writer) translates the "savage" into terms familiar to readers, the greatest degree of imperial violence is committed. Much of Cheyfitz’s argument hinges on the notion of imperial violence, but it does so while presenting unique individual representations of that violence and of the various writers. While the writings of Smith, Williams, and Morton may include some presentation of English imperial violence in the New World, the individual representations my subjects demonstrate are largely of themselves. In setting before us their various conceptions of self, Smith, Williams, and Morton all demonstrate the effects of translation on selfhood. Each translation of self represents an effort by the writer to present himself in a specific role, even though that role can only be considered concrete at one specific historical moment. At the same time, each writer provides readers with the clues necessary to translate that writer’s words into an image of the writer’s self as fashioned in the writing.
At the same time, Cheyfitz claims "the political purpose, however unconscious, of the evolutionary process of translation is to figure internal problems of translation as simply a problem of translation between an inside (the domestic) and an outside (the foreign), in which the problem of communication is, typically, located exclusively in the outside" (18-19, Cheyfitz's emphasis). In other words, any difficulties a writer has in presenting unusual or unknown things about his observed subject are made to be the fault not of the writer/insider, but of the observed/outsider. In the most literal sense, though, the colonizing writer is the foreign and the colonized subject of writing is the domestic, and, in that sense, Cheyfitz's point holds true, even though he does not suggest it in these terms: translational difficulties are the fault of the outsider (the colonizer). However, the colonizer assumes for himself the role of domestic and forces the colonized to take on the role of foreign; this configuration allows the colonizer to appear "normal" to his readers back home. Cheyfitz's formulation dovetails in some respect with Greenblatt's, because both acknowledge the tensions between domestic (authority) and foreign (alien) in any discourse.

The tension becomes even more important when one realizes that such writers as John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton often find themselves as the outsider,
even as they work to write from the inside. This tension provides translational problems both for the writer and for the reader. Both writers and readers are faced with the difficult challenge of translating or making clear the author’s position as authority or alien at a particular moment in the text, a task further complicated in my examples by Smith’s, Williams’, and Morton’s strange positioning as both authority and alien within the same section of a work. The competing push and pull of their situations allowed these writers the space to attempt to fashion themselves within the context of the "discovery" of the New World, despite forces within Old and New World cultures which often worked to discredit and to subsume those self-formations. Those antagonistic forces also helped each writer in his various experimentations with self-definition, because each writes in response to those forces. One might wonder at the value of a self-conception that is discredited or unrecognized by one’s home culture. Its value lies within the individual writer’s freedom to respond to those forces—despite being compelled by those forces to respond to them—by choosing how to define his own public self—or at least to experiment with such formations. I plan to study how three seventeenth-century New World colonizers take advantage of, react to, and are reacted upon by their respective experiments with selfhood.
When I present the terms "self" or "selfhood" in this study, I am referring to what I will call a writer's public self, often but not always distinct from, his private self—a distinction Greenblatt perceptively makes in his discussion of Sir Thomas More. More, for instance, struggled throughout his life to reconcile conflicting aspects of his public and private lives, and his writings often reflect this conflict. I do not believe that we can constructively, or even accurately, discuss a seventeenth-century writer using terms like "whole," "essential," or "integrated" self. This contemporary, pop-psychology approach to individuals does not acknowledge that any integration of aspects of one's self is, necessarily, a conditional integration—one conditioned solely by the number and type of aspects brought together by the subject.

On the other hand, by separating discussion of my subjects into discrete components, I hope to be able to discuss features of Smith's, Williams', and Morton's public personas which will illuminate their contributions to a colonialist history of selfhood. I decided to focus on the public aspects of these writers because we have at hand a great deal of textual evidence to aid such a discussion—each of my subjects wrote texts expressly for publication and/or circulation (John Smith's True Relation excepted)—and because access to one's public persona can reveal much about the forces at work while that persona was being
formed. Even in the one case where we have access to an ostensibly private genre—Roger Williams' letters—those documents still tend generally to be about events in his public life. In other words, his appears to be more a professional than a personal correspondence.

By presenting my position as a study of public persona, I do not intend to give the impression that the public and the private are mutually exclusive. On the contrary, the two spheres are intertwined in a relationship that privileges neither one nor the other all the time. The public and the private always move together and apart, merging and diverging, in not always obvious relationships to each other. Despite the convergences and divergences between the public and the private, I want to assert throughout this dissertation that the view we will get of the public self-formations of John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton will be conditioned by their respective historical conditions and by their responses to those conditions. In other words, I do not expect to present concrete and immutable self-formations of these three men. The formations might appear to be concrete, but we can only consider them to be so at the precise moment of their composition, if even then.12

*****

While it is true that any citizen of any nation at any given time has a subject position shifting constantly
between authority and alien, most citizens of most countries in most eras do not have the distance--both physical and emotional--from their centralized governing bodies that New World colonists did. Even those that later found themselves in colonies far from England--the pursuers of British colonial interests in India, for example--found themselves constricted by a well-entrenched imperial government with local British officials on hand to ensure the colonial venture's success. Conversely, the majority of English New World colonies were not under the direct control of royal authority, even when royal governors were actually in the colonies. And the great distance from England at which the New World colonists found themselves--with the relative freedom from absolute authoritative control it implies--coupled with the vastness of the land the colonists encountered, opens up spaces of possibility for any colonist seeking to forge new relationships between himself and authority.

Beyond the apparent openness of the New World, English colonists' reconceptualizing of their relationships with authority seems to have occurred similarly in Ireland, the colonial frontier closest to the English mainland. Raymond Gillespie points out that "the Dublin administration intervened in the late sixteenth century to reorganise the traditional family spheres of influence by creating large numbers of freeholders who would hold their land directly
from the Queen, as in Cavan and Monaghan in the 1580s and 1590s" (2). Despite this attempt at maintaining centralized authority, as Nicholas P. Canny asserts, by the early 1600s, both Irish and Virginian central authority "no longer exerted any substantial influence over those who were theoretically subject to it" (40), mainly because "like their counterparts in Virginia, the new landed proprietors [in Ireland] gained control of the central government but used it as an instrument for their own enrichment rather than for the advancement of the interests of the monarch" (43, my emphasis). As much as English authorities wanted to control the actions of English colonizers, they repeatedly failed to do so, even in areas like Virginia and Ireland, where authorities attempted to impose martial law upon the colonists.

Physical distance from English authority provided some unique opportunities for English New World colonists’ experimentations in selfhood, but emotional distance from England was also a crucial determining factor in the extent of one’s experimentations with various self-formations within colonial settings. Of course, the freedom and the ability to experiment with different self-conceptions were only available to individuals at certain levels of New World society—slaves and indentured servants were not allowed to become emotionally distant from their masters’ concerns. As Canny informs us, in the 1620s and 30s, the
Virginian "planters, who by this time had chief responsibility for discipline, were constantly alert to dissidence among the work force, and any servant who showed disrespect to his master or the government was hauled before the courts and severely punished" (41). The planters responsible for such severe punishments were, themselves, quite able to conceptualize their individual senses of self in many different ways and nearly as often as they cared to, all without fearing repercussions from English authorities. Because England was interested in the profits derived from slavery, for example, Edmund Morgan asserts that "Virginians could be confident that England would condone their slave laws, even though those laws were contrary to the laws of England." Such planters found themselves compelled to change their formations of their public personas as circumstances dictated. Morgan notes that the Virginian planters moved toward slavery once owning slaves became a more profitable investment than owning servants did. Their decision initially to focus on retaining servants instead of buying slaves appears as more a testimonial to their business sense rather than their moral revulsion at the thought of supporting an institution like slavery (297-302).

The reason colonists distanced themselves emotionally from the interests of England stems, at least in part, from the major constituency of the colonial group. Aside from
slaves, who obviously did not choose to relocate to the New World, and indentured servants, who agreed to relocate in the hopes of eventual freedom and a land grant as reward for their years of service, the colonies, as Canny reminds us, attracted mainly "landless younger sons of minor gentry and discharged army captains who were noted neither for their honesty nor for their concern for the public good" (37). Such men were more concerned with personal advancement, especially with acquiring land and material wealth, than with the advancement of the colonial enterprise as a whole, increasing the difficulty English authorities had in asserting their authority over the colonies. Even the indentured servants tended to have a mindset similar to that of these lesser gentry; after all, most of them--at least those who were given the option to agree--agreed to indenture simply to get to the New World, in the hope that, once their term of service expired, they could get about the business of improving their own fortunes and social statuses. One can easily see the possibilities for self-fashioning created within colonies faced with such crises as physical or emotional distance, such absence of strong English control, such tensions between the monarchy's colonial ideal and the personal agendas of many colonists, and such lack of rootedness in, or loyalty to, the English class system by many colonists. Not all colonists took advantage of the available space
opened by New World colonization for self-fashioning, but those who did helped their fellow colonists and their audiences back in England to reconceptualize and interrogate their own constantly shifting and always relative positionings as subjects. Those who chose not to take advantage of the opportunities the New World presented for the creation of a new self can also be viewed as fashioners of self. In their cases, however, we see them as much like they were before they ventured to the New World: as loyal citizens of England who colonized the New World for the glory of England rather than for the glory of themselves.

Self-fashioning at some level can be read into nearly any text, making it, for some, a moot point. However, I believe a wider range of New World writers needs more complete contextualization of their experiments in self-fashioning, in the effort to present a more accurately multi-faceted picture of New World colonization. To have John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton more fully contextualized is vital to our understanding of them, because they exemplify some of the common strategies employed by other New World colonial writers in their attempts to make sense of rapidly expanding and changing societies and of their places within them. By viewing how these three writers experiment with self-fashioning, read through their contemporary contexts, we learn not only
about the complexity of those contexts and, hence, of the English aspects of the history of the United States, but also about the complexities and uncertainties structuring the dynamics of a writer's attempt to develop, or any group's attempt to theorize, one specific self or an "American" identity. I do not intend to claim an exceptionalist approach to all New World writers as somehow inherently "American"; rather, I want to call into question any positioning of "Americanness" as a clearly definable, and thus strictly categorizable, entity by exposing readers to several variants on the Anglo-inspired New World strains of the self-fashioning theme.17

Clearly, the United States did not come to existence in a directly linear progression. A linear construction of the United States implies a clear and dominant hegemony at work in each era of our history from the initial contact through colonization, the Revolutionary era, the Republic and up to today, which obviously is not the case. For instance, Jack Greene contends that early English colonists developed two major models of colonization between 1600 and 1760: the declension model of New England and the progressive model of the Chesapeake region. New England's model represented a move not to transplant seventeenth-century English society to the New World but rather to transplant an idealized version of the pre-industrial period in English history to New England. Conversely, the
Chesapeake approach closely paralleled the development of metropolitan England and placed higher value on individual achievement, advancement and wealth than on the communal, familial and religious values of New England. Initially, at least, the colonies were quite far apart in the overarching principles each used for governance and for social formation. Further, Greene's analysis contends that, as the colonies moved toward independence, their respective operational modes began to converge. While Greene's work moves toward the type of project I suggest, his approach also perpetuates the linear model of the United States' development instead of fully interrogating the divergences in colonial thought and action.

The linear model also implies that the movement from "then" to "now" is one of constant and inexorable progress, not simply chronological, but also technological, social, etc.--a progress valuing the present by assuming it to be superior to the past. However, I prefer to view the move to nationhood as a more complex and intertwined path, full of fits and starts, successes and failures, and concord and discord among the colonies, the colonists, the slaves and the native peoples. I believe an approach like mine better allows critics and historians to place the New World colonial efforts of various European countries into play with each other, instead of keeping those studies focussed on one nation's colonization of the New World. Consider,
if you will, the possibilities of a discussion of Spanish, Dutch, and English mercantile efforts in the New World. Such a project would be fruitful for many reasons, not the least of which is the setting up of an apparatus for interrogating the expansion of European capitalism into the New World instead of merely commenting on one nation's capitalistic ventures.

William Spengemann's provocative works questioning our current conceptions of early American literature started me thinking about the study of New World colonization as a more comparative enterprise than other critics have previously considered it. Unfortunately, Spengemann equates English colonial activity with all colonial activity, and he generally equates British American colonial writing with all early American literature. While I too focus solely upon the English colonizers, I do so while acknowledging the English voice as only one of several reporting from the colonial arena. I limit my scope of investigation to the English to bring together specific aspects of English culture with colonial activities in Virginia and New England without the complication of additional national cultural contexts.¹⁹

Some may criticize my approach for perpetuating the stranglehold of English colonizers on the development of the United States as well as on the development of critical studies of that development. Instead, through beginning
with considerations of some English colonizers of the New World and their self-formations, this study presents a framework for future studies of any colonizing culture or individual rather than making the English position the one afforded privileged status. This study also paves the way for similar works concentrating upon other national colonial efforts with a mind toward more inclusive and comparative studies of New World colonization. Because this dissertation focuses on English colonizers, my approach amplifies the need for more comparative studies of Spanish, Portuguese, French, English, and Dutch responses to the New World. As importantly, my approach positions the critic to deal with each writer as an individual operating in a specific historical moment rather than as the representative of his entire nation. Colonial histories of selfhood allow us to understand individual responses to the New World colonial arena. While the New World experience conditions writers to experiment with various self-conceptions, each writer's personal agency is exercised via his approach to the colonial imperative to articulate his public persona. Though some might take exception with my approach for focusing solely upon colonists from New England and Virginia--perhaps reinforcing the primacy of those regions upon our conceptions of the United States' development and of colonial studies--I want to insist again that my purpose is
to read Captain John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton more as a variety of individual subjects and less as singularly representative of their region of settlement or of all male, English settlers. Their writings indicate several important strategies New World writers have employed in experimental self-fashioning, but they are not the only strategies available, nor are their implications or results uniform. In this study, then, I view the inception and development of the United States, via John Smith’s, Roger Williams’, and Thomas Morton’s experiments in self-formation, as what Eric Cheyfitz calls "a complex of interacting, still open-ended histories in which certain figures at certain times gain more or less articulation" (50). Smith, Williams, and Morton are the figures who gain articulation in my study. Despite my choosing these three as subjects, I recognize them as just three among a myriad of voices of colonizers from England and, ultimately, from Europe.

Notes to Chapter One


4. White studies several modes of European historical thought and presents the attributes of each. He claims "there are no apodictically certain theoretical grounds on which one can legitimately claim an authority for any one
of the modes [of historiography] over the others as being more realistic" (xii). One cannot make this claim, White asserts, because historians create each mode of history based upon their individual biases and emphases. See Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1973).

5. Bakhtin makes this assertion in his *The Dialogic Imagination*, which was written in the 1920s but was not translated into English and made widely available until 1981, the year after *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* appeared.


7. For citations from Williams’ *Key*, see Roger Williams, *A Key Into the Language of America*, ed. Howard M. Chapin, (Providence: Published for the Rhode Island and Providence Plantations Tercentenary Committee, 1936).

8. Smith’s final voyage to the New World commenced on March 3, 1614, when he led two ships across the Atlantic, in the employ of one Marmaduke Rawdon. Rawdon and Master Thomas Hunt, the captain of the second ship, apparently were more interested in securing gold and valuable whale products than they were in colonizing New England. Smith’s actions on this voyage point once again to his interest in presenting himself as vital to colonial development in the New World. While ostensibly traveling around the area trading for furs, Smith spent much of his time away from the ship closely exploring the coastline and mapping it. Whereas others wanted riches from the trip, Smith stuck to his purpose of mapping the region in great detail. His work on this culminated in his 1616 *Description of New England* and his being named Admiral of New England by the Plymouth Company. See Philip L. Barbour, *The Three Worlds of Captain John Smith* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964), esp. 305-314.


Among others, Shakespeare saw the ability of the New World simultaneously to perform both functions for a self-fashioner, and he presented a modified version of that ability in *The Tempest*. The island allows Prospero the space to fashion himself as a practitioner of magic. His isolation gives him the opportunity to perfect that
practice, and the resident spirits, along with the books Gonzalo provided, aid Prospero in fulfilling his wishes. Being on the island also forces Prospero to re-fashion himself, initially into a man of magic to achieve his purposes and then into a man who eschews the use of magic after achieving them. The self Prospero fashions on the island (magician) re-fashions him into the Duke of Milan.


11. In one instance, Captain John Smith heard of a possible move to colonize New England. In an attempt to gain passage back to the New World—an event Smith had worked very hard for since his return to England in 1609—Smith offered to the prospective colonists both his services and a copy of the map he had helped draw up after a brief voyage to the region. Before leaving for the New World, the colonists thanked Smith for his map, but they declined his offer of assistance, effectively disregarding John Smith’s formations of himself as a man vital to the colonial effort based on his experiences at Jamestown.

12. The debate between Roger Williams and John Cotton illustrates the illusory nature of language constructions. By refining and clarifying their positions from text to text, both Williams and Cotton show that the positions they presented in previous works were not understood by the other in the manner the writer expected those positions to be comprehended. As we move from one text to its more lengthy answer—"Letter of Mr. Cotton" is 14 pages long in Williams’ *Complete Works*, while Williams’ response to it is 83 pages—we also move toward each writer’s attempt to be more and more minutely precise regarding his positions. At the same time though, we seem to move farther and farther from any sense of a rhetorical "truth," because the lengthy explanations often cause the original point of contention to be left far behind.


16. Take, for example, the ever-changing reputation of Captain John Smith. Since Smith added to his story of life in Jamestown from one work to the next (like the Pocahontas episode), many scholars up into the twentieth century tended not to believe Smith in any of his accounts. However, in the mid-twentieth century, Philip L. Barbour began to follow Smith's pre-Jamestown trail, and he discovered along the way documentary evidence to support most of Smith's claims. Barbour's resulting work, *The Three Worlds of Captain John Smith* helped to solidify Smith's reputation.

17. Although I am in agreement with critics who consider "American" to refer to any region of the Americas at large, in this study I retain such terms as "American" in referring to what later became the United States, mainly because the United States did not exist during the time period under consideration here, while British America certainly did. When possible, however, I do utilize the more geo-politically accurate term United States.

18. Jack P. Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1988), esp. 1-100. Greene's assertions about New England have brought previously accepted notions of United States history into question. A prime example can be found in Kenneth L. Lockridge's review of *Pursuits of Happiness*. Lockridge asserts that though "we do not really believe this, many of us write as if New England were America, in the sense that we ignore the rich counter-point of regional and sub-regional societies and cultures, which was already in the colonial era making up a complex and diverse America" (625, Lockridge's emphasis).


CHAPTER TWO
WILL THE REAL CAPTAIN JOHN SMITH PLEASE STAND UP?:
INCIDENTS IN THE FASHIONING OF A COLONIAL SAVIOR

Since his death in 1631, Captain John Smith's reputation has waxed and waned, depending upon the climate of the times. Bradford Smith asserts that "John Smith had a prominent place in the eighteenth-century histories of Virginia, and as early as 1791 was being held up by Noah Webster as a model for school children" (297). At that time, Professor Smith reports, a number of literary treatments of John Smith's life and his relationship with Pocahontas appeared, as "both on the stage (J.N. Barker's The Indian Princess, 1808, and Pocahontas, 1830, by George Washington Parke Custis) and between the covers (as in John Esten Cooke's My Lady Pocahontas, 1885) the Captain became a great lover as well as a great fighter" (11).

Marshall Fishwick notes that as a result of these fictional accounts of Captain John Smith's life, "the reputation of Virginia's earliest hero was very high indeed as the ominous clouds of civil war began to gather over the nation" (46). Just as the Civil War divided the nation by region, so the debate over John Smith's reliability as a chronicler divided the nation along sectional lines. Northerners attacked Smith and claimed that his tales of his early exploits were untrue. For example, New Englander Henry Adams said of Smith's work, "The readiness with which it was received is scarcely so remarkable as the credulity..." 
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which has left it unquestioned almost to the present day" (79). On the other hand, southerners defended Smith on often rather emotional grounds. It was not just that they believed his accounts of his adventurous life, but also that he was one of the founders of Virginia, and as such deserved all possible defense against attacks from northerners. Southern writers claimed an almost Olympian stature for Smith. For instance, William Gilmore Simms’ *The Life of Captain John Smith* opens with the following sentence, placing Smith among the greatest men ever to live:

> In the long roll or catalogue which the world may exhibit of the great or remarkable men who have distinguished the several epochs and conditions, none have ever so completely ravished the regards of contemporaries as those who have been equally marked by the great and spontaneous readiness of their thoughts, and the resolute activity and eagerness with which they advance to the performance of their actions (9).

Captain John Smith, Simms asserts throughout his volume, was a man whose life demonstrated his worthiness of such a description.  

A prominent twentieth-century critic, Lewis Leary, asserts that the writings of Captain John Smith should be read as heroic legend. Leary reminds us of the twenty-two features of the life of a typical hero as set out by Lord Raglan, and he notes that John Smith meets "nine fairly certain, with maybe two more if I may be allowed to fractionalize, admitting some reasonably far-stretched
possibilities" (28-29). Meeting just nine of the features places Smith in company with Elijah "and close on the heels of Apollo and Siegfried" (28). Viewing Smith in this manner places him into a centuries-old tradition of heroic writing, and in the upper echelons of those ancient heroes. While Smith may fit those criteria--and many of the literary and historical treatments of Smith's life attempt to portray him in just that manner--there is no evidence that he consciously chose to present himself as heroic. The Captain John Smith we are about to discover did present himself as an important person. However, if Smith consciously fashioned himself into a heroic ideal, that ideal is more representative of Smith's own concept of what constitutes heroism--taking the actions that ensured Jamestown's survival--than it is of any larger or more ancient sense of heroic activity. Instead, Smith viewed characteristics such as concern for the welfare of others, resourcefulness, reliability, truthfulness, bravery, and dutifulness as requisite for a person to be a successful colonizer.

The polarized reactions to the life and writings of Captain John Smith stem largely from one source: the shifting image of himself that John Smith presents in his writings. Because that image comes to us from the pen of Smith himself, it is viewed as corrupt in many eyes. While my concern is not with Smith's truthfulness, I must point
out that historical research has validated many of Smith's claims about himself. Philip L. Barbour's biography of Smith traces his path as Smith himself presented it through Europe. Along the way, Barbour unearthed documentary evidence that corroborates nearly all of Smith's claims about his pre-Jamestown life. Despite Barbour's work, some skepticism about Smith's reliability has continued. There is, however, a growing consensus not only that Smith was truthful, but also that he should be studied and presented as a positive force in the colonization of the New World. Most influential in this regard is the scholarship of J.A. Leo Lemay, a noted apologist for Smith. In a recent volume, for instance, Lemay argues that we should believe Smith's assertions about the infamous Pocahontas incident, despite the statements of numerous scholars against its truthfulness.

In this chapter, I will move beyond the question of Smith's veracity about the events of his life to direct my focus toward precisely how John Smith fashions images of himself. Such a focus disregards the issue of Smith's truthfulness and allows us instead to learn about Smith from a careful reading of his texts. In addition, I will bring into the discussion aspects of John Smith's historical context that relate to the manner of his self-fashioning. Smith, for instance, uses the literary conventions of the promotional tract and the large-scale
collection in his texts to fashion for readers an image of himself, his actions, and his importance to the colonial activity in Jamestown. Also, Smith's unique social positioning within the Virginia Company—being asked to govern but not being of the class levels governors ordinarily come from—influences his attempts at self-fashioning, because that positioning practically forces Smith to make himself appear more important to the colonial venture than he may actually have been. In addition, Smith's self-fashioning presents one level of the humanism which flowered in Renaissance England and carried forward into the seventeenth century. That is not to say that John Smith was a learned man, nor that his writings were replete with evidence of voluminous, if disordered, book learning in the manner of Thomas Morton's *New English Canaan* or the immense learning shown by Cotton Mather throughout his corpus. Instead, Smith's learning came through his military experiences throughout Europe, and his version of the humanistic impulse caused him to rely almost solely upon his own actions and experiences to secure the future for himself that he desired. Smith seemed to believe that the things he actually experienced were a vital part of his education. Although Smith does not explicitly state this attitude toward his experiences, he demonstrates it through the emphasis he places on his experiences in his writings.
As the son of a yeoman, Smith did not enter the Virginia venture with the same status as his more gentlemanly counterparts. Several of them were openly distrustful or disdainful of Smith simply because they believed he was an upstart. While it appears that Smith's earlier exploits throughout Europe had prepared him for the rigors of leading the colonization and exploration of a "new" territory, some of his contemporaries believed that Smith's class level automatically precluded him from such roles. As a result, Smith was compelled to present himself as being as vital to the Jamestown colony's survival as possible, particularly after it became clear that a return trip to the New World would not be offered to him. Unless he presented his achievements in the best light possible, Smith believed that it was likely that no one would notice his accomplishments in Jamestown. And if no one noticed, Smith might never gain recognition for those accomplishments, much less be given the opportunity to accomplish even more.°

John Smith may have been one of the earliest Englishmen to view colonial expansion as a means of elevating himself to a higher class position, but he was certainly not the last. In nineteenth-century Africa, English colonizers also found themselves reaching for class advancement via their efforts in the colonial frontier. In particular, members of the London Missionary Society and
the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society sought advancement via their efforts within the traditional English class system. Jean and John Comoroff tell us that sixteen of seventeen "LMS and WMMS missionaries who began work among the Southern Tswana before 1860" can be described as

persons caught between rich and poor, either indeterminate in their class affiliation or struggling to cross the invisible boundary into the bourgeoisie. Five of them came from peasant stock, five were from artisan backgrounds, three had been petty clerks or traders, and three were risen directly from the ranks of the laboring poor (196-7).10

Each of these missionaries rose to somewhat higher positions in the English class structure because of their efforts, much like what Smith attempted to do via his writings. John Smith certainly was no missionary to the natives. He was, however, something of a missionary in favor of the colonial effort, and he seemed to feel that he should play an important role in any colonial undertaking.

Philip Barbour notes that

John Smith ranked but little higher in Elizabethan society than an 'untouchable' in Akbar's India. Perhaps because of this, he was by disposition tolerant of everything except intolerance, and by this token he lacked both the background and the ruthlessness necessary to forge ahead in the field of money-making, or in his chosen field of building an English colonial empire (x).11

Although many of Smith's Jamestown colleagues believed that his class level doomed him to failure in the upper echelons of the Virginia venture, Smith felt he was at least as capable as any of the other colonists, if not more capable
than they, at working for the good of the colony. Smith first attempted to prove his worth to the colony through his actions. During his time in Jamestown, Smith often went out to trade with the natives for food. At another point, he forced every member of the colony to work to secure shelter for all. His efforts to focus all the colonists on the goal of working for Jamestown's survival were initially successful. However, those efforts were soon undermined by the class prejudice and the political strivings of other, more gentlemanly colonists. Once Smith's initial actions failed, he decided that another way he might show his value to the enterprise and to the Company was to raise his status (class) in the eyes of his readers—primarily, the members of the Virginia Company back in London, and secondarily, the English public.

After his return to England in 1609, Smith faced a more and more difficult task in convincing colonial authorities that he should be part of any future ventures to the New World. Therefore, he found it necessary to sell himself rhetorically more and more forcefully in each of his later texts. Smith also had to navigate carefully between selling himself enough to achieve his goals and overselling himself so much to colonial authorities that he ruined his chances to return to the New World.

Because Smith was of common lineage in a venture largely financed by the wealthy and locally governed by
gentlemen, he was forced to make himself and his contributions to the colony appear as important as possible. At the same time he justifies his actions and his place in Jamestown's governing Council, John Smith also presents a carefully constructed version of himself to the colonial authorities and his other readers. Generally, the self Smith presents is a man who takes actions which are in the best interests of the colony and its survival, and as a subset of that presentation, Smith attempts to raise his class level amongst the colonists. Smith's justifications and self-constructions come in written form, and range chronologically from his True Relation of 1608 through the Generall Historie, published in 1624. Within his various published texts, John Smith undertakes two strategies for justifying his actions, and presenting specific constructions of self, to others: compiling a collection of writings about himself and rhetorically passing himself off as being of a higher status than he was.

John Smith uses the writings of others about himself, such as those by Anas Todkill, for example, to compile his 1624 collection, the Generall Historie. This is an unusual form of autobiography which we might refer to as self-reproduction--autobiographical re-presentation or re-creation of one's self through one's own writings and the writings of others. Normally, such compilation of previous works about a person falls to the domain of the biographer.
Nearly every biographer uses as references previously published works about their subject—that way, we know which aspects of the new biography are actually new. Some biographers take this style further than others. For instance, a recent biography of Elizabeth Bishop brought together not only Bishop’s memoirs, but also what others had to say about her life and work. The idea that an autobiographer would do the same seems foreign to us, though. Generally, we might expect that a writer would carefully choose which parts of his life to portray and which to omit in an autobiography. John Smith does precisely that, but with a twist, as he selectively brings other writers’ texts into his own autobiographical work. He emphasizes those incidents which increase the reader’s sense of Smith’s importance, not only to Jamestown’s survival, but to the survival of England’s colonial adventures. For example, Smith informs us at one point that after John Ratcliffe took over as President of the Council, he and John Martin, "being little beloved, of weake judgement in dangers, and lesse industrie in peace, committed the managing of all things abroad to Captaine Smith" (II, 144). Smith then reports his actions on the colony’s behalf, noting that he

by his owne example, good words, and faire promises, set some to mow, others to bind thatch, some to build houses, others to thatch them, himself alwayes bearing the greatest task for his owne share, so that in short time, he provided most of them lodgings, neglecting any for himselfe (ibid).
While he fashions himself as a vital member of the Jamestown colony, Smith also defines the grounds of the authority which he depends on for his self-fashioning. It is true that Smith works to advance within the colonial structures that were already in place during the early periods of England’s colonization of the New World, but by defining himself in terms of his actions, Smith attempts to move the parameters of advancement from one’s predetermined social position to the position justified by the actions one undertakes in support of the colonial venture.

John Smith tended to revise and expand his earlier works and include parts of them in subsequent texts. In the Generall Historie, though, Smith went beyond using his own revisions. That text demonstrates how Smith gathered what others had written about him and used the portions of those works that help to make him appear as vital to Jamestown’s survival as possible. Smith’s apparent lack of success in achieving the goal of his self-fashioning testifies more to the rigidity of the structures he attempts to transcend via his self-fashioning than to his failure to fashion himself effectively.

Beyond emphasizing his own actions in Jamestown, Smith employs a second strategy for self-fashioning, which also comes in the Generall Historie but is anticipated by what he does in his earlier texts. By means of this strategy, John Smith made himself appear to be of a higher class than
he actually was. Throughout the *Generall Historie*, Smith presents catalogues or listings of colonists undertaking a particular activity, and when he makes such lists, Smith also takes care to place himself as high upon the list as he possibly can, thus subtly raising his status level from what it actually was. Smith needed to undertake this strategy because within the colony itself he faced a battle for his political survival. When the colonists landed at Jamestown, the leaders unsealed the instructions from the Virginia Company which named Smith as one of the members of the Governing Council. However, he was not allowed to assume his duties, because the other Council members, many of whom were gentlemen, did not feel that a farmer's son deserved a place of authority. In his *Generall Historie*, then, Smith exacts some small measure of revenge on his adversaries by rhetorically placing himself at a higher status among them than he normally occupied.

Although the instructions of the Virginia Company included Smith as a member of the governing council, we learn in Smith's *Proceedings* that "Captaine Smith was not admitted of the Counsell as the rest" (I, 205). While at sea, Smith had been arrested and accused of what Matthew Page Andrews describes as "having conspired to incite mutiny on the voyage" (66). Smith himself claims that he "was restrained as a prisoner upon the scandalous suggestions of some of the chiefe (envying his repute) who
fained he intended to usurpe the government, murder the Council, and make himself king, that his confederats were dispersed in all the three ships" (I, 206-207). The members of the Governing Council of higher social rank than Smith feared that he would make himself the supreme ruler of Virginia and would thus reap all the material rewards of the enterprise for himself, not to mention that he would usurp the authority of men, who by English social standards at least, were his superiors. Such a move on Smith's part would surely endanger not only the social statures of the gentlemen in the colony but also their opportunities to realize capital gains from the Virginia venture.

Philip Bruce asserts that "foremost in their influence upon the minds of the greater number of shareholders in the London Company when the enterprise was inaugurated were the probable presence of gold there [in Virginia] and the supposed nearness of the country to the South Sea" (I, 11). Because of the shareholders' expectations of gold and other riches, many colonists pushed Smith to cease exploring the rivers near Jamestown and insisted he focus instead on tracking down potentially fruitful areas for gold mining. At one point, a supply ship was loaded by the other colonists with what Smith called "gilded durt" to satisfy shareholder cravings for gold. Furthermore, Smith's priorities of exploring the region and securing food from the natives did not endear him to some members of
the Virginia Company back in England. As Mary Newton Stanard points out, when Captain Samuel Argali arrived at Jamestown in July 1609—in advance of the Second Charter and Lord Delaware—he "brought Smith letters from the Company reprimanding him" for, among other things, "failure to send the ships freighted with valuable commodities" (78). Smith is continually pushed toward ventures designed to increase wealth for others rather than toward practices ensuring the continued survival of the Jamestown colonists, and his pragmatic priorities again caused him trouble later, when he made his only trip to New England in 1614. This tension, combined with Smith's class disadvantage, forced him to fashion a self that could be viewed as important in the Jamestown venture.

Both strategies Smith employs in creating his image revolve around a general concept of the importance of the individual which was then emerging in England. The dawning European industrial system displaced the kinship economies it encountered, both at home and in its imperialist efforts abroad, with capitalist ones. The need for the printing press in managing this broader, more abstract form of organization entailed a corollary displacement of oral cultures by the written culture of the developing system: the state and the market. The much broader access of writers to readers in the print system meant, however, that communal forms of expression were displaced by more
individual forms. Such displacements on the colonial frontier reflect similar occurrences in England. For instance, one of the effects of the Protestant Reformation was to bring the Bible into the vernacular, thus making it accessible to a wider range of believers. Pulpits resounded with calls for individual church members to read Scripture for themselves. Printing had been developing as a force in England for years, and the increase in literacy rates in the seventeenth century made the reading of the printed word more of an individual activity than it had been in the past. Hence the very system that gave access to greater freedom of self-expression also demanded more rigidly enforced ties to the imperial system, including its religion.

Eric Cheyfitz further amplifies the English move away from communal values toward individualism in another example. First, we learn that Richard Hakluyt's Discourse of Western Planting (1584) suggests the ease with which the English might convert the natives to Christianity, in effect creating a large community of believers in the New World. However, by 1609, Hakluyt's recommendations are largely forgotten. As Cheyfitz reports it, the Instructions sent to the colonists from the Virginia Company officials in London "ordered Sir Thomas Gates, prospective interim governor of the colony, to institute a plan, using force if necessary, for educating the children
of weroances (Algonquian leaders) 'in [the English] language and manners'" (qtd. in Cheyfitz 6). In this instance, the move is from thinking of the natives as a potential community of believers to forcing the natives to "go English" one child at a time.

The increasing emphasis upon individuals in English society was also transported to the New World, where colonists were able to transform that emphasis into the attempts at self-fashioning we find in writers like Smith, Williams, and Morton. John Smith, for example, demonstrates his concern for the welfare of the colonists, contrasting it with the carelessness of others. He went on several missions to procure food for the colonists, which "caused the Pinnace to be provided with things fitting to get provision for the yeere following...yet what he carefully provided the rest carelesly spent" (II, 145). Another of his traits Smith emphasizes is resourcefulness, which he presents in the story of the compass dial (see this study 92). Smith also demonstrates his resourcefulness during trade with the natives. On one trip Captain Newport attempted to appease Powhatan by allowing him to view the English commodities and determine their trading value himself. As a result, "Powhatan having his desire, valued his corne at such a rate, that I [Smith] thinke it better cheape in Spaine: for we had not foure bushells for that we expected twentie hogsheads" (II, 156).
In response, Smith overvalued some blue beads that Powhatan had expressed interest in. Powhatan importunately desired them, but Smith seemed so much the more to affect them, as being composed of a most rare substance of the colour of the skyes, and not to be worn but by the greatest kings in the world. This made him halfe madde to be the owner of such strange Jewells: so that ere we departed, for a pound or two of blew beades, he brought over my king 2. or 300. Bushells of corne; yet parted good friends (ibid).

In this instance, Smith did not trade fairly with the natives, but that was not his goal. Instead, he wanted to secure a supply of food for the Jamestown colonists, regardless of the means required to do so. By demonstrating such single-mindedness about the well-being of the colonists, Smith proves his worth both to Jamestown and the Virginia Company as a whole.

As the main proponents of New World colonization moved their emphasis from the communal to the individual, so too did the individuals involved in carrying out the colonial mandate. John Smith’s reliance upon an individual--himself--for achieving his goals was not always successful, while Roger Williams’s ideas about soul liberty being a priority in Rhode Island--which required the efforts of every individual to maintain it as a priority--were successful to a point. Differently from both Smith and Williams, Thomas Morton’s emphasis upon individuals can be seen in his satirical portraits of individual New England Puritans. While Morton’s satire was successful, his self-
fashioning was not, because his emphasis rested more on his adversaries than himself.

****

John Smith's first text demonstrates his emphasis upon individual effort in the New World. The True Relation appears originally to have been written as a letter to a friend of Smith's back in England rather than for general public consumption, and it comes across as a factual, if incomplete, narrative. Philip L. Barbour notes that this text

was published without Smith's knowledge, permission, or supervision. It was also ruthlessly edited and hastily and badly printed to an unusual degree. Both the editing and the rush to press fitted the Virginia Company's interests (I, 5).

In fact, the text "was entered for publication less than six weeks after its arrival in London" (I, 5), via still unknown means. At the time of the publication of True Relation, the Virginia Company was trying to quash the rumors of the ill fate of the Jamestown colonists in order to sustain interest in expanding the colony, so the Company had the True Relation strategically edited to further their own ends. To promote the monetary advantages of investment in colonization, the Virginia Company would expect those under its command to present the new colony in the best possible light. As William Wirt Henry tells us, the colonists departing from England for Virginia were instructed to "'suffer no man to return but by passport from the President and the council, nor to write any
Thus, any portions of the *True Relation* which might hinder the Company backers' efforts to expand interest in Virginia were expunged before Smith's text was published. The Virginia Company used Smith's letter, not originally intended for them, to promote investment in its venture in the New World.

Since there is no evidence that the English editors of *True Relation* actually changed any portion of the text, we may accept the 1608 version of it as a reasonably accurate, if abridged, version of Smith's actual relation. While we are told a great deal about Smith's activities in the colony, he seems not to exaggerate his role in Jamestown too much. We learn about his activities in and around the colony, but not nearly as much--or as forcefully--as we do in his later works. In several instances, Smith omits from the *True Relation* events that he relates in great detail in later texts. The most famous addition is, of course, the Pocahontas episode, which did not appear in the published version of *True Relation*, but which did appear in *Proceedings* and which Smith greatly expanded in the *Generall Historie*. While there is some speculation that this incident was edited from Smith's original text, there is no way, at least at this time, to prove precisely what was edited. Most speculations about deletions from Smith's original text are based upon obvious breaks in the
narrative flow of True Relation, but while scholars might be able to determine where a passage was deleted, it is impossible to determine the content of such passages.

Interestingly, though, Philip Barbour tells us that "Smith himself seldom if ever followed the text of the True Relation in his later works" (I, 108, n.242), despite his inclusion of many of the same incidents in the later writings. Why? Because the original published text appears to have been heavily edited, either by "I.H."--whom Barbour identifies as one John Healey--or by the publisher. In either case, Smith was unable to see the text through publication--both because he was still in Virginia at the time it was "edited" and published and because he did not expect it to be published. Because of the editing done to True Relation, Smith viewed the text as flawed, or at least not as complete and accurate a text as he might have liked it to be (or as it originally may have been).

While we may not get a complete picture of Smith’s original text of True Relation from the extant copies, it is instructive to note what type of picture of Smith we do get from them. By considering how Smith’s later portraits of himself differ from this edited version of his exploits, we can gain some understanding of the changing forces at work on Smith, on his writings, and on the colonizing project in general.
The incidents in *True Relation* are presented in a more plain and straightforward style than the later examples he writes or those he uses from others' works. Smith relates the events that occurred in the Jamestown area with little rhetorical embellishment. What readers see in *True Relation* appears simply to be Smith's narration of the events in and around Jamestown during his brief time there. This plain style could result from Smith's lack of formal education--he attended grammar school, but apparently did not read widely until after his Jamestown experiences. Once Smith ended up back in England, he had the necessary time and motivation to read more widely, at least in contemporary travel and exploration narratives, especially during the time he compiled and wrote the *Generall Historie*. That reading clearly informs his later writings, wherein he freely and openly uses whole passages from various writers' notes and works in writing about himself.

In the *True Relation* as edited and published, Smith takes great pains to provide precise measurements for the features of the New World which he describes. For instance, we learn that "Weramocomoco is but 12 miles" from Jamestown (I, 61), and that "The mouth of the River, as I see in the discoverie therof with captain Newport, is halfe a mile broad, and within four miles not above a musket shot" (I, 57). At times, Smith's meticulousness of detail seems useful to potential future colonists, while it is
also likely that Smith simply wants to be accepted as a reliable and truthful information source. Even though he wrote the *True Relation* to a friend of his, Smith would likely want to be viewed as reliable and truthful because to be seen as otherwise, even to a friend, would undermine all that Smith wanted to achieve in the New World. How could an unreliable chronicler expect to be rewarded with further prominence in the Virginia Company? Smith's apparently meticulous quantifying of various aspects of the lands he settled and explored place his text within a tradition of writing that continued in the United States at least through Byrd's *History of the Dividing Line*, a tradition that by purveying reliable factual information for colonization establishes the reliability and hence the worthiness of the writer. By this means, fact enters into discourse in service of the imperial system, following Bacon's equation "knowledge is power." But at the same time it serves the interests of empowering the individual as a trustworthy part of the developing information system. Since Smith's text was published, Smith's positions of reliability and truthfulness worked to affirm the Virginia Company's confidence in him. At the same time, the Company would be interested in Smith's presentation of the natural features of the Jamestown area, because those features--like the size of a river--might be useful for English merchants considering the viability of sending colonists to
sail a trading ship (or a ship to load with commodities bound for England) up a particular river.

Once Smith's readers, including the members of the Virginia Company, have access to the published version of the True Relation back in England, they are able to see him as a truthful and reliable chronicler of the Jamestown area. Beyond the useful information Smith provides, he also teaches us a great deal about his activities during his brief stay in Jamestown. In the portions of True Relation Smith's twentieth-century editor Philip L. Barbour views as unexpurgated from the original, we see Smith as having an important role in the Jamestown venture. For example, Smith explores several rivers in search of the much-desired passage to the Indies. In addition, he is sent on several forays to get food from, and to trade with, the natives. However, in these passages, Smith seems to let his actions—or at least whoever edited the text seems to let Smith's actions—speak for and about him. Early in True Relation, we discover one such episode. Smith informs us that the colonists' "victualles being now within eightene dayes spent, and the Indian trade decreasing, I was sent to the mouth of the river, to Kegquouhtan, an Indian Towne, to trade for Corne, and try the river for Fish" (I, 35). The natives perceived the colonists' need and consequently undervalued English trinkets. As Smith relates it, the natives "thinking us neere famished, with
carelesse kindnes offred us little pieces of bread and small handfuls of beans or wheat, for a hatchet or a piece of copper" (I, 35). However, Smith also tells us how he "in like scorne offered them like commodities," (I, 35) thus achieving his own trading goals. What we learn about Smith in this example is that his actions were an important part of Jamestown's early survival, because he focused almost single-mindedly on the practical details necessary for the colonists' survival. In addition, the members of the Virginia Company back in London used Smith's text to present the New World as a land where trade could be promulgated and where commodities could be had by industry or by shrewdness in trade. While Smith's text proved useful for the Virginia Company in promoting colonization of Virginia, Smith's actions apparently did not prove useful to him in his efforts to gain a position in future colonial ventures, even though many of those actions were still included in the published version of True Relation.

Furthermore, we should consider how this scene demonstrates Smith's careful self-fashioning. Although Smith occasionally acts with respect toward the natives, in this instance, we see him more as a typical Englishman of his time. Here, he views the natives in an adversarial role in trade. If Smith allows the natives to undervalue English commodities in this case, then he will have a difficult time maintaining beneficial trade in the future.
Smith places himself, then, as authority in this scene, while the natives are the alien. This would generally not be considered a surprising fact, but it is surprising when viewed in its complete context. Just prior to the trading scene, Smith noted that the colony’s food supply was running low and that he was sent to procure more food. Although Smith was not the President of the colony at this time, he names no authority of the colony in this sentence—he "was sent." Instead, Smith presents himself as the authority, not just of the trading episode, but of the entire expedition. Note that he does not claim to be the person in charge of the colony—that would be treasonous—but he again shows himself to be a man who takes action for the good of the colony. In that sense, Smith subtly gains authority over the entire colony, because he both acts to sustain the colony and writes to sustain his own reputation within it.

We see the essence of other promotional texts in True Relation. Smith spends much of his text discussing his own activities in support of Jamestown and its colonists, but he also spends a significant amount of time in the traditional promotional text activity of extolling the bounty of the region he explores. At one point, Smith mentions being upriver from Jamestown on an exploratory voyage where he and his colleagues met a group of natives who were "kindly intreating us, daunsing and feasting us
with strawberries, Mulberies, Bread, Fish, and other their Countrie provisions wherof we had plenty" (I, 29). During the period of Smith's captivity by Powhatan, he was well provided for, telling us "a quarter of venison and some ten pound of bread I had for supper" and that "each morning 3. women presented me three great platters of fine bread, more venison then ten men could devour I had" (I, 49).

In this passage readers are exposed to numerous examples of the bounty available in Virginia. However, we also learn that Smith receives the hospitality noted above at least partly because his native guide "discovered [him] to be the Captaine" of the expedition and because Smith gave the king "a compassé diall" along with an explanation of its use (I, 47). While the bounty in the New World might be available to any person, Smith informs us that he receives it because of his actions--captaining the search for food, giving a gift to his captors, and explaining that gift's uses. In several instances in True Relation, we get a sense of the degree and range of Smith's activities in the colony, and those glimpses of Smith as a man of practical action prepares us for the Smith we discover in his later works.

****

Just about one year after the publication of True Relation, John Smith was seriously burned during an exploratory journey in a suspicious gunpowder accident.
Throughout this journey, Smith had had to circumvent the wrath of the colonists on board with him, because they seemed to have tired of his authoritarian rule as President. While on a boat sailing down the river back to Jamestown, Smith "stretched out to rest while his mariners stood guard. Somehow a spark from the matches for their muskets or from a tobacco pipe lighted on Smith's powder bag, which burst into flame right on his lap" (Barbour, *Three Worlds*, 276). The severity of his injuries, coupled with the machinations of Smith's enemies Ratcliffe and Archer against his rule as President, caused John Smith to board a ship--either the *Falcon* or the *Lion*--to return to England.\(^{22}\)

Once back in England, Smith seems to have pursued a commission to return to Virginia, but a confluence of forces combined to keep Smith from realizing his ambition (*Three Worlds* 292-296). Smith's chief obstacle to gaining a new position in the Virginia Company was the newly appointed Lord Governor of Virginia, Sir Thomas West, who received a commission from the Virginia Company on February 28, 1610, "the first such document ever issued to the Lord Governor of an English colony in America" (292). As Baron of De La Warre in addition to his New World title, West was given an unusual degree of autonomy and was able to choose his own associates in the colony, instead of having the Virginia Company choose them for him. West's authority
rendered useless any petition Smith might make to the Virginia Company for a position, while the lack of a connection to West precluded Smith from applying directly to him. Fortunately for Smith, around this time several colonists returned from England, and the notes they brought with them aided Smith in writing and compiling the Map of Virginia and The Proceedings, both published in 1612. For my purposes here, the only noteworthy aspect of this joint publication is that The Proceedings is avowedly an amalgamation of other writers' notes and/or texts, and that fact is only noteworthy because Smith later uses The Proceedings as the basis for Book III of his Generall Historie.

In addition, we learn from Barbour that Smith's 1612 "Map of Virginia had to be printed in Oxford, the London publishers apparently being unwilling to flout the mercantile 'establishment'" (Works I, 1x), indicating both the increasing power of the mercantile class and the decreasing importance of Captain John Smith and his previous efforts in the Virginia colony. Also, he was unable to secure a commission to return to the New World after 1615. Despite the fact that Smith perceived and presented himself as an authority regarding the colonization of Virginia, to the most influential members of the Virginia Company Smith appeared to be alien. That positioning as alien had to be overturned if Smith was ever
to realize his hopes of returning to the New World, and he attempted to overturn it by fashioning himself through his writings into an absolutely vital member of early colonial life in Virginia.

Smith pinned his later hopes for a return to Virginia on a rumored restructuring of the Virginia Company, which began in April of 1623. Barbour tells us "that before the year was out, Smith had put together a considerable volume to back up just such a move" (Works III, 5), and, in fact, Smith published a prospectus of the Generall Historie in 1623 wherein he solicited money to finance his volume.

"Although there is highly questionable evidence that most of Book I was written by September 23, 1622," Barbour further notes, "it is evident that John Smith whipped his Generall Historie into shape during the period of receivership [of the Virginia Company] (May 9, 1623-May 24, 1624)" (Works III, 29). Smith seemed to expect favorable treatment in the wake of the Company's restructuring--his old foes would probably be ousted from the Company, giving him an opportunity to be sent back either to Virginia or to New England. As a result, Smith was again motivated to present himself and his earlier contributions to the Virginia venture in the best light possible. The Generall Historie was to be Smith's vehicle for his return to Virginia. To make that text as appealing as possible, Smith "wove his source material into his own accounts,
modifying it almost ad libitum, while still painstakingly preserving the original text where it served his purpose" (Barbour, Works I, lxv). And his purpose in this case appears to be to redefine himself and his role in the beginnings of Virginia.

Barbour's introduction to Smith's Map of Virginia (1612) indicates that Smith was familiar with Thomas Hariot's and Ralph Lane's texts--both of which appeared in Hakluyt's 1600 edition of Principal Navigations--because he uses some of Hariot's descriptions in True Relation and some native words from Lane's work in Map of Virginia. Barbour conjectures that Smith used these two works, because he had access to the 1600 edition of Hakluyt in Jamestown, as it was one of the texts sent by the Virginia Company with the original colonists (I, 123-124). Furthermore, upon his return to England, Smith was introduced to Samuel Purchas and each became interested in the other's work (See Barbour Three Worlds, especially 297). On several occasions, Purchas either referred Smith to, or provided him with copies of, the latest texts on exploration and colonization. It is apparent that Smith took advantage of the ready availability of Hakluyt's text and Purchas' resources, because Smith employs collection techniques in the Generall Historie that are similar to those Hakluyt and Purchas used.
Smith presented us with some sense of the opposition he faced in his *True Relation*, and he expanded his discussion of that opposition in the more retrospective *Proceedings of the English Colonie in Virginia* (1612). Within his publication of *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles...* (1624), Smith added a great deal more to what he had previously written. Although Kevin L. Hayes does a fine job of presenting many of the additions Smith made in reworking the *Proceedings* of 1612 into his later text, *Generall Historie*, Hayes only emphasizes a select few episodes in concluding that Smith was interested in presenting and celebrating the qualities necessary for success in Virginia. Hayes rightly informs us that Smith viewed the requisite qualities for colonial success as courage and ingenuity, selflessness and resourcefulness, and adventurousness and the willingness to take action, each of which can be seen in Smith's various additions from *True Relation* to the *Generall Historie*. These traits are vital to the New World colonial version of self-fashioning, because they revolve around an individual's abilities rather than around an individual's positioning of himself in relation to a perceived alien or authority. However, John Smith found himself in a challenging situation regarding his self-fashioning because while he wanted to stress his abilities in demonstrating his value to the
colonial venture, many others evaluated persons by virtue of their birth, fortunes, or connections—in other words by how those persons fit into a rigid structure of alien and authority.

In looking at the totality of Smith’s additions to the *Generall Historie*, particularly in Book III, it becomes apparent that Captain John Smith felt he possessed the majority of the requisite traits of the ideal colonist, viewing himself, as Hayes points out, "as an exemplum" (133). In many instances, Hayes informs us, Smith reduced, or omitted entirely, passages which denigrated other colonists. These reductions and omissions show Smith as concerned with how his audience might perceive the Virginia venture and those involved in it. At the same time, though, those same reductions and omissions place even greater emphasis on Smith, by removing most discussions of the other colonists from the text. Smith enhances his image in the *Generall Historie*, as compared to how he presents himself in earlier works, through the compilation and reproduction of others’ writings on a particular subject (Captain John Smith, in this case), a technique popularized by Hakluyt. Smith borrows from other texts—not an uncommon practice in England at the time—in writing a detailed consideration of himself and his actions—a practice still uncommon (if not completely unheard of) in autobiographical writings.\(^\text{24}\)
John Smith's Generall Historie expands his own earlier accounts of life in Virginia, while often quite liberally and without acknowledgement using many other sources in what Wayne Franklin calls an "anthology of writings by various hands" (187). The precursor to this work, the 1612 Proceedings, also contained writings from others besides Smith. However, the names of the authors of a particular Proceedings chapter were appended to the chapter proper, while Smith's Generall Historie makes no distinctions between his own words and those borrowed from other sources. Hayes views Smith's additions to the Generall Historie as providing readers with a wide range of examples of exemplary conduct written by persons other than Smith, including Anas Todkill, George Percy, and others. Instead, I prefer to view the result of Smith's compilation in Book III of the Generall Historie as not so much an anthology of travel writings, as in the case of Purchas or Hakluyt, but rather more like an integrated collection of works discussing the exploits of Captain John Smith, a collection which Philip Barbour refers to as "a thorough, somewhat egocentric compendium of facts as John Smith saw them, elaborated by extensive quotation from other, and usually unacknowledged, sources" (Three Worlds 355). Smith collected others' accounts of his experiences and integrated them into what he wrote about himself, and he also added to the previous works he had written about his
exploits. We can see how Smith utilized Hakluyt’s example of collecting various texts together into one large volume, but we can also see how Smith transcended Hakluyt’s example by integrating the collected works together to form a seamless text that strives to create a specific image of Captain John Smith. As Hakluyt promoted both the New World and English activities there, Smith promoted himself. In much the same way that Hakluyt sees the lands to the west of England as a new world, Smith seems to view his formation of himself as the formation of a new man, one ideally unencumbered with much of the weight of England status-based system. Though Smith’s collection was sold under subscription to a general English readership, in Smith’s eyes it is most relevant to the members of the Virginia Company who could aid him in achieving his goal of returning to the New World. It is not surprising, then, that Smith attempts to reach this segment of his audience by promoting himself as much as possible.

Even though he integrated together the works he collected rather than printing each text separately, Smith drew the idea of collecting numerous works together from a tradition of collecting travel narratives, which commenced in sixteenth-century Europe. George Bruner Parks informs us of Giambattista Ramusio, a sixteenth-century Venetian, "whose collection of travels had been published in the fifteen-fifties" and had "the plan of including the
travelers of all nations" (124). In England, we find Richard Eden's 1555 translation of Peter Martyr's Decades, which he retitled The Decades of the New World, wherein Eden included three of Martyr's eight decades along with a wide range of other information concerning early Spanish exploration. Englishman Richard Willis furthered Eden's work by reorganizing it and reprinting it in 1577 with additional information as History of Travel in the East and West Indies. Richard Hakluyt moved beyond both these works as he published his first collection, Divers Voyages Touching the Discovery of America (1582), a volume that Parks believes "closed his apprenticeship" (75) and moved Hakluyt into the level of expert on colonial activity. In each of the above cases, the focus was not solely upon the English voyages, if it concerned them at all, because the English had not yet strongly established their colonial position. Other European countries had a head start on the English in the New World, and perhaps the only way to inspire higher levels of English exploratory achievement was to point out how successful those countries had been.

The work of preparing Divers Voyages aided Hakluyt greatly in putting together what was the grandest celebration then available of English colonial efforts, The Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation... of 1589. Coming on the heels of the English conquest of the vaunted Spanish armada, this text...
was published amid a fervor of national pride. Though the English had not yet established a lasting presence in the New World, Englishmen could be buoyed by noting English success in other regions of the world. As Hakluyt revised and expanded his collection, eventually taking it into three volumes published between 1598 and 1600, he provided much of the impetus for English efforts to colonize the New World. Indeed, Hakluyt’s collections, especially the Principall Navigations, were part of concerted efforts to propagandize for both England and for its colonial ventures throughout the world.

As John Smith perused Hakluyt’s collection during an idle moment or two at Jamestown, he likely did not envision the uses he would make of the example of textual collection before him. At that point in his career, Smith had no reason to believe that he would not enjoy a long and successful tenure in the New World. True, he was opposed by several members of the colony, but he also did not appear to be intimidated by them initially. However, when it later became apparent that his reputation in England was not strong enough to keep him in the center of colonial planning, Smith needed a way to bolster his standing. It was then that Hakluyt’s structure became important to Smith, and it was then that Smith altered the structure of the collection to aid him in his attempts to fashion himself into a valuable part of the colonization of the New
World. Smith took Hakluyt's structure for English nationalist propaganda and turned it into a propagandistic tract for himself and his efforts to return to the New World. Whereas Hakluyt presented tracts in his *Principall Navigations* which represented the impressive range of English voyages to all parts of the world with the goal of further glorifying those efforts and England in general, John Smith turned the focus of his collection onto himself, again and again demonstrating himself as the embodiment of the traits necessary for colonial success in the New World.

Since Captain Smith was none too precise about acknowledging his sources, and since many of the authors he listed as sources did not publish the notes Smith apparently borrowed, it is quite impossible to determine accurately which descriptions of Smith came from which source. However, it is reasonable to conjecture that Smith himself was the author of most, if not all of the additions made to his text in its transition from *The Proceedings* to the *Generall Historie*. Several of the sources he used in the 1612 *Proceedings* had died before Smith put together the *Generall Historie* over a decade later, and there is little evidence to corroborate an extensive communication between Smith and his remaining living sources. In addition to the sources Smith came across on his own, there is some indication that Samuel Purchas provided Smith with several contemporary reports during Smith's preparation of the
Generall Historie. Unfortunately, most of those reports also remain unacknowledged in Smith's work, and unearthing the pieces of Smith's text borrowed from Purchas---most likely via a corollary reading of Purchas' collection and Smith's work---is work that remains to be done but which is beyond the scope of this project. Acknowledging Smith's technique does not require outlining every borrowing he made. What is more pertinent is to look closely at the portrait of Smith that we get in the text, no matter the source of the information. As the compiler of the work, Smith would have had control over what we learn about him, and it is that control, coupled with the specific manner in which he wielded it---the content of the image Smith's control produces---that is an important part of understanding Smith's self-fashioning.

Even though parts of the Generall Historie are merely reprints of Smith's earlier work, his role in Virginia is expanded in other sections of the text. For example, the title page of the Second Book of the Generall Historie states that Virginia was "Discovered and described by Captain John Smith" (II, 100 my emphasis), a description not found in True Relation, A Map of Virginia, or The Proceedings. If Barbour's hypothesized omissions from the original text of True Relation are, in fact, true, then this may account for the apparent addition noted above. Since the original text of True Relation is not extant, it
is impossible to make such a statement with any degree of certainty. However, if Smith considered himself the discoverer of Virginia at any point in his life—to Smith's contemporaries, of course, discovering meant something akin to exploring an area and making it known to others (uncovering and exposing it to their view)—then he must have felt reasonably certain that he could "prove" his assertions about himself. At the very least, he wanted his readers to think, from the very beginning of the Generall Historie, of Captain John Smith as a vital part of the colonial experience in Virginia.

In the opening of his text, Smith fashions himself into a man whose efforts on the colonial frontier provide valuable information to those back in England seeking insights into the New World. Smith allows his readers to see in him the full range of meaning embodied in the word "discoverer." Not just a term describing the act of bringing into public view a previously unknown thing, "discoverer" also carried connotations of danger and adventure that were inherent in the colonial venture. Most in England knew the risks associated with colonization, and Smith's awareness of that knowledge provides him the opportunity to capitalize on it in advancing his own interests.

While discussing his role in the colonizing effort, Smith seems to want to work within the system set up by the
Company authorities. Before his adventures in Virginia, Smith was primarily a military man. He spent several years as a mercenary in Europe, including a stint in the Austrian army, "then engaged in the 'Long War' with the Turks (1593-1606)" (Barbour, Works I, lvii). As a soldier, Smith "bowed to superior authority, but expected that authority to be capable and effective" (ibid). By nearly all accounts, Smith was uneasy—to say the least—with the other members of the governing council, both because he often disagreed with their decisions and because he felt himself to be the victim of class snobbery. Unfortunately, the English system conspired against Smith, in spite of the fact that, as Philip Barbour claims in his introduction to Smith's works, "the doughty captain was evidently not a boasting braggart, but a man of parts in his own microcosm whose convictions carried him beyond the smug routine of the traditionalists who all but destroyed him" (I, lvii). Partisanship for Captain John Smith aside, Barbour's assessment of Smith reasserts the main point Smith seemed to want to make about himself—that his actions in and around Jamestown (such as trading with the natives for food or putting every colonist to work building houses) were much more important to the colony's day-to-day survival than his adversaries were willing to admit.

The apparent additions from True Relation to A Map of Virginia and the Proceedings and on into the Generall
Historie show Smith's important role in the colony, as they give more detailed accounts of Smith's attempts to help the colonists find food and build shelters. For example, we learn that at one point during Smith's Presidency, the colony faced a severe shortage of food. To keep the colonists alive, Smith "provided for Nandsamund, and tooke with him Captaine Winne, and Master Scrivener, then returning from Captaine Newport." The natives "long denied [Smith] not onely the 400 Baskets of Corne they promised, but any trade at all" (II, 191). In response, Smith and his men fired their muskets, which caused the natives to flee. When the natives eventually returned, Smith impressed them into service, convincing them to load his boat with food. While some today might note this as an example of European imperial violence, the members of the Virginia Company back in London likely viewed it as a necessary and decisive action, taken to ensure the colonists' survival. Contrast this action with Smith's more amicable trade relations with the natives in True Relation. In this instance, Smith clearly attempts to fashion himself to the Virginia Company as a man whose actions benefit both the colonists and the overall colonial venture. While Smith seems to have gained this decisive nature from his military activities prior to his time in Jamestown, he nonetheless is able to transform himself from being viewed as a military man of action into being seen as
a bold yet provident leader who can improvise when necessary.

In the move from True Relation to the Generall Historie, Smith has raised himself into almost heroic status. For example, Smith informs us that "by Election of the Councell, and request of the Company, Captaine Smith received the Letters Patents: which till then by no means he would accept, though he was often importuned thereunto" (II, 181). In other words, Smith, like any loyal servant of the Company, waited for a mandate from his co-council members before he took charge, even though some of his colleagues had already noticed his abilities and had already asked him to take over. In this one statement, Captain John Smith demonstrates his apparent knowledge of his place in the social scheme, the decidedly non-radical nature of his actions in Jamestown, and the confidence of the others in him and his abilities. At the same time, he shows himself to be a judicious man, rather than the power-hungry upstart his adversaries in the colony portrayed him as. Next, Smith details exactly what was accomplished under his administration:

Now the building of Ratliffes Pallace stayed as a thing needless; the Church was repaired; the Storehouse recovered; buildings prepared for the Supplyes, we expected; the Fort reduced to a five-square form; the order of the Watch renewed; the squadrons (each setting of the Watch) trained; the whole Company every Saturday exercised, in the plaine by the west Bulwarke, prepared for that purpose" (II, 180-181).
Smith placed this extensive catalog of actions immediately after the notification of his ascendance to the Presidency, thus rhetorically setting the scene to be read as 'I was elected and I immediately went about helping the colonists to better their living conditions.' Smith, of course, expects his readers to note the contrast between life in the colony during his tenure as President and the colonists' experiences under the previous administration's rule, which included former President Ratcliffe having a "palace" built for himself. In Smith's cataloging of his activities as head of the military-like organization he established in Jamestown, he fashions himself as a man who takes action for the benefit of all. He is able to fashion himself this way because he does so in opposition to the previous administration, which Smith perceives as "alien, strange, or hostile" (Greenblatt, Renaissance, 9) and as self-glorifying and impractical. Smith's oppositional stance, much like Roger Williams' against John Cotton and Thomas Morton's against the New England Puritans, allows him a rather limited space within which to define himself. Smith can only fashion himself as opposite to his adversaries, thus limiting his options for self-fashioning, but not impossibly so.

One of the most unusual features of Smith's self-fashioning is that what he considers alien in this instance, and thus opposable, is precisely the institution
he is a part of and wants to advance within--the Virginia Company of London. Greenblatt observes that self-fashioning "partakes of both the authority and the alien that is marked for attack, and hence any achieved identity always contains within itself the signs of its own subversion or loss" (9). This is precisely how Smith's dual positioning relative to the Virginia Company operates for him. Smith is concerned with adaptation, whether it is to the material conditions encountered in the New World or to the political conditions at work amongst the members of the Virginia Company. This requires an ambivalent attitude toward authority. Despite the apparent centrality of this duality between authority and alien in many episodes of self-fashioning, this trait of Smith's self-fashioning--his working from both without and from within simultaneously--is quite different from both Roger Williams' and Thomas Morton's fashionings. Williams opposes himself to John Cotton's ideas, and by extension the ideas of the leaders of Massachusetts Bay. While Williams did subscribe to many of the same beliefs as the Puritans, he was not part of their system. Instead, Williams wanted to create a religious society completely separate from the Church of England. Likewise, Thomas Morton opposed the New England Puritans, and because of his Anglicanism, Morton certainly was not a part of their group. Morton did work within the
Anglican and Royalist systems, but he never opposed them while fashioning himself within them.

Because Smith was a member of the system he also opposed, he found himself in an even more complex situation than either Williams or Morton did. At the same time that Smith saw the potential for advancement based on his actions in the New World, he also needed the structure of England’s class system as a yardstick against which to measure his progress. He could not comment on that system nearly as harshly as Thomas Morton could against the Puritans, because Smith was not working to overturn those he opposed, as Morton was. Instead, Smith wanted to advance within the colonial administration and perhaps achieve some level of wealth or renown. Smith’s response to his situation was carefully to walk the line between self-promotion and class-system destruction.

Despite Smith’s utility as the leader of Jamestown, he was often overruled by the Council in London. For instance, at one point, the Company decided to stage a coronation for Powhatan—a move Smith vehemently opposed because he expected it would weaken both his own and his colony’s position relative to Powhatan. When it was clear that the coronation was to go on whether or not Smith approved, however, he volunteered to go to inform Powhatan of the news. In the face of his defeat over this issue, Smith still manages to get in a rhetorical blow in defense
of his own bravery. He notes that "where Newport durst not
go west, not with less than 120, he [Smith] onely tooke with him
Captaine Waldo, Master Andrew Buckler, Edward Brinton, and
Samuel Collier" (II, 182). Here, Smith presents himself
both as much more brave than Newport toward the natives and
as a loyal servant of the colony who would not allow his
personal feelings to interfere with his duty to the colony
and to the Virginia Company.

Smith also seemed to feel that the Company was being
misled by his opponents in Jamestown, particularly
Ratcliffe. Smith may have even thought that these
deceptions had led to his being "blackballed" by the
Virginia Company. To the Generall Historie Smith adds "A
Copy of a Letter sent to the Treasurer and Councell of
Virginia from Captaine Smith, then President in Virginia,"
which was previously unpublished. In it, Smith writes
"Though I be no scholeer, I am past a schoole-boy; and I
desire but to know, what either you, and these here doe
know, but that I have learned to tell you by the continuall
hazard of my life. I have not concealed from you any thing
I know; but I feare some cause you to belevee much more
then is true" (II, 188). Again, Smith presents himself as
appearing to know his place socially, but he is also
clearly mindful of both the significance of his actions on
behalf of the colonists and the personal hazards inherent
in those actions. Smith's emphasis on his experiences and
actions in Jamestown reinforces what we learn about him in his earlier text, the True Relation. Smith wants the readers of this letter--the members of the Virginia Company--to understand how his actions would benefit them, regardless of either the danger or the benefit to Smith. The implication is that Smith's betters in the venture were interested in his actions only insofar as those actions enriched them personally as investors in the venture, again regardless of the danger to Smith. The fact that this letter is an addition to the Generall Historie is significant, because it demonstrates another tactic Smith used in his attempt to make himself appear to be of great value to the Company, namely his sense of duty and his willingness to fulfill that duty.

In the Generall Historie itself, Smith shows his value to the Company in other ways as well, nearly all of which revolve around Smith's own action in and around Jamestown. For instance, early after his capture by Powhatan's forces, Smith is taken to the village of Opechancanough, Powhatan's half-brother, to whom Smith gave "a round Ivory double compass Dyall" (II, 147). Smith then discussed its usage with the natives and explained several astronomic features of the earth to them, after which "they all stood as amazed with admiration." Once Smith's lengthy explanations were concluded, the natives tied him to a tree and prepared to execute him, "but the King holding up the Compass in his
hand" (ibid) spared Smith's life. This section is an expansion of Smith's earlier account of the same incident (see I, 47), and in it Smith presents himself as a crafty and resourceful man who survives threats to his life by use of his wits. While Smith does not overtly make the case for himself in the example above, he nevertheless implies that his quick thinking has value to the Virginia Company. If Smith was able literally to keep his head in a potentially dangerous situation, he might also be important to the continued success of the Jamestown colony.

In addition to Smith's expansion of his previous discussions of his activities in the colony, he also incorporates writings from various other hands into his text. Through his mostly seamless integration of the sections of other's works dealing with himself, Captain John Smith presents a portrait of a man who was a central driving force in keeping the Jamestown colonists alive, even though many of them were unaccustomed to working for their survival. It is entirely possible that John Smith could have written himself into being--into the being he desired others to believe him to be (a man of parts worthy of a new commission to return to the New World)--without borrowing from others' texts. He uses those texts to form a text of himself which, unfortunately for him, was unsuccessful in aiding Smith in reaching the New World again. Smith's efforts were unsuccessful not because he
was an ineffective fashioner of self, but rather because he faced an unusual combination of class prejudice and political misfortune.

*****

Initially, the Generall Historie appears to be simply a reprint of the Map of Virginia. Aside from one introductory sentence added to the beginning of the text and some minor alterations, the first six paragraphs are identical in both texts. Then, however, we find one subtle addition that sets the stage for Smith's agenda throughout the text. The addition comes as the second sentence of the seventh paragraph. In the previous paragraph, Smith told us about "Cape Henry, in honour of our most noble Prince" (II, 101). Smith next describes "Cape Charles, in honour of the worthy Duke of Yorke" (ibid) in the first sentence of paragraph seven, and he then informs us about "The isles before it [the Cape], Smith's Isles, by the name of the discoverer" (ibid, my emphasis). Here Smith reinforces his importance to the Virginia venture. He either believes himself important enough to name islands after himself, or he wants his readers to think of him having that level of importance. What might be easily overlooked here is the social status of the company Smith places himself in. John Smith, son of a yeoman, takes the liberty to name islands after himself, almost in the same breath as he proclaims two capes to be named after members of the highest levels
of English nobility. What is at issue here is not the relative worth of islands versus capes, but rather the strong sense of self-worth Smith displays by placing himself on nearly equal footing with the Prince and a Duke. 

Throughout the *Generall Historie*, Captain John Smith presents himself in such a way as to imply to his readers that he is of a higher class than he actually is, according to the class distinctions at work in his day. One way Smith attempts to achieve his goal is through a strategy which might be called a rhetorical identity shift. One who rhetorically shifts identity uses literary "garments"—language and rhetorical devices—which make him appear to be of a higher class than he actually is, and such a strategy might be usefully compared to actual transvestism. In speaking of literal cross-dressing, Marjorie Garber claims "that transvestism is a space of possibility structuring and confounding culture: the disruptive element that intervenes, not just a category crisis of male and female, but the crisis of category itself" (17 Garber's emphasis). As he works to raise his class level in the eyes of his employers, John Smith also attempts to move beyond the boundaries of the class differences between himself and the other members of the Governing Council, thus raising a "crisis of category." Although Smith's class shift might seem to be a radical idea for him to
undertake, Garber notes that for the people of "Elizabethan England 'confusion,' of both gender and status, became, perhaps inevitably, itself fashionable" (27). During Smith's era, the English people found themselves bombarded by an array of changes that caused confusion, not just of gender and status, but also of religion, scientific knowledge, the role of the monarchy, and England's place in the world community. Within this maelstrom of confusion, John Smith promotes confusion about his class, particularly in his *Generall Historie*.

Some might take exception to my comparing Smith's rhetorical moves with cross-dressing, mainly because Smith does not don women's garments, nor do any of his writings concern themselves very deeply with issues of Smith's gender or his sexuality. I chose this analogy because, as Marjorie Garber informs us, transvestism itself is not just an issue of gender and because

the apparently spontaneous or unexpected or supplementary presence of a transvestite figure in a text (whether fiction or history, verbal or visual, imagistic or 'real') that does not seem, thematically, to be primarily concerned with gender difference or blurred gender indicates a *category crisis elsewhere*, an irresolvable conflict or epistemological crux that destabilizes a comfortable binarity, and displaces the resulting discomfort onto a figure that already inhabits, indeed incarnates, the margin (17, Garber's emphasis).

Again, it seems that Garber refers to distinctions among genders; however, she goes on to assert that "category crises can and do mark displacements from the axis of class
as well as from race onto the axis of gender" (17 Garber's emphasis), thus asserting the ability of literally (or, I also believe, rhetorically) transvestive actions to interrupt our beliefs about categories other than gender--what she calls in the book's second part "Transvestite Effects." 

At another level, Garber's assertions about gender identity jibe with Renaissance era notions of subjectivity, especially as manifested in writers in the New World. For instance, Garber asserts that in our society, having procedures in place to alter one's gender identity necessitates acknowledging the constructed nature of all gender identities (see esp. 100-101), and in following the analogy, of class identities. Elizabethan England demonstrates the constructed nature of class identities in its reliance on sumptuary legislation which dictated appropriate forms of dress for the various class levels, while John Smith demonstrates the constructed nature of class in his attempts to write for himself an improved class identity. If we can accept both the constructed nature of identity and that the face of individuality was changing in Elizabethan England, then it would follow that writers in the New World--where subjectivity was even more fragile than in England, because there were few apparent rules governing the limits of subjectivity in that massive and relatively unknown land area--would necessarily find
themselves compelled to construct their subject identities in the attempt to secure, if but for a moment, a place within society.

Rhetorical identity shifting is similar to the more literal version of transvestism in that both use adornment to author a persona different from that of the original author. A transvestite wears clothes usually associated with another gender—a twentieth-century male wearing heels, hose and a dress, for instance—or with another class level—an Elizabethan-era London merchant wearing an ermine cape or other such clothing proscribed by law for the nobility. Similarly, Captain John Smith applies rhetorical adornments to himself, presenting various positive aspects of himself in his writings in the attempt to make his readers believe he is something more than the son of a yeoman.

For obvious reasons, however, Smith's devices solely revolve around the category of class and have nothing to do with gender. But by viewing Smith's rhetorical identity shifting as parallel to Garber's conception of transvestism we can see the category crisis Smith attempts to create within the English class system. Smith's making himself appear to be of a higher class than he was creates what Garber calls a transvestive effect—with Smith as the transvestive figure who uses writing to shift his identity—and it underscores the category crisis created within the
English class system by the move to colonize the New World. Many of the colonists were not members of the nobility, but many viewed colonization as the means to achieving a noble, or at least a higher, status (see this study, 51). Once those non-noble colonists arrived in the New World and noticed how closely their survival depended on their own efforts rather than on the largess of a landlord or a nobleman, then many of them also realized the potential for self-fashioning available in the colonial New World.

Smith's utilization of the strategy of rhetorical transvestism is not part of a chronological progression in his self-fashioning. Instead, it is simply another strategy he employed in that self-fashioning effort. In one instance, Smith gives a brief overview of the beginnings of the initial moves in England toward the colonization of Virginia. He notes that Captain Bartholomew Gosnoll, after spending years trying to gain help in putting together a journey to Virginia, "at last prevailed with some Gentlemen, as Captaine John Smith, Master Edward-Maria Wingfield, Master Robert Hunt, and divers others..." (II, 37 my emphasis). Two points are relevant here. First, Smith makes himself into a gentleman, when it is clear that he is not on the same social level as any of the other members of the expedition. He has, in effect, "passed" himself off as a gentleman, or rather, has used his writing to make himself
appear to us as a gentleman. Second, note that Smith places his name before that of Edward Maria Wingfield, a nobleman, and "the only patentee of the undertaking Present" (II, 139n2). Normally, one might assume that a patentee of the Company, especially a nobleman, should be listed before the son of a yeoman in a proper English document of this class-conscious time. This apparent presumptuousness on Smith's part represents an attempt to raise his status by making himself appear as more important than Wingfield. Smith appears to be more important than Wingfield because he positions himself rhetorically so that readers literally see him as the first and perhaps foremost member of the group attempting to organize the colony. Although Smith's pre-Jamestown activities prepare him to be a prominent part of the Governing Council, Smith still needs to show the Virginia Company his importance to them. When Smith was initially brought into the colonial enterprise by the Company, his resourcefulness was considered a useful asset to launching the venture. However, when it appeared that the Virginia colony would become a reality, many of the more noble members of the Company saw Smith's class level as a detriment, thus they no longer viewed his pre-colonial actions as worthy of consideration. As a result, Smith found it necessary to use his writings to enhance his status. Initially, Smith believed his actions would aid his advancement within the
Company, but when he realized that status was more important to many in the Company, he began to work to enhance his stature through his rhetorical manipulations of positioning.

We can see Smith's use of the rhetorical identity shift in later examples as well. When Smith relates the breaking of the seal on the Company-selected list of members of Virginia's Governing Council, he lists himself after only Captain Gosnoll--for it would have been impolitic, if not downright foolish, of Smith to place himself above Gosnoll, whom Smith himself acknowledges as "one of the first movers of this plantation" (II, 137)--but he again lists himself before Wingfield. Such subtle rhetorical moves might be construed as Smith's way to revenge himself on Wingfield, the man who wronged Smith earlier by making false accusations against him and attempting to keep Smith from assuming his appointed position on the Governing Council. However, interpreting Smith's placement of himself in this way ignores the major thrust of John Smith's life: action. It seems likely that if Smith spent the better part of his early years, including his time in Jamestown, taking action whenever the situation warranted it, then he likely would have taken direct action against Wingfield. In fact, a legal action was brought against Wingfield on Smith's behalf, and
Wingfield was ordered to pay damages to Smith (See this study 113, n14).

It is true that just after the two instances noted above, Smith lists Wingfield before himself. By Smith’s account, on 15 June 1607, after the colonists had spent several weeks exploring the area near where they had landed, Captain Newport, in accordance with the terms of the original orders from the Virginia Company, set sail for England, leaving at Jamestown the initial planting of 100 colonists. Smith continues by noting that "The names of them that were the first Planters were these following," after which he begins by listing the Council members--Wingfield, Gosnoll, and then Smith, followed by Ratliffe, Martin, and Kendall (II, 140). We have already established Smith’s reasoning for listing himself after Gosnoll, but why would Smith rhetorically place himself below Wingfield after having listed himself above Wingfield earlier? In this instance, Wingfield is now the President of the Council, having been elected by the other Council members, while in the previous examples neither Wingfield nor Smith was President. What might appear to be an inconsistency on Smith’s part could also be viewed as a move calculated to defuse Wingfield’s earlier claims against Smith--claims of wanting to overthrow the entire Council and make himself the King of the colony--by his apparent acceptance of Wingfield’s new-found position. Within just four pages in
the Barbour edition of *Generall Historie*, Captain John Smith almost simultaneously attempts to subvert and works to reaffirm the class distinctions of his time.

Noting the shift in Smith's strategy of self-fashioning from emphasizing his actions to emphasizing his social importance allows us to gain a more complete understanding of Smith's position within his own time. I view his attempts at self-fashioning in his various writings as being parallel to the progression of Smith's life and fortunes within the Virginia venture, both in the colony and back in England. First, through the version of Smith we find in the *True Relation*, we see Smith as a man of action, whose accounts of those times mainly revolve around his own actions. Then, after his return to England and his futile attempts to return to the New World for any substantial length of time, Smith realized that his actions in support of Jamestown had failed to help him secure a long-term position in the colonial administration. With the failure of those actions, Smith's next possibility for a return trip to the New World would be to write himself into such a position--to make himself appear to be so vital to Jamestown's survival that keeping him away from the colony would ensure the colony's demise.

Smith's unusual placement within the class system--being called upon to govern but not being of the class level expected of governors--causes him to write the way he...
does about himself. Smith seems ambivalent about the class system he inherits. He appears to embrace what later came to be known as the concept of the self-made man (as opposed to the man whose status is already largely determined by lineage) who often has to fashion himself outside the existing class system, while he also seems to work to advance within that same system. Normally, one might assume that a self-made man would typically judge his advance based on the existing class structure. However, because Smith attempts to create himself in the seventeenth-century New World, he has the space to work both within and outside the system transported from England, thereby demonstrating the degree to which one's positioning as authority or alien in any situation is complex and historically contingent.

At the same time, though, Smith also reinforces his support for the class distinctions he inherits from England, as he completes his list of planters (See I, 222-223 and I, 240-242 for example). Smith groups the planters together according to their respective statuses, and each group is appropriately labeled--Gentlemen, Carpenters, Labourers, etc. So at times, Smith appears to be acutely aware of the structure of his society, but on other occasions he works to transcend that structure. While it is clear that John Smith has a sense of the class distinctions at work in his society, he does not
necessarily see those distinctions as limiting or forever determined. He sees society as class-based, not caste-constricted. That distinction allows him the freedom to attempt to raise his status throughout the text of his Generall Historie of Virginia.

****

The necessity that led Smith to write the way he did helps to reveal some of the mystery surrounding the self-representation of the John Smith who wrote the True Relation. Stephen Greenblatt tells us in Marvelous Possessions that practices of representation "are ideologically significant," and he goes on to warn us that "it is important to resist what we may call a priori ideological determinism, that is, the notion that particular modes of representation are inherently and necessarily bound to a given culture or class or belief system, and that their effects are unidirectional" (4).^17 The representation and its effects are in a dynamic relationship with such a system. This extension of the position he asserted in Renaissance Self-Fashioning further clarifies Greenblatt's conception of self-fashioning in that what one hopes to gain from a particular representation is not necessarily what one gains, as there are a multitude of factors--both within and outside the author--influencing that representation. In self-fashioning terms, because a fashioner of self faces an
array of constantly shifting relationships with authorities and aliens, the activity of self-fashioning is constant and dynamic. Even though we can look at a writer’s fashioned self and perhaps view it as a fixed and concretely demonstrable persona, we must also acknowledge that a fashioned self exists as we see it only within the confluence of the specific set of historical circumstances in place at the time the fashioning occurs. In a similar vein, Greenblatt asserts that "representations are not only products but producers, capable of decisively altering the very forces that brought them into being" (6). Smith’s representations attempted to do precisely that. On one hand, Smith attempted to boost his place within the system of class distinctions he encountered. At the same time, though, he upheld the distinctions of that system many times in his works. In other words, as Smith’s self-representation recreated him, it also attempted to restructure the class system the colonists brought over with them from England. In this regard, Smith’s writings are similar to those of Roger Williams, in that both work within a system to change it. However, Williams begins inside the Puritan system but eventually places himself outside it, while Smith begins outside the upper levels of the English class system and works to insert himself into that system while altering it. Thomas Morton, on the other hand, spends his entire New World career outside the local
New England system, and he attempts to change that system to a Royally governed one so he can then insert himself into that improved system.

The earliest text by Smith was edited by others, in effect presenting a version of John Smith that is not necessarily in accord with Smith's own conceptions of himself. The editors of Smith's True Relation might have been hard-pressed to alter the text they published without appearing to be large-scale liars, but they nonetheless presented an edited version of Smith's character and actions, one that Smith did not refer to, or borrow from, in his later texts. Interestingly, many of the representations of Smith made after his death demonstrate traits about him that he presented about himself. To take an extreme but not untypical example, the Captain John Smith character in Walt Disney's 1995 movie, Pocahontas, is handsome, strong, athletic, heroic, and interested in the survival of his colony. A reading of Smith's writings demonstrates similar characteristics. Smith forced the colonists to focus on their survival rather than their comfort, and he often placed himself at risk to gain supplies and food from the natives. However, the Disney version of Smith is not always accurate. Smith is visually portrayed as a clean-shaven, rather athletic-looking man over six feet tall with shoulder-length blond hair and blue eyes who dances and sings his way through the production.
Conversely, by most accounts, particularly engravings done of Smith during his life, we find a rather diminutive Captain with dark hair, dark eyes, and a full beard, who, according to his written accounts, seems more apt to go on an expedition to procure food (whether by trade or with force) from the natives than to sing and dance with them.38

Despite any quarrel one might have with Disney's visual portrayal of Smith, the movie nonetheless shows the Smith character as having the traits that Smith attempted to demonstrate himself as having. In one instance, we see Smith as the man of action in contrast to Ratcliffe as the man who expects others to work for him. As the English ship approaches the shores of Virginia, Smith enters Ratcliffe's cabin to inform him of the impending landing. Ratcliffe orders Smith to make ready to take a party ashore, and Smith replies that he has already given the order and that he has "a party of men standing by" to go ashore and explore the area.

In perhaps a more telling incident, Smith and Ratcliffe are contrasted in the movie through the variations in the songs they sing concurrently. After the English make land and begin to establish camp, Smith goes into the wilderness to find the Indians, while Ratcliffe orders the other men to clear the land, build a fort, and dig for gold. Ratcliffe then sings about the wealth of gold to be found in the New World, claiming that all the
gold is his. As the scene switches back to Smith, we see
him exploring to wilderness and singing about the dangerous
and challenging land and the many adventures he will have
there. While Ratcliffe claims the gold, Smith claims the
adventures, noting that the New World is a place where "a
man can be bold."

Even taking into account the dramatic license
necessary for Disney to make a commercially appealing
movie--yet another manifestation of Smith's image, one
purportedly based on Smith's works and other historical
documents--one finds the image of Captain John Smith has
both changed exponentially and consistently beyond what
even Smith presented about himself and his role in the
continued survival of the Jamestown colony and, in some
instances, remained consistent with the way Smith fashioned
himself in his writings. Eric Cheyfitz claims that many
English imperialist texts effected "the translation of the
Indians into proper English" (10). As a result of Smith's
imperialist texts, various writers translated Smith into
representations that fit their conceptions of him, and the
Walt Disney Company translated the encounter between
Pocahontas and Smith into a commercially viable movie,
while in many of his published works, Captain John Smith
seems to work also to translate himself into proper
English.
Although Smith's purpose behind his initial efforts at self-fashioning met with failure, he was successful in creating a version of himself that is at least as controversial today as it was when he initially fashioned it. In much the same way that Smith's contemporaries portrayed him as a lying braggart who only sought to rule Virginia, so did many Northerners brand Smith in the nineteenth-century. At the same time, though, the appeal of Smith's fashioned self as presented above is clear. First, some view Smith as the archetype of the American hero. He relies on himself for his own advancement, and he inspires others to better themselves. Second, Smith defies the traditions of his society and seems to create his own rules for life in a move that anticipates what romanticized versions of heroes in the American West did after him. Third, Smith translates the Renaissance humanistic emphasis on the glory of the individual from the accumulation of classical learning to the taking of heroic and necessary actions, this time in anticipation of the pioneers who explored and settled the west. Because many perceive Smith as the first man to demonstrate the possibilities of the United States, the self he fashioned in the seventeenth century will remain popular and controversial, even as we move into the twenty-first century. Smith may eventually come to be viewed as one of several examples of what seems to be a fundamental American experience, maneuvering
between set lines of power and discourse in order to survive and advance, and in that very fluidity, in that ambiguous zone between alien and authority, to find one's identity. However, a study of John Smith's self-fashioning is not important because it provides some tenuous sort of origin for distinctively "American" characteristics. Such originary exercises are never as precise or as complete as we would wish them to be. Instead, we should be interested in Smith's experimentations with selfhood, because they help us to understand more fully some of the tensions at work during the early years of European colonization of the New World.

Notes to Chapter Two


2. See Robert Tilton's Pocahontas: The Evolution of a Narrative (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994) for the most thorough consideration of the various treatments of Pocahontas through history.


Philip L. Barbour’s scholarship on John Smith is legendary among several generations of Early Americanists. Prior to undertaking the editing of Smith’s Complete Works, Barbour travelled extensively throughout Europe unearthing a great deal of documentary evidence supporting most of Smith’s claims about his pre-Jamestown activities. That research culminated in the still-authoritative biography of Smith: *The Three Worlds of Captain John Smith* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964).

J.A. Leo Lemay, *Did Pocahontas Save Captain John Smith?* (Athens: U of Georgia P, 1992). Many critics refuse to believe that Smith told the truth about his encounter with Pocahontas. Aside from the debate over whether Smith’s life was actually in danger from Powhatan and his men, most skeptics do not believe Smith because he seems to suddenly have remembered the incident in texts written after the *True Relation* of 1608.

There is, of course, a great deal of tension inherent in such a situation. On the one hand, Smith wanted to return to the New World, so he needed to make himself as indispensable to any future colonial ventures as he could. On the other hand, Smith always ran the danger of being too zealous in his approach. If he offended the wrong person, Smith might easily be blackballed from ever participating in colonial activity again.

That Smith could easily offend is a point easily demonstrated. During the final days of his Presidency in Virginia, Smith had his authority undermined by Captain Gabriel Archer, Captain John Martin, and John Sicklemore (alias Captain John Ratcliffe), all of whom had recently arrived from England. Though Smith refused to give up his post without written orders, his three nemeses sowed discord throughout the colony. After dispersing the colony to several areas (in an effort to save as many lives as possible during the winter), Smith made a trek to visit one group. While there, he told the colonists they had settled in a bad area, denigrated their leadership, and berated the colonists for their cowardice in failing to stave off an attack by about a dozen natives. During his return to Jamestown, Smith was burned as the result of a spark igniting his powder bag while he slept. There has been speculation that this was no accident, but there is no definitive proof either way. See Barbour’s *Three Worlds* (273-6) for discussion of the moves made against Smith and the circumstances surrounding his injury.


14. Smith provides the same basic information about this incident in *The Proceedings and Generall Historie*. After the passage cited above, Smith informs us of how he handled the episode. "he [Smith] much scorned their charitie, and publikely defied the uttermost of their crueltie. Hee wisely prevented their pollicies, though he could not suppressre their envies, yet so wel he demeaned himselfe in this business, as all the company did see his innocencie, and his adversaries malice, and those suborned to accuse him, accused his accusers of subornation" (I, 207 in *Proceedings* and II, 140 in *Generall Historie*).

As we learn later, the charges against Smith, mainly levelled by Edward Maria Wingfield, were unfounded. When judgement in the dispute finally came, Wingfield was ordered to pay damages to Smith in the amount of £200. (See Philip Barbour's *Jamestown Voyages*, esp. 223).

Unless otherwise noted, all references to works by Smith come from Philip L. Barbour's edition of *The Complete Works of Captain John Smith (1580-1631)* (3 vols.; Published for the Institute for Early American History and Culture by the U of North Carolina P, 1986), hereafter cited parenthetically within the text by volume and page number(s).


18. Michael McKeon notes the trend toward individuality as one thread of the development of the English novel, informing us of how saint's lives, spiritual autobiographies, picaresque stories, and criminal biographies all contributed elements to what later became the novel. See Michael McKeon, *The Origins of the English
Novel, 1600-1740 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987), especially 90-128.


20. As Smith relates the incident, after being captured by Powhatan's men, Smith found himself captive in the sachem's camp. At one point "two great stones were brought before" Powhatan, and "as many as could layd hands on him [Smith], dragged him to them, and thereon laid his head, and being ready with their clubs, to beate out his braines, Pocahontas the Kings dearest daughter, when no intreaty could prevails, got his head in her armes, and laid her owne upon his to save him from death" (II, 151).

21. See Works I, 98n11 for the initial assertion about Healey. See the "Biographical Directory" entry on Healey (I, xxxviii) for a little more detail about him.

22. Barbour goes on to tell us that Smith was unaware of the new instructions sent to the colonists from the Company, because the ship carrying the instructions was believed lost at sea. In fact, that ship wrecked near Bermuda, but the instructions and the royal Governor both survived. The Company told the colonists of Sir Thomas Gates' appointment as the new royal Governor and that Captain John Smith was named "second member of the newly appointed Governor's Council, preceded in rank only by Sir George Somers" (Three Worlds, 286). This would have been a slight demotion within the structure of the Governing Council because Smith was the President, but it would have represented a move upward in terms of Smith's status within the colony and in England. Had those Instructions arrived in Jamestown with the rest of the fleet, perhaps it would not today be necessary to consider how John Smith attempted to elevate his class level in his writings.


24. In referring to Smith's writings as autobiographical, I am, of course, using the term loosely. A great deal of the Generall Historie, for example, is not specifically about John Smith. However, Book III of the Historie concerns itself largely with Smith and his adventures in and around Jamestown, and it is this section of the text that is most akin to autobiography.


Although Smith did not explicitly acknowledge his sources, Philip Barbour has unearthed a few: Martin Fotherby, Bishop of Salisbury and Chaplain to James I, from whose *Atheomastix* Smith borrowed several quotations (II, 29n1); Richard Knolle's *The Generall Historie of the Turkes*..., which Barbour speculates was the "probable source" for Smith's title (II, 28n3), and "John Minsheu's polyglot *Guide into Tongues*, which had been published by subscription and may have given Smith the idea of circulating a broadside, or prospectus, to finance his *Generall Historie*" (II, 28-29). None of these three men was of aristocratic origins, so that is eliminated as a reason why Smith used them as sources. The borrowing from Fotherby's text might be viewed as a way to curry favor with the Crown, but there is no evidence supporting that assertion. It might also be that the slight similarities between Smith's work and those of Knolle and Minsheu are so slight as to be merely coincidental.

The title page of *True Relation* presents Smith as "one of the said Collony," that of *A Map of Virginia* claims he was "sometimes Governour of the Countrey," and Smith is not mentioned on the title page of *The Proceedings* (I, 23; I, 131; and I, 199 respectively).

Throughout his edition of *True Relation*, Barbour notes breaks in the narrative which he suspects were created in the editing process. Based upon his assumptions about the Virginia Company's possible motivations for editing Smith's text as well as the flow of the narrative prior to the break, Barbour speculates about the content of each expurgated passage.

According to *The Oxford English Dictionary*, one usage of "discover" contemporary with Smith was "to bring into fuller knowledge; to explore (a country, district, etc.)," now an obsolete usage. The O.E.D. cites this usage as early as 1582 in Lichefield's translation of Castanheda's *Conquest*.... "Discover," *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., CD-ROM (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992).
In addition, see Barbour's *Three Worlds* (32-49) for more detail on his time with the Austrians.

Most of the changes from *Map of Virginia* to *Generall Historie* are spelling variants, for instance, the change from "wee" to "we" in the first paragraph (I, 143 and II, 100 respectively). Other alterations are word or phrase changes, from "variety" to "raritie" or from "The shew of the land..." to "The land..." (I, 144; II, 101; I, 144; and II, 101 respectively).

While Smith's Isles are identified as such in the first state of the Smith/Hole map, which first appeared in print with *A Map of Virginia and Proceedings* in 1612, Smith does not refer to them by name in either of those texts. (See *Works* I, 140-142 for the original map and a brief description of it.)


In another angle on the question of early American literature, William Spengemann has charged early Americanists with the task of expanding our definition of our field to include works from the Americas as a whole, not just from the area that became the United States. See his *A Mirror for Americanists: Reflections on the Idea of American Literature* (Hanover, N.H.: Published for Dartmouth College by the UP of New England, 1989) and *New World of Words: Redefining Early American Literature* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1994).

Although John Smith was referred to in most documents relating to Jamestown as "Captain," he did not earn that designation in the typical manner of Englishmen of his time. After leaving England at 16, Smith went to the continent where, after various adventures, he volunteered to serve in the Hungarian army in its battles against the Turks. After providing his commander with a strategy which resulted in the successful breaking of a Turkish siege on the town of Limbach, Smith "was promoted to be captain of 250 horse" (*Three Worlds*, 29). Being named a captain under such circumstances, however, was not necessarily a valid indicator of actual rank.
In a note appended to the sentence quoted above, Barbour states that "Dr. Sokoll has pointed out to me (his letter of March 10, 1961) that later-known practice indicates that volunteers often were rewarded with the title 'Captain' after an expedition. This did not necessarily imply a regular command" (407 n6). Furthermore, among English colonizers, the name "Captain" generally indicated those who piloted or captained the vessels across the ocean rather than military men who had attained the rank of Captain. Despite his experiences in military situations throughout Europe, Smith appeared, at least to his fellow colonists of higher class standings, as a man ill-equipped to assume the duties of governing a colony because of his class level.


38. In one instance, Philip Barbour refers to Smith as "The short, sturdy veteran of Hungarian wars, Turkish slavery, [and] Transylvanian duels" (Three Worlds, 117).
Since the nineteenth century, scholarship on Roger Williams has focused generally on the relationship between Williams' life and his ideas on religious freedom and on the separation of church and state. Perhaps because of Williams' dense writing style—Henry Chupack considers it "crabbed and prolix"—such critics feel it necessary to relate the events of Williams' life in order to make sense of his thought.  

Ivy Schweitzer's recent chapter on Williams' A Key Into the Language of America is one of very few works that deals with Williams' writings through the lens of genre. However, Schweitzer's approach focuses on one small aspect of the Key--the poems comprising the "More Particular" observations which end each chapter. Hers is a much-needed addition to the body of work on Williams, because almost no attention has been paid in the past to Williams' poetry. Furthermore, Schweitzer's insights on the poems help us to understand Williams' views on the intersubjectivity of Native Americans and English colonizers, and she points us usefully toward Williams' appropriation of gendered language and its role in his portrayals of subjectivity.

Though I do not intend to consider the issue of gendered language in this chapter, I do want to extend Schweitzer's consideration of genre into a larger
discussion of Williams' writings. In this chapter, I plan to view Roger Williams' works as demonstrations of the utopian impulse so prevalent in seventeenth-century England. By transporting his vision of the ideal society to the New World, Williams minutely transforms the tradition, creating neither a completely English utopia nor a distinctly American one. Instead, Williams' works can be viewed as one level of mediation between the two national literatures. There is not one precise moment in the early years of colonization where we can find an abrupt shift from purely English literature to purely American literature, mainly because the early years of English colonization in the New World are marked by such a broad range of writers utilizing a spectrum of genres in a variety of ways.

This chapter, then, considers how Williams implements elements of the utopian tradition, both to present to his audience the characteristics necessary for an ideal society and to fashion himself. By viewing *A Key Into the Language of America* as Williams' utopian vision of the New World's possibilities and viewing his later writings as more narrowly focused presentations of aspects of an ideal society, we gain a clearer understanding of how Williams sought to fashion himself—as a man uniquely equipped, because of his first-hand experiences in the New World, to outline and establish an ideal Christian community there.
In other words, Roger Williams places himself in the position of commentator upon what the New World colonies should be, and he can authoritatively comment on the composition of that ideal society because he has seen it first hand--albeit in pieces, some native and some English. Roger Williams used the conventions of a genre concerned with society as a whole--the utopia--to reflect the image of himself he desired to present, in much the same way that John Smith used what was essentially a multi-authored genre, which generally supported larger national concerns, to author a specific version of himself.

There is only one article that even mentions Roger Williams and the utopian genre in the same breath. In that work, however, John Teunissen and Evelyn Hinz simply compare Williams' *Key* to Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, noting the similarities of the two works, at the level of particular parallel example. For instance, they note that Williams' *Key* is similar to *Utopia* "in terms of the subjects Williams treats and his observations upon them" (284). In other words, these authors look for parallel concerns and discussions between the two texts rather than searching Williams' text for its unique utopian characteristics. My approach in this chapter is first to discuss what I view as utopian about *The Key Into the Language of America* and then to follow some of the main ideas expressed there into Williams' later writings.
Through this approach, I expect to link Williams' use of the utopian genre to the way he fashions himself, to his ideology of self-fashioning, in his various works.

Roger Williams uses the genre of utopia as the means for achieving a charter for the Providence Plantation and as the vehicle for his self-fashioning. Williams' *A Key Into the Language of America* is his attempt to convince Royal colonial authorities in England to grant him a charter for Providence, but his method of selling them on his plan is to present his ideal society not as one that allows economic improvement, but instead as the harbinger of a moral-religious improvement plan. Williams achieves this by presenting in broad strokes his ideas on the proper constitution of an ideal society in the *Key* and following up in his later works with a more focused type of utopia—a religious one. Williams creates for himself the role of 'man on the scene'—expert on the land and the local natives—to show the Crown's representatives his importance to the future expansion of the English colonies in the New World, and Williams fully expects that such a demonstration will help him gain a charter for the Providence Plantation. At the same time, Williams links his location in what later became Rhode Island with both the cross-cultural interactions he finds there and the genre of utopia to create an overall package which allows the Royal authorities to view Williams as the man who has the ability
not only to imagine an ideal society--religious or otherwise--but also to make it into reality. In nearly every case, Williams' works demonstrate his sense of certainty that he (and perhaps he alone) held the keys to establishing an ideal (or true) religious community in the New World. Williams attempts to convey that sense of certainty to his readers in *A Key Into the Language of America*, where he intertwines his consideration of the utopic elements of the Narragansett people's lifeways with the presentation of himself as the only eyewitness to that utopia. And in his later writings, Williams refines his sense of the religious ideal into something both compatible with royal expectations and in many ways decidedly not compatible with the expectations of the New England Puritans. In other words, Roger Williams uses the utopia to assert his personal ideology, which is a curious amalgamation of self-promotion, colonial advancement, and religious idealism.

Karl Mannheim asserts that the difference between ideology and utopia is one of varying levels of realization. We learn, for instance, that "ideologies are the situationally transcendent ideas which never succeed de facto in the realization of their projected contents" (194). In other words, an ideological view is necessarily contradictory, presenting a situation or mode of thought which is usually not demonstrable in daily activity as if
it were the existing situation. Mannheim presents the example of the contradictions in attempting to achieve the Christian concept of brotherly love in "a society founded on serfdom" (195) to support his assertions. Mannheim goes on to note that there are three main levels of what he calls the "ideological mentality" (195): a person's language masks the incongruences between that person's ideas and reality; a person demonstrates the possibility of uncovering the incongruence but conceals it instead; or the person's ideology is "a purposeful lie" (195). Like an ideology, a utopia also presents elements that are generally not part of current reality. However, utopias contain the possibility of change, and that change is generally revolutionary relative to the status quo. A utopia protects itself from the dangerous consequences of its revolutionary perspective by locating that changed situation elsewhere, or more literally, nowhere.

At the same time, though, Mannheim informs us, "what in a given case appears as utopian, and what as ideological, is dependent, essentially, on the stage and degree of reality to which one applies this standard" (196). Much like any degree of self-fashioning a writer might undertake, determining an idea's place as ideological or utopian is an extremely context-sensitive process. What Roger Williams might view as an ideological assumption (if he had such terminology at his disposal)--that church and
state should remain separate entities—we might view as utopic, especially when considered in light of Williams' historical context. However, were a twentieth-century citizen of the United States to make a similar assumption, we would likely view it as ideological rather than utopian, regardless of whether or not we see separation of church and state as reality in the twentieth century. Mannheim, then, views the relationship of ideology and utopia as dialectical at the same time that he attempts to distinguish each from the other.

Mannheim is useful insofar as he brings the terms ideology and utopia into play together. However, he does not allow that any position a writer might take, even a position within a utopia, is necessarily a position containing an ideology. Even an attempt to present an ideal is an ideological attempt, because it is the writer's utopian ideology that is presented in a text. Every utopian vision is formed from the biases of the utopist's agenda. In Roger Williams' case, noting an implicit utopian genre at work in his writings allows critics to get a clearer picture of various of Williams' ideologies, including religious and personal.

Paul Ricoeur also views ideology and utopia as intertwined concepts. However, Ricoeur asks us to problematize Mannheim's position on the relationship of ideology and utopia by asserting that both of Mannheim's
main points about that relationship—noncongruence and realizability—are neither easily measured and evaluated nor necessarily divorced from the influences of ideology. Instead, Ricoeur posits, "what we must assume is that the judgement on ideology is always the judgement from a utopia" (172). In other words, we must be outside an ideological position in order to pass judgement on it, and when we place ourselves outside that position, we automatically place ourselves into an ideal other place, a utopia. Ricoeur implies, but does not state, that the utopia a writer places himself into in order to critique an ideology is itself a construction of yet another ideology.

Roger Williams' ideologies and his use of the utopia are closely linked together. There is a dialectical relationship between the two concepts, with each informing and transforming the other. But, one might ask, what ideology(ies) can be viewed in Williams' works? One might assert that Williams presents his religious ideology to us in his works, because much of each text is devoted to espousing Williams' views on religion and the proper role of both religious and civil magistrates. For instance, we learn that Williams believes that the civil magistracy has no business enforcing religious laws, a view that was in opposition to that of the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay authorities. One might also claim that Williams' predominant ideology revolves around colonialism, because
of the potential uses of his Key for increased colonization of the Narragansett territories. Let me assert here, however, that Williams' main slant in his writings is towards himself. Although Williams' texts are also concerned with the ideological positions I noted above, his primary emphasis is on Roger Williams, his experiences, his responses to those experiences, and his impressions of the relative goodness or badness of Englishman and native alike. Williams presents himself as the link in the dialectic between ideology and utopia, and his self-fashioning is shaped primarily by that positioning. He is both the visionary of the utopian New World and the missionary for the ideology which led to the colonization of that New World. In fact, the writing of a utopia usually requires an individualist emphasis, because one dares to found a society—albeit an imaginary one—on one's own beliefs.

It may seem strange to discuss an emphasis on selfhood or on the individual in relation to a Christian man like Williams who held many theological affinities with his adversaries in Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay. After all, Christ exhorted the Christian who "wishes to come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me" (Luke 9:23, my emphasis). While the idea of denial of self in this passage may mean many different things, based upon nuances of scriptural interpretation, at
least part of that phrase's meaning seems to admonish against undue emphasis on, or glorification of, oneself. Williams' self-fashioning is not out of line with his Christian beliefs, but it does point up a tension in the believer's life. At the same time the believer was expected to "deny himself," in many circles--among many of the New England Puritans, for instance--he was also expected to scrutinize minutely the particulars of his life in the search for evidence of election. And such election might call for heroic initiative and self-determination in a particular case, as many examples of the saints' lives attest.

As a variety of commentators have pointed out, versions of the ideal society have been in circulation since Plato's Republic, and at least one critic pushes the beginnings of utopian thought back even farther. In her monumental work on the utopia, Joyce Oramel Hertzler urges us to look back past Plato's Republic to prior works which demonstrate utopian elements, calling for "broader reading with the search for utopian elements uppermost" (7). Hertzler's own "broader reading" begins with several of the Hebrew prophets of the Old Testament, including Amos, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, elements of whose works are evident in many later utopias.

Twentieth-century scholars who study ideal societies generally agree that literary manifestations of such
societies fall into five distinctive categories: utopia, millennium, arcadia, the land of Cockaygne, and the perfect moral commonwealth. These divisions can be briefly summarized.

utopia--an overall plan for society that often shows man's capacity to dominate nature

millennium--related to Christ's second coming, a providential history wherein writers look for signs of the fulfillment of biblical prophecy in contemporary events

arcadia--a paradise of comfort and ease which integrates man and nature

Cockaygne--a paradise of pure pleasure where, for instance, lords must spend seven years in penance (up to the chin in pig filth) to be able to enjoy the pleasures the monks experience each day

perfect moral commonwealth--ideal society achieved through the moral reformation of each person or group in it

While there are clear differences between the various forms of ideal society presented above, the one element common to all is, as Ruth Levitas phrases it, the "desire for a better way of being and living" (7). Each utopic vision demonstrates that desire in different ways, but no matter the package it is presented in, the desire is still the common element.

Why, one might ask, did writers attempt to envisage ideal societies? Furthermore, why does this tradition make a "sudden" reappearance in early modern Europe? Hertzler notes eight major events in the millennium separating St. Augustine and Sir Thomas More which provide fuel to the
search for ideal versions of society. In chronological order, the events are the Crusades, the travels of Marco Polo, the rapid spread of the plague in the mid 1300s, the "threatening advance upon Europe" by the Ottoman Turks (123), the growth of Renaissance humanism, the beginning of print culture in Europe, and the early explorations of the New World along with the resulting knowledge of the lands brought back to Europe (121-124). These events might usefully be divided into three categories of types of influence, each of which in different ways caused people to question and challenge previously accepted notions of authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Catastrophe</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crusades</td>
<td>Plague</td>
<td>Humanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polo</td>
<td>Turkish advance</td>
<td>Print culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New World exploration</td>
<td>Knowledge from New World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, contact caused people to reassess their previous beliefs about the make-up of the world and its inhabitants. Though contact often led colonizers to judge those they came into contact with through the filters of their own home cultures, in many cases, as in Roger Williams', the filter itself is called into question. Catastrophe tends, as the major outbreaks of the plague did, to send a society into chaos. While the wealthy were able to flee the pestilence, those left behind had some freedom to alter the previous order of things. When the elite returned, they discovered a people a little less
willing to accept a return to the pre-plague notions of authority. Finally, radical shifts in cognition also challenged formerly revered forms of authority. Print culture, for instance, allowed the individual greater access to information than ever before, and that information allowed a person to read Scripture and discover its truths for himself.

Each of these individual events contributed to the European mindset the view that long-held assumptions about the nature of things were often incorrect. For instance, the growth of Renaissance humanism led to innumerable advances in scientific thought, including the move from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican version of cosmology. Also, the travels and discoveries of Marco Polo introduced many new products into Europe and helped expose many Europeans to new traditions and modes of thinking and living far different than what they were used to. In the face of such sweeping changes, it is natural that facts be challenged and, often, replaced with new and more accurate belief systems. And if one could not completely trust what one previously believed beyond all doubt, then the very nature of one's society was open to interrogation. As a move to encourage such questioning, and occasionally as a means for discouraging it, writers in greater and greater numbers imagined and created new and ideal versions of society to share with others.
During the early modern era, many writers struggled with the utopian form. The first and most famous is, of course, Sir Thomas More, whose *Utopia* was published in Latin in 1516 and later translated into English. More introduced the term "utopia" into the English language, and his work provided a portrait of an ideal society in action, rather than simply theorizing about what that society should contain. Once *Utopia* became widely available, other writers hastened to add their visions of the perfect society to the growing list of works. On the continent, for instance, one finds Eberlein’s *Wolfaria*, Doni’s *I Mondi*, Campanella’s *City of the Sun*, and Andreae’s *Christianopolis*.

The utopian tradition continued to evolve back in England. J.C. Davis argues that Robert Burton’s 1621 text *Anatomy of Melancholy* presented the utopia as "mocking the incapacity of a flawed human nature ever to erect a society in which humanity and social life might be given meaning" (86). In the midst of normal human chaos, Burton attempted to set forth a structure for a society he believed would bring order to the chaos. Sir Francis Bacon’s *New Atlantis* (1627) was an unfinished utopia, yet Davis notes that "it is, perhaps, a testament to Bacon’s literary skill that we first read the New Atlantis without realising how little he has in fact told us about his ideal society and its institutions" (117). Throughout the seventeenth century--
both before and after Roger Williams' time--one can discover a wide range of utopian writings.

So there was in England and Europe a persistent, if not always consistent, tradition of writing about ideal societies in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Into this tradition I want to insert Roger Williams' *A Key Into the Language of America*, because in that text, Williams presents a wide range of the elements of an ideal society. In contrast, one can view his post-*Key* corpus as Williams' sustained attempt to present a religious utopia.

Rather than attempting to discover how Williams' works fit into a narrow definition of utopian writing, let me instead borrow from Levitas the one element common to all utopias. Although Williams confines most of his works to considerations of the ideal religious society, that conception is, nonetheless, an expression of Williams' "desire for a better way of being and living." One might also argue that Williams' writings demonstrate to us his vision of a perfect moral commonwealth. However, that description is only relevant to a discussion of the *Key*, and then only partially. Throughout the *Key*, Williams presents various actions that can be considered models of ideal conduct. Williams implicitly calls each us of to model our actions after the ideals he presents to us, but nowhere in the *Key* does he tell us that the realization of
his ideal society depends upon the moral reformation of each individual in that society.

Because Williams works to present the characteristics of an ideal society in the *Key*, he often shifts between criticizing the natives and criticizing the English, depending upon which group demonstrates the ideal he wishes to promote. In his discussion of Orientalism, Edward Said calls this strategy "flexible positional superiority," a technique that "puts the Westerner [Englishman] in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient [New World] without losing him the relative upper hand" (7).¹² Part of the reason for this, Said tells us, is that a Westerner "was in, or thought about, the Orient because he could be there, or could think about it, with very little resistance on the Orient's part" (7, Said's emphasis). The writers in the early English colonies in the New World demonstrate both flexible positional superiority and the Westerner's role in Said's Orient. Because the English colonists have books and writing, they are able to define, describe, classify, and categorize the natives and the land itself in any manner they choose, with almost no resistance from the natives.¹³

As but one example, Williams relates the story of a native who infiltrated an enemy camp, presented himself as a deserter, and offered his services to his captors. Then he led them into battle and turned on them, killing their
leader and rejoining his original tribe. Williams states that "his act was false and trecherous, yet herein appears policie, stoutnesse, and activitie &c" (I, 139), thereby telling us that an act can be interpreted differently depending upon the perspective or the agenda of the observer of that act. While the native's actions also demonstrate the flexibility of his positioning, Williams, as the writer relating the action, demonstrates an even greater degree of superiority in positioning. He can, at will, favor the natives or the English, depending upon which group demonstrates the characteristics he wishes to emphasize. Also, Williams is able to discuss the natives with little or no resistance from them--the natives will likely not read or react to Williams' works--and both the colonists and those back in England were dependent upon his descriptions, because they had little or no direct experience with the Narragansetts or their language.  

A prime example of Williams' ability to present his New World/Orient as he chose to occurs early in the Key where Williams relates a long story concerning Canonicus [a Narragansett sachim] and his use of the word Wunnaumwayean, or "If he say true." Canonicus claims that he will leave the English in peace, if what they say is true. Williams attempts to assure Canonicus of the Englishmen's good intentions. However, Canonicus "tooke a sticke and broke it into ten pieces, and related ten instances (laying down
a sticke to every instance) which gave him cause thus to feare and say" (I, 145). Again, Williams strives to assuage Canonicus' concerns, and he ends the Observation by saying of the English that he hopes they "will be far from giving just cause to have Barbarians to question their Wunnaumwâuonck, or faithfulnesse" (I, 58). Instead of taking exception to Canonicus' examples of English duplicity himself--examples Williams does not print for us--Williams opts to have Canonicus make the criticism. By taking the agency away from himself, Williams in effect removes himself from the possibility of retribution for criticizing the English. In effect, Williams criticizes the English by representing the natives as being critical of them. At the same time, Williams shows his ability to present the land and the natives as he sees fit, and he leaves implicit the idea that he could also fashion himself with a similar degree of freedom. For if Williams can consciously leave out parts of the Canonicus story, then he can also choose to present only certain of his own characteristics, mainly those which help to fashion Williams as an observer-participant in interactions with the Narragansett. The flexible positional superiority Williams demonstrates in the Key is vital to his self-fashioning, because the ability to shift positions throughout the text allows Williams the freedom to present himself as either authority or alien, depending upon which
position will be most advantageous to him at a given moment.

In addition, having flexible positional superiority also allows Williams more freedom to construct his utopia than he might otherwise have. While More's Hythloday, for instance, generally tends to present a positive view of the Utopians' way of life (mainly because he is contrasting that society with English society), Williams can present aspects of both English and native society as positive (mainly because he is not completely committed to either of the sides). In other words, Roger Williams cannot achieve the brand of utopianism he does in the Key without flexible positional superiority. The irony, of course, is that Williams' positional posturing points out a major contradiction in Mannheim's models of ideology and utopia. The very perspective that undoes an ideology is possible only by being caught up in another ideology. And in Williams' case, the perspective undoing an ideology as well as its replacement ideology are identical: his attempts to articulate the traits of an ideal society.

Perhaps because of his ability to adopt various stances relative to the sources of the specific traits of his utopia, Williams' vision of the ideal society contains very little similarity to any of the other recognized forms of ideal societies noted above. His society is not Cockaygne, because Williams seems opposed to the notion of
pure pleasure, much less the radical overturning of established hierarchies the Cockayne construction implies.\textsuperscript{15} Nor does Williams present us with an arcadia. His view of society as seen in the Key is not one of ease and comfort, but rather of harmony and justice. Further, despite his religious inclination, Roger Williams does not present a millennium-based ideal society either. It is true that Williams maintained strong millenarian beliefs,\textsuperscript{16} but Williams' utopia does not fit Davis' definition of millennial. While Williams does present some contemporary events in the Key and his later works, he does not attempt to link those events to the second coming of Christ. Finally, the Key can be seen partly as a utopia, at least in the way Davis defines it, because that text contains Williams' plan for an ideal society. Again, Williams' work only partially fits this category, because even though Williams discusses some aspects of nature, his society does not demonstrate man's dominance of nature.

Williams, like Thomas Morton and John Smith, has a literary tradition to work both within and beyond. Because Roger Williams places his works beyond most of the traits of the ideal society that were in circulation during his lifetime, he gives himself the liberty to fashion and refashion himself throughout his writings and his life. He thus stands as the most balanced relation between self and writing in the literary activity that is self-fashioning.
By contrast, Morton's incomplete adherence to any of several levels of satire shows his lack of certainty about the self he attempted to fashion, and conversely, John Smith's use of only the general principles of his tradition seem to stem from his having more confidence in himself and his actions than in his ability to fashion himself in his writings.

With that said, let us move into our consideration of Roger Williams' writings as the utopic expressions of his personal ideology of self-fashioning.

*****

Roger Williams was born in London to James and Alice Williams sometime in 1603 or 1604. He grew up in the Smithfield area of London near St. Sepulchre's, the parish church. While living in Smithfield, Williams apparently learned shorthand from a friend of his father. Young Williams' proficiency at shorthand caught the eye of Sir Edward Coke, the eminent jurist, who hired the lad to record in shorthand the court proceedings in the Star Chamber.

Coke's patronage assured Williams a place in the Charterhouse School and likely saved him from following in his father's footsteps as a merchant tailor in England. Roger excelled in the academic environment, and his success earned him status as a pensioner at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, in 1624. Williams graduated A.B. in 1627,
having met all requirements for graduating from Cambridge, including the signing of the required statement of submission to the Church of England, and he went on to graduate studies at Cambridge. However, Williams did not earn the master's degree. Cyclone Covey reports that Williams "evidently fulfilled all the requirements for his master's degree except formal submission to episcopacy, which, in the course of his two years of graduate study, he found he could not abide" (7-8).

Close upon leaving Cambridge, apparently for reasons of conscience, Williams was hired as chaplain to Sir William Masham, a man of "deep Puritan sympathies" who opposed Charles and Archbishop Laud. While living at Masham's manor at Otes, Williams became acquainted with many of "those militant Puritans who had been instrumental in having enacted the Petition of Right." Eventually these connections led Williams to an August 1629 meeting with members of the fledgling Massachusetts Bay Company at Sempringham, Lincolnshire. There, Williams met, among others, John Winthrop, John Cotton, and Thomas Hooker, all of whom would impact greatly Williams' later life (Chupack 38).

Because the seventeenth century in England was a time of tremendous upheaval, many citizens were intimately interested in and involved with the political, cultural and religious changes of the time. As we can see from even
this brief glance at the particulars of his life, Roger Williams was also involved to some extent in those changes. That is hardly a remarkable fact, but I note it in order to further assert that because Williams was so clearly typical of his own time and place, he would have been exposed to a whole range of literary productions of his time, ranging from the religious tracts proliferating in England in the early seventeenth century to works within the utopian genre. While it is not clear that he had read Thomas More's *Utopia*, Williams would certainly have known of it and, perhaps, of Bacon's *New Atlantis* and other seventeenth century utopian texts more contemporary to him.

Roger Williams' first published work, the 1643 *A Key Into the Language of America*, demonstrates his reliance upon the utopian tradition. Each chapter of the *Key* presents Narragansett language appropriate to the chapter's avowed subject--such as "Of the Family and Businesse of the House," or "Of Religion, the Soule, &c"--and each chapter also represents one aspect of Williams' theory of the constitution of an ideal society. In Williams' prosaic and poetic observations on the natives and their culture, we get the clearest sense of which traits--including courteousness toward strangers, truthfulness, bravery, and, inevitably, Christianity--Williams views as necessary for life in an ideal society. Of the natives, for instance, Williams reports that "In Summer-time I have knowne them
lye abroad often themselves, to make room for strangers, English, or others" (I, 107), while "Jewes and Christians oft have sent/Christ Jesus to the Manger" (I, 110, lines 7-8). Nowhere in the Key does Williams make any claims that the conduct he presents is exemplary or ideal, but the very fact that he presents it, even when that conduct indicts the English, demonstrates his commitment to presenting the "best" in conduct for his readers. Instead, each admirable trait Williams points out fits together with the others he presents to complete a picture of what life in an ideal society would be like, much like Raphael Hythloday's method of describing the attributes of Utopia in More's work. Hythloday, you may recall, presents his discussion of the various features of Utopia's society in distinct sections, such as "Travel and Trade in Utopia" and "Their Moral Philosophy," among others. Williams achieves a similar effect by placing the observations into chapters which present specific aspects of the Narragansett culture. For example, as we learn about how the natives or the English treat the relatives of a deceased person, we uncover Williams' version of how society should act in such situations. Williams reports that "As they abound in lamentations for the dead, so they abound in consolation to the living, and visit them frequently, using this word Kutchimmoke, Kutchimmoke, Be of good cheere, which they
express by stroking the cheeke and head of the father or mother, husband, or wife of the dead" (I, 275).

Why, in a text purportedly about the Narragansett language, do we learn so many day-to-day details about the natives? From one point of view, such information can be used to subdue the natives. By "learning" their ways, the English can devise methods for using those lifeways against the natives, much as the early Church appropriated pagan holidays into Church celebrations in an effort to get the pagans to celebrate Christian holidays on the day they were used to celebrating anyway. However, historical fact denies appropriation as a possibility, because colonizers have generally tended to subsume, rather than appropriate "other" cultures once they make contact with them--John Smith being a notable exception. Others might suggest that the profusion of details Williams presents on Narragansett ways is Williams' way of showing his great respect for the natives without his actually having to praise them. Williams, however, does not always praise the characteristics of the natives that he presents. At one point, he notes that the natives' "publique Games are solemnized with the meeting of hundreds; sometimes thousands, and consist of many vanities, none of which I durst ever be present at, that I might not countenance and partake of their folly, after I once saw the evil of them" (I, 254).
A more accurate way to view Williams' emphasis upon the lifeways of the Narragansetts encompasses both his attempts to promote himself and his use of utopian writing. In the face of his troubles with authorities in England, Massachusetts Bay, and Plymouth, Williams needed a way to obtain what he desired--a charter for the Providence Plantation--and the only way to get that was for Williams to demonstrate his importance to the colonial project, part of whose aim was to convert the natives to Christianity and to establish trade with them. Williams' positioning as local expert helps him in his struggle to gain a charter for the colony at Providence. What better way for Williams to achieve the charter than for him repeatedly to present aspects of Narragansett language and culture which perhaps only he was privy to? By presenting himself as the 'man on the scene' in Providence, which he certainly was, Williams indirectly states that no one else has his level of experience with the natives. If they did, they would publish works about that experience as Williams has. He also implies that many of the features of Narragansett life he reveals to us are models of an ideal life, coequally with the several examples from English society he cites. Therefore he implies a model beyond any single culture, a model, he further implies, all should strive to equal.

One way to clarify the relationship between Williams' self-fashioning and his use of the utopian tradition is to
note that Williams' utopia depended not only on Williams' being the right man to establish and govern Rhode Island, but also on Rhode Island being a proper place to establish an ideal society because of the contacts between English and native culture that are possible there. By representing himself as an expert in the area, Williams shows how he is the right person to establish Rhode Island, and as Williams presents the various positive traits of either native or English culture, he shows how Rhode Island is the right place to create and maintain a utopia. Although the colonial authorities in England did not necessarily view Rhode Island as an experiment in utopianism, they did view Williams' work among the natives as an important factor in granting the charter to him. In this instance, then, Williams' role of expert on the natives was successfully sold to his initial audience, the authorities in England who recommended to whom the Crown should grant colonial patents.

Because the Key is the precursor for Williams' later writings which present the necessary traits of an ideal religious society, Williams frames a large part of his discussion in religious terms in that early text. Many of the "More Particular" poetic observations ending each of the Key's chapters take the tone of sermons wherein Williams reiterates the theme of the chapter. He also
makes the bulk of his theological points in those poetic observations. For instance, he asserts that

   English and Indians all passe hence,
   To an eternall place,
   Where shels nor finest gold's worth ought,
   Where nought's worth ought but Grace.

   This Coyne the Indians know not of,
   Who knowes how soone they may?
   The English knowing prize it not,
   But fling't like drosse away (I, 238).

What Williams presents to us in this instance is another example of a behavior that should occur in an ideal society. He attempts to move us to acknowledge God's grace and to esteem it as more valuable than either native wampum or English gold. We also learn that neither the natives nor the English appear to Williams to demonstrate the behavior he desires. But such behavior, nonetheless, is the ideal Williams expects them (and his readers) to strive for.

   Aside from the religious tone of the Key, there are several other levels of utopie discussion of the natives in that text. During Williams' presentation of the elements of the Narragansett mode of governance, he reports that

   Their Government is Monarchicall, yet at present the chiefest government in the counrey [sic] is divided betweene a younger sachim, Miantunnómu, and an elder sachim, Caunoñicus, of about fourscore yeeres old, this young mans uncle; and their agreement in the Government is remarkable:
   The old Sachim will not be offended at what the young sachim doth; and the young sachim will not doe what hee conceives will displease his uncle (I, 223).
Williams seems astounded that the natives have such a peaceful working government, yet later in the same chapter he refers to the goodness of the sachims toward their subjects. The Native leaders, we learn, do not turn their monarchies into dictatorships; rather, "they will not conclude of ought that concerns all, either Laws, or Subsides, or warres, unto which the people are averse, and by gentle persuasion cannot be brought" (I, 224). While Williams presents an ideal of governmental conduct, it is the natives, not the English, who represent the ideal in practice. In contrast, we should recall at this point Williams' treatment at the hands of the Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth authorities. When the church at Salem overwhelmingly chose to offer Williams a position as teacher to their congregation, the elders of the Boston church responded by rejecting "a petition from the Salem townsmen for a grant of land at Marblehead Neck" (Correspondence I, 20) because the elders were not consulted prior to Salem's offer to Williams and because the appointment of Williams was against their wishes.25

Williams' presentation of native practices of governing relates to his self-fashioning in one main way. Simply by reciting to his readers such little known facts about the Narragansett people's structure of government, Williams demonstrates his thorough knowledge of the native people of his area. This information could be useful for
future colonists, because it could help determine appropriate ways to relate to the Narragansetts in order to gain their trust. Williams' information was also useful to him in furthering his goal of a charter for Providence. His work among the natives did not go unnoticed by colonial authorities in England, and this incident represents yet another example of Williams' experience in the New World and provides further support for his fashioning of himself as an important expert on the area. As Williams fashions himself in this manner, he takes much the same approach that John Smith does. Both attempt to gain advancement within colonial enterprises by showing their practical value to those ventures. Roger Williams is just more successful at it than John Smith was.

However, that may simply be a function of the different systems Williams and Smith found themselves judged by. The Northern colonies tended to focus on colonization and settlement of the land, while the Southern colonies placed a greater emphasis on plantation establishment and profit accrual. Therefore any efforts to enhance colonization (like Williams') would meet with approval. Conversely, Smith's actions tended to keep the colonists alive instead of increasing their wealth, which is why his efforts at self-fashioning met so little success. Thomas Morton, like Smith, did not meet the general expectations for the colonial effort in his area.
Morton did attempt to settle and add to colonization in New England, but his mistake was in doing so in conjunction with the natives instead of in opposition to them.

Another phase of Williams' idealizing of native practices occurs when he discusses the division of labor amongst them. In two different sections we learn how the natives divide labor. First, Williams informs us about the native practice of moving settlements seasonally in order to be near the best type of land for a particular time of year—living near the cornfields during planting and harvesting time, for instance. During those regular removes from place to place, "The men make the poles or stakes, but the women make and set up, take downe, order and carry the mats and householdstuffe" (I, 135). And later in Williams' text, he reports that the natives "have some who follow only making of Bowes, some Arrowes, some Dishes, and (the Women make all their earthen Vessells) some follow fishing, some hunting: most on the Sea-side make Money, and store up shells in Summer against Winter whereof to make their money" (I, 239-40). By these two examples, Williams demonstrates the idea that, in an ideal setting, certain people should have only certain functions for the betterment of all. We can be sure Williams was concerned with this idea; it was one of the cornerstones of his early debates with the authorities in Boston. Of course, in those debates Williams framed the discussion
much more tightly than in *A Key Into the Language of America*. Roger Williams believed that civil magistrates should only be responsible for punishing breaches of civil code, while church authorities held jurisdiction over violations of religious laws.

In the poems that conclude each chapter, Williams pushes the native/English comparisons to another level. Take, for example, the last stanza of the poem at the end of Chapter 22, "Of their Government and Justice:" "We weare no cloaths, have many Gods,/And yet our sinnes are lesse:/You are Barbarians, Pagans wild,/Your land's the Wildernesse" (I, 227). What better way for Williams forcefully to make the comparison between Englishman and native than to put such a verbal barb into the mouth of a "savage" native? The irony inherent in having a "savage" see the reality that "civilized" men cannot see is one of Williams' most potent weapons in the *Key*.

By allowing his native subjects the ability to criticize English sins, Williams employs a strategy Montaigne hoped for, but never expected to see in European writings about the Native Americans. In his "Of Cannibals," Montaigne reports that he is "sorry that, while rightly misjudging their [the natives'] misdeeds, we are very blind to our own" (281). Montaigne's attitude toward the natives is similar to that of Williams, if somewhat more liberal. Whereas Williams would expect the
natives to accept Christianity as the true form of religion compared to what he considers to be their barbaric religious practices, Montaigne asserts "that every one calls 'barbarism' whatever he is not accustomed to" (275). In other words, both Williams and Montaigne view the natives as flawed and, often, barbarous. However, Montaigne moves beyond Williams' discussion of the natives by questioning the Europeans' objectivity and their ability to judge accurately the natives' customs and lifeways. Williams disregards the question of objectivity, so he believes he has the ability to judge rightly the natives and their behaviors. As Roger Williams shifts back and forth between praising the admirable qualities of the natives and enumerating the positive aspects of the English character, he presents us with his vision of the composition of an ideal society as articulated through Williams' own flexible positional superiority.

We have learned that Williams loosely employed some characteristics of the utopian genre in framing his _Key_, but to what end? One might possibly assert that Williams simply wanted to write his own version of utopia for readers in England. While that is partly true, at least in my conception of the _Key_, such a view does not represent the entire reason Williams wrote as he did. Another determining factor in the set-up of _A Key Into the Language of America_ is Williams' need to promote himself and his
activities in Rhode Island in order to obtain a charter for the land from the Crown. By presenting various aspects of the New World as utopian or ideal and then placing himself as the expert about that area, Roger Williams attempted to guarantee that he would be rewarded for his work with a charter for the lands he had settled.

Williams repeatedly promotes himself in the Key, mainly by discussing many instances of Narragansett culture that he has experienced during his extensive interactions with them. Williams' publication of his lexicographic work indicates that he spent a good bit of time with the Narragansett—at least enough to appear to know their language. Williams himself makes readers aware of the work he put into gathering the materials that ended up as the Key, materials he "had so dearely bought in some few yeares hardship, and charges among the Barbarians" (I, 79). Beyond this, Williams notes how he has "travelled with neere 200. of them at once, neere 100. miles through the woods" eating the native dish of "parch'd meal" (I, 11). Contrast this, as I am sure Williams wanted his readers in England to, with the relatively comfortable lives enjoyed by those in Boston, Salem, and Plymouth who were so busy working to make the "city upon a hill" a reality that they appeared to be unconcerned with interacting with, much less converting, the natives. Williams' audience in England, the Crown and its representatives among the colonial
authorities, would be concerned with native conversions, because they viewed such conversions as one route to effectively establishing an English presence in the New World. Those conversions also represented souls brought to God without the influence of French or Spanish catholics, another important consideration in the race to colonize the New World. Trade was yet another component of the English mission, but neither Williams himself nor the other New Englanders were sending much of value back to England. Therefore, Williams emphasized his activities with the natives as a counter to the inaction on the part of the other New England colonists.

Again and again Williams relates his experiences with the natives, noting at one point how "Shoes and Stockins" of deer skin are useful when travelling in wet weather because of their waterproof qualities, and that "being hang'd up in their chimney, they presently drie without hurt as my selfe hath often proved" (I, 205, my emphasis). Williams sets forth example after example of the experiences he has had with the natives, much as Hythloday does throughout More's fictional Utopia and as both John Smith and Thomas Morton do in their factually based writings. Williams' personal experiences with heretofore unknown events and actions brings those events and actions into the ken of his English readers, and they emphasize Williams' view of the New World and its native inhabitants
as more "natural" than the English—in other words, as the "natural" inhabitants of what is, in some ways at least, an ideal society. As the attitudes, actions, and mores of the Narragansett are more often than not admirable in Williams' view, he must report on them extensively in order to show his readers those ideal actions. How would we learn about both the natives' exemplary activities and their more reprehensible actions otherwise? Williams' insistence on providing so much information about the natives stems from his need to convince his initial audience of the depth of his experiences in New England.

Although the Key presents Williams' experiences in New England and his vision for the general makeup of an ideal society, he does not carry many of his ideas about the constitution of a utopia into his later works, because those later works are where Williams refines and focuses his vision of utopia rather than where he expands and broadens it. At one point in the Key, though; Williams overtly presents an idea which is carried into his later writings. In discussing the natives' religious ideas, Williams asserts that "they have a modest Religious persuasion not to disturb any man, either themselves, English, Dutch, or any in their conscience, and worship" (I, 213). Even though Williams describes the native attitude here, this idea manifests Roger Williams' belief that people should be allowed freedom of religious
conscience. The idea of soul liberty played a large part in Williams' post-Key writings, starting with his Bloudy Tenent of Persecution. It may seem unusual that Williams portrays the natives as holding a belief that he held so dear. However, it is not at all unusual, because throughout the Key the natives can often be viewed as exemplifying the ideal actions of good people, often in opposition to the English colonists other than Williams. To emphasize this opposition, Williams could show the natives living out one of his ideals that the English do not exemplify. The fact that Williams often refers to the natives as "wild," "rude," or "pagan" in various places in the Key only underscores his utopian purposes in the text. If the natives are really as bad as such adjectives might make them seem, why would Williams point out their activities, customs, and mores, except to present their admirable traits as ones desirable for others to follow and their less desirable traits as ones to refrain from? Williams repeatedly demonstrates his flexible positional superiority relative to the natives, because he can define them as he chooses, either positively or negatively.

****

While Roger Williams was in England in 1643-4 working to gain a charter for the Providence Plantation, he spent a good deal of time waiting to discuss the colony with the English authorities, who were busy, of course, with the
Civil War. It is during this waiting period that Williams compiled and published *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution* in response to an earlier tract by John Cotton. According to Samuel Caldwell, Williams claimed that the *Bloudy Tenent* "was burned by the Presbyterian party (then prevailing)" in England (Qtd. in Samuel Caldwell's "Introduction" to CW III, xiii). Williams placed his text into the middle of a raging controversy in England over the proper form of the state religion, which erupted when King Charles I allied himself with the Scottish in an effort to overcome the political opposition of the Anglicans. However, in return, the Scots assumed some authority in Parliament, and they brought their Presbyterian ideas with them. Many worried that the effort to overthrow the Anglican hierarchy would merely result in the institution of a Presbyterian hierarchy in its stead. Most felt that the Presbyterians would be at least as intolerant of diverse religious opinions as the Anglicans, if not more so. Williams believed that the only way to create a pure church was to establish one entirely separate from the Church of England, because the rituals of that church were an obstacle to religious purity. Apparently the Presbyterians burned Williams' text in response to his assertions about freedom of conscience and about separating the religious and civil realms, two ideas which were contrary to the main tenets of the Scottish Presbyterians.
At the same time, however, Williams' text was not just geared toward the controversies in England. He also found himself in dispute with John Cotton, and, by extension, with the authorities of Massachusetts Bay. For instance, Williams believed that civil magistrates should have no jurisdiction in religious affairs and vice versa. On the other hand, the Cotton/Massachusetts view was that civil authorities had every right to punish the violators of religious codes--the keeping of the sabbath for example. As Williams wrote works discussing his religious ideals, he presented readers with his vision of what an ideal religious society--a religious utopia--would look like. It is in writings like Bloudy Tenent that Williams narrows the focus of his utopian vision to purely religious concerns and refines his strategy of self-fashioning to present himself as a man who has a plan for establishing the ideal religious community in the New World. In view of his disputes with New World authorities, Williams needed a way to carve out a niche for the colony he had founded to avoid its being incorporated into the Massachusetts colony. Where the religious leaders of Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth saw no need to separate the ecclesiastical and the civil and did not always tolerate religious diversity, even to the point of exiling dissenters, Williams strove to found Rhode Island on the basic principles of complete separation of the realms of church and state and complete
religious freedom. In Williams' view, it would not be acceptable for the religious freedom of Rhode Island's citizens to be reduced or eliminated as the result of that colony being swallowed up by the Massachusetts colony and its authority. Therefore, Williams needed to convince English authorities of his value to their colonial efforts (in the Key) and then establish some parameters for the type of religious society he sought to establish in Rhode Island (in nearly all his later works).

Williams repeatedly questioned the relevance of civil authority in religious matters, and his polemics reflect this attitude throughout his life. Another area of particular emphasis in his debate with Cotton is the question of persecution for conscience's sake. Cotton held that such persecution was justifiable only if the conscience was in error, though it seems that any conscience which disagreed with Cotton's (or, more properly, Massachusetts') was considered to be in error. Williams believed that such persecution was never acceptable, because he felt that people should be free to pursue their own (albeit Christian) consciences, free from the constraints and repressions of civil authority. The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution was the first major product of the Cotton/Williams debate.

The very structure of The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution reveals that text to be a presentation of Williams' utopian
vision of a true or ideal religious society. In much the same way that each chapter of the Key reveals a different aspect of Williams's beliefs about the composition of an ideal society, each chapter of The Bloudy Tenent presents part of Williams' conception of the proper make up of an ideal religious society. In every chapter of the text, Williams allows Peace to present the positions of John Cotton, which Williams (speaking as Truth) then overturns and replaces with his own opinions. As Williams refutes Cotton's opinions and discusses and promotes his own thoughts, he demonstrates his vision of what an ideal religious community would be. Williams points to his ideas as being better than those already in place in Massachusetts, and in doing so he demonstrates several of the key elements of any religious utopia.

Williams' use of the dialogue form for Bloudy Tenent makes it clear to readers that he is in complete control—both of the terms of the dispute and of the ultimate result of it—allowing him to fashion himself as he chooses. Because Williams is both the author of the dialogue and, through the character Truth, a participant in it, that dialogue can be said to demonstrate Williams' personal ideology. Contrary to Mannheim's assertions that ideology and utopia are mutually exclusive terms, Williams is able to bring ideology and utopia into play with each other by using the religious utopia as a means for presenting one
version of his ideology. Furthermore, use of the dialogue form places Williams' text into a tradition of dialogue as an engine for religious controversy, which can be traced back at least as far as Augustine. Ivy Schweitzer believes we should "think of Williams' use of dialogue as characteristic of his notion of fallen epistemology: until further divine revelation, truth is merely provisional, in this world engaged in a continuous dialogue with peace" (199). She also sees the dialogue as "a structural effect of Williams' belief in the freedom of conscience" (199), allowing for each discussant to retain their own opinions rather than enforcing only one opinion upon the audience. Viewing Williams' dialogue in *Bloody Tenent* as provisional allows us to note that each discussant in this text does not have an equal chance for their version of truth to be regarded as correct. Instead, Peace merely reflects John Cotton's assertions and represents a "straight man" for the ostensibly more accurate opinions of Truth. Had John Cotton penned this text, the terms of the dialogue would, of course, be quite different than they now are, as can be seen in Cotton's response to *The Bloody Tenent* entitled *The Bloody Tenent Washed*. This use of the dialogue is ironic, because a dialogue generally entails openness among discussants, as each participant hears and immediately is able to respond to his adversary's positions, while
Williams' and Cotton's texts turn the dialogue into more of a monologue.

In addition, the structure of the dialogue format allows Williams to make clear delineations between Truth and Peace, between the authority and the alien. Obviously Williams would present himself as authority, while his opponent, Cotton/Peace, would be represented as the alien. At one point Peace exclaims, "Deare Truth, I know thy birth, thy nature, thy delight. They that know thee, will prize thee farre above themselves and their lives" (III, 56). Because of Truth's position as authority, a position in this instance which is superior to the alien (perhaps because the overriding authority is actually authoring the entire dialogue), Peace is subordinate, content to "spend eternall dayes and endlesse dates at thy holy feet, in listening to the precious Oracles of thy mouth" (III, 157).

The arguments throughout Bloudy Tenent are not always as thoroughly supported as the use of the dialogue form might make one think they would be. At several points, both Williams and Cotton circumvent supporting their arguments by evading particular points. First, in his response to the Newgate prisoner's letter (included with Bloudy Tenent), Cotton states that he "forbeare[s] adding Reasons to justifie the Truth [of his assertions] because you may finde that done to your hand, in a Treatise sent to some of the Brethren late of Salem" (III, 53). And
Williams later utilizes the same evasive strategy via the voice of Truth, when Truth claims that "I could particularize other exercises of Worship, which cannot be denied....[But] only upon these premises I shall observe" (III, 70). Certainly, it is not necessary for either Williams or Cotton to leave these examples out for brevity's sake. After all, though Cotton's initial letter is reasonably short, Williams' text already runs 165 pages in the 1967 reprint edition (370 pages, if you consider Williams' response to Model of Church and Civil Power, which comes just after the initial response to Cotton and is titled Bloudy Tenent at the head of each page). What difference would a few extra examples make to this already lengthy text? Also, as students having received a traditional University education in England, both Williams and Cotton would have learned that one should not leave such gaping holes in one's argument, particularly concerning support of one's position. So what is the reason for such obvious and self-conscious omissions? Could it be that Williams and/or Cotton are not as sure of their positions as they would like for us to believe? Is it possible that both men felt some obligation to their readers not to overload their texts with detail? The ambiguity of argument manifested through the lack of detail self-consciously noted by both writers makes each man appear to have a strong grasp on the argument without him
having to actually prove such acumen. Today, politicians might use this same strategy to be elected to office. A candidate might, for instance, promise during a campaign to cut taxes without providing any details on how the cuts will be achieved. Voters may decide to believe the candidate simply because he sounds like he is telling the truth, while the candidate may not have the least intention of cutting taxes once in office.

As John Cotton and Roger Williams leave deliberate gaps in the support of their assertions, the participants in the dialogue of *Bloudy Tenent* who present each man's position demonstrate distinct speaking personae. In the "Dialogue between Truth and Peace" section of *Bloudy Tenent*, the major portion of that text, both Truth and Peace have distinct modes of speaking. For example, Peace asserts Cotton's objections and restates his support of them, while Truth tends to present Williams' rebuttals of Cotton's earlier assertions along with Williams' own arguments. Williams equates Peace with a stereotypically feminine role--doting, sighing, teary eyed, "daughter of the God of Peace," and concerned mother (*CW* III, 56)--while Truth seems to be stereotypically masculine--speaking of himself in strong, almost martial terms. Since Peace presents Cotton's positions, assertions, and objections, seventeenth-century readers of this text might have assumed the Cotton position to be the feminine one and, thus, the
inferior one—at least inferior according to the norms of Williams’ and Cotton’s society. Also, Williams presents his own position, that asserted by Truth, in the strongest terms possible to create the effect that Truth is mighty and cannot be overcome. By presenting Truth as mighty, Williams fashions himself in an interesting way. Since the Truth character represents Williams’ position and Truth is mighty, Williams can also be considered mighty and his position unassailable.

Even though Peace generally presents Cotton’s arguments, at the beginning of Chapter V, Peace rather than Truth seems to present Williams’ thoughts on men like Cotton: "How can their Soules be cleare in this foundation of the true Christian matter, who persecute and oppresse their own (acknowledged) Brethren presenting Light unto them about this point?" a criticism Peace presents "with lamentation" (CW III, 67). Rather than being viewed as Peace "taking over" Truth’s "masculine" role, this example shows Peace setting the stage for the harsher commentary of Truth upon the same point. In other words, the feminized voice cannot state as harsh a criticism of Cotton as the masculinized one is allowed to. Once again Williams enforces a version of himself as the strongest possible advocate of the truth in this discussion. And the truth in
this case lies in Williams' conception of the religious ideal.

One of Williams' main ideals throughout his life concerned the freedom of religious conscience, variously known as soul liberty or religious toleration. Williams often faced persecution for his beliefs, and he therefore seemed resolved not to persecute others as he had been persecuted. One of the focal points of The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution was the argument over whether persecution for conscience was a practice that true Christians should undertake. Roger Williams' position, of course, was that such persecution was never acceptable, while John Cotton claimed that when a conscience was in error, it sinned against itself, which therefore justified persecution.

At one point, Truth places Williams' position on persecution against conscience into the terms of a marital relationship. This indicates a parallel common throughout Christian thought--between the institution of the church and the institution of marriage. Williams' construction reinforces this parallel in a way that should have been obvious to most of Williams' contemporaries. Truth asks that we

suppose a believing Christian Husband hath an unbelieving Antichristian wife, what other charge in this respect is given to an husband, 1 Cor. 7. but to dwell with her as an husband if she be pleased to dwell with him: but, to bee so farre from forcing her from her conscience unto his, as that if for his conscience she would depart, he was not to force her to tarry with him (III, 242).
In this instance, Williams shows his aversion to persecution for conscience’s sake clearly. By extension, he also shows civil authorities the proper way to act when faced with religious ideas different from their own, as he goes on to note that just as husbands act, "so ought the Father, Husband, Governor of the Commonweale" (ibid). Williams asserts a basic principle of proper action in this instance, and his ideal is a part of Williams’ creation of a religious utopia. Though this discussion does not specifically mention Williams as a person who would govern in such a tolerant manner, Williams implies that he is the person who has a clear plan for governance in an ideal religious society, simply because his thoughts on the impropriety of the persecution of conscience are the ones foregrounded in the discussion.

Throughout The Bloudy Tenent, Williams closely links the notion of persecution of the conscience with the idea of keeping the church and the state separate from each other. Since Williams believed that people should have free consciences, he obviously believed that the state should not attempt to legislate those consciences, because religious conscience was a religious decision and therefore beyond the jurisdiction of a civil state or government. In Chapter 5 of Bloudy Tenent, Truth points out Williams’ thoughts on the issue.

The City or Civill state of Ephesus was essentially distinct from the worship of Diana in the
Citie, or of the whole city. Againe, the Church of Christ in Ephesus (which were Gods people, converted and call'd out from the worship of that City unto Christianitie or worship of God in Christ) was distinct from both (III, 73).

Because the civil state is separate from the religious, the establishment and enforcement of laws concerning each division should also necessarily be separate. In his later text, The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody, in a chapter entitled "Examination of Chapter XXX" of John Cotton's The Bloody Tenent Washed, Williams further refines his position on church and state. Peace reports Cotton's assertion that Magistrates may be subject to the church and lick the dust of her feet, and yet be supreme governors of the church also: In spirituall matters (saith he) and in a right administration of them, he is subject; but in civil things, and in the corrupt administration of church-affaires (so far corrupt as tendeth to the disturbance of civil peace) there the Magistrates (saith he) are supream governors, even over the churches in their own dominions (IV, 170-71).

In response, Williams asks

Who sees not here, but by this Doctrine Magistrates must judge, when the church is rightly administered: And that whatever the Ministers of the church, or the whole church judge, that is nothing, for the Magistrate if he be supream governor, he must judge?

***

Besides (as elsewhere I observed) what if the people will have no kings, governors &c. nay no Parliament, nor general courts, but leave vast interregnims or Ruptures of government, yea conclude upon frequent changes (as all nations of the world have had great changes this way) shall the churches of Christ Jesus be without an head, a governor, defender, protector? What a slavery doth this bloody doctrine bring the faire Spouse of Christ into (IV, 171)?

In addition to advocating separation because civil authority held no sway over the religious conscience,
Williams also believes that the civil and the ecclesiastical should be separated because if a civil ruler (who also governed the church) was overthrown—as they often were in Williams' time—that would leave the church without governance and protection. In addition, having a civil ruler in charge of the church would place Christ's church into subjection to a human institution, an idea which was anathema to Williams, though it certainly was not thought of in those terms by many of Williams' contemporaries. We can avoid the dire consequences Williams speaks of if both the church and the state are left to govern themselves. As the points in this dispute become more and more refined and precise with each new text, Roger Williams brings his ideas closer and closer to an ideal form, closer and closer to his utopic vision of a New World religious community.

The larger irony here is that as Williams' writings moved through the controversy with Cotton and closer and closer to his ideal of what a religious community should be, his practice moves away from that ideal. Near the end of his life, Williams entered into a three-day disputation with Quaker leaders over their refusal to take up arms in Rhode Island's defense. Quaker beliefs advocated pacifism, and the Quakers argued that Williams violated the freedom of Quaker consciences, and therefore the freedom of the Quakers themselves, by attempting to force them to join in
armed struggle. Throughout even that disagreement, Williams continues to present himself as the person who has the clearest conception of the make-up of an ideal religious society. Even though at times Williams may contradict what he earlier claimed as an essential element of that ideal, he consistently focuses on the ideal and generally attempts to place that ideal into practice, thus supporting the fashioning of himself that occurs throughout his writings. Despite his inability to maintain a consistent vision of an ideal society, Williams presents a consistent vision of himself to readers, as a man equipped, because of his vision and his experiences, to establish and maintain an ideal religious society within the parameters of English colonial efforts in the New World.

Roger Williams worked to present himself to his readers as an expert on his region in the New World, much as both John Smith and Thomas Morton did. Like both Morton and Smith, Williams fashioned himself in an effort to gain stature in a colonial venture. In one way, Williams' effort was the most ambitious of the three, because his goal was neither a place in someone else's colony nor a royal revocation of the charter to someone else's colony, but rather a charter for his own colony. The scale of Williams' ambition might help to explain why he so clearly and consistently demonstrated the flexibility of his
positioning to a greater degree than either Smith or Morton. Williams had flexible positional superiority precisely because he created his own system and his own colony, and thus his own positions within them.

Thus far, we have considered two New World variations on the theme of self-fashioning: John Smith’s collection of a range of works about himself and Roger Williams’ use of the utopia to represent himself as the right choice to head up a colony that would promote the ideals of his utopia. While Smith’s positioning is limited by the system within which he attempts to advance, Williams’ self-fashioning manifests the seemingly limitless possibilities for such fashioning in the New World. As Williams’ utopian focus narrows from a general social improvement to a specifically religious society, his self-fashioning expands from a specific construction as England’s resident expert on the Narragansett and their region to a more fluid construction, where Williams has the freedom to switch religious identities from Puritan to Separatist to Baptist to Seeker as he moves through his life. We shall soon see in the work of Thomas Morton what appears initially to be a fluidity similar to Williams’. However, Morton’s self-fashioning actually results in a sharp limitation in his possibilities for future advancement.

Notes to Chapter Three

1 Throughout this chapter I maintain all spellings original to Williams’ text, except the long S and the
interchangeable u and v. In addition, I retain Williams’ apparently random and excessive use of italics in the interest of fidelity to his writing style. Therefore, all emphases included in or added to cited material will be underlined.


Other critics focus their attention on close readings of Williams’ texts in an attempt to unearth his thought. In one such work, Edmund Morgan picks instances out of Williams’ writings that demonstrate most clearly Williams’ ideas on the proper role of church and state in society. See Edmund S. Morgan, *Roger Williams: The Church and the State* (New York: Norton, 1967).

At the same time, others have written more generalized biographies, which usually focus upon Williams’ life as a whole, and there are a whole range of titles in this category. Among the many general biographies are included Samuel Brockunier’s *The Irrepressible Democrat: Roger Williams* (New York: Ronald P, 1940) and Cyclone Covey’s *The Gentle Radical: A Biography of Roger Williams* (New York: Macmillan, 1966), generally considered to be the two best; Jeanette Eaton’s *Lone Journey: The Life of Roger Williams* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1944); James Ernst’s *Roger Williams: New England Firebrand* (New York: Macmillan, 1932); and Ola Winslow’s *Master Roger Williams: A Biography* (New York: Macmillan, 1957).

Aside from biographical concerns, the other major thrust of Williams scholarship has been toward explication of Williams’ main thought patterns, often with extensive background on the development of those ideas in seventeenth-century England. Perry Belmont, for example, focuses on Williams as an early advocate of religious toleration, as do Hans Guggisburg, Edwin Gaustad, and Neal Riemer. See Perry Belmont *Political Equality: Religious Toleration From Roger Williams To Thomas Jefferson* (New York: Putnam, 1927); Hans Guggisburg “Religious Freedom and the History of the Christian World in Roger Williams’ Thought” *Early American Literature* 12 (1977): 36-48; Edwin Gaustad *Liberty of Conscience* (cited above) and his “Religious Liberty: Baptists and Some Fine Distinctions"


5. Christopher Felker hints at a connection between Roger Williams and self-fashioning--telling us that his "commentaries are opportunities for Williams, as author, to fashion himself" (638)--but he does not explore the implications of this statement. See Felker's "Roger Williams's Uses of Legal Discourse: Testing Authority in Early New England" New England Quarterly 63.4 (1990): 624-48.


11. See J.C. Davis, pp 20-40, for more detailed definitions of each form of ideal society.


13. Williams points out the power books had with the natives. During a visit with the Narragansetts, Williams
took the opportunity to present information to them about the Christian God. The information prompted a debate between Miantunnômu, the local sachem, and a man visiting from a nearby tribe. The visitor reiterated the traditional position that the souls of the dead go to the Southwest, which Miantunnômu disputed by taking the Christian position Williams had just told him. When the visitor persisted, the sachem pointed out that "he [Williams] hath books and writings, and one which God himselfe made, concerning mens soules, and therefore may well know more than wee that have none" (198-9). All citations come from The Complete Writings of Roger Williams, 7 vols. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963). A Key Into the Language of America is found in Volume I, 61-282.

14. Stellio Cro, in his discussion of Jesuit missionaries, notes that they create works similar to Williams' Key: namely printing parallel texts of Spanish and Guarani. The political benefit to the writer of such a text is obvious. Since "no Spanish official could speak Guarani, they had to rely on the Jesuit missionaries for their communications with the native populations" (69). Roger Williams' text placed him at a similar advantage, relative to authorities in Old and New England. See Cro's The Noble Savage: Allegory of Freedom (Waterloo, ONT: Wilfrid Laurier P, 1990).

15. One might argue that Williams' Separatist sympathies once he arrived in the New World indicate his support for overturning the hierarchies within the Church of England. Despite Williams' insistence on having colonial churches be self-governing, he sought more to keep the realms of church and state separated than he did to change the overall structure of that church. He did, it must be admitted, work to overthrow the structure put into place in Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay. However, he did so because of what he believed were the erroneous conclusions of the authorities regarding soul liberty and the separation of church and state rather than the need to level the church and begin anew.

16. For the most thorough account of Williams' millenialist ideas, see W. Clark Gilpin The Millenarian Piety of Roger Williams (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1979).

17. A close look at Williams' extant writings reveals the reason for present-day confusion about his precise birthdate. Cyclone Covey informs us that in 1632, Williams claimed to be "neerer upwards of 30 then 25;" in 1678, he was "about seventie five years;" but by July 1679, Williams was "neere to Power Score Years of age." Williams was
never specific enough to allow for anything more than an educated guess, and the records for his parish church were lost in London's great fire. The above quotations are attributed to Williams in Cyclone Covey, The Gentle Radical: A Biography of Roger Williams (New York: Macmillan, 1966), 2.

18. Raymond L. Camp asserts, contrary to generally received opinion, that Williams' shorthand instructor was Robert Willis, not family friend John May. Camp claims that "the extent of May's shorthand skill, if any, is unknown," and that "Willis was a popular teacher of the new and practical art, and he was published in five editions by 1617." See Camp's Roger Williams, God's Apostle of Advocacy: Biography and Rhetoric (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen P, 1989), vii.

19. Although Williams' training prepared him for a life in the ministry, he used what he had learned from his father to secure an income for himself and his family during their time in the New World.

20. The information on Masham is found in Chupack's, Roger Williams, 36. There is a dearth of further information about Sir William Masham. While the Dictionary of National Biography contains entries on several Mashams, Sir William is not one of them.

21. John J. Teunissen and Evelyn J. Hinz make much the same point, expanding it to include all early colonists. They note that "as much as the New England colonists deserve to be regarded as the forefathers of American cultural and literary traditions, so much also do they demand to be recognized as the mature productions of the English Renaissance and its cultural and literary traditions" (281).

22. We do know that Roger Williams was familiar with at least Bacon's essays. Williams closely paraphrases from Bacon's Essay 3, Unity of Religion, in the "To the High Court of Parliament" section of Bloudy Tenent. See III, 9 for the passage.


24. Williams was not the first to refer to a native system of governance as monarchical. In his 1612 Map of Virginia, John Smith sees a similar structure amongst the peoples ruled by Powhatan in Virginia. Smith reports that "the forme of their Common wealth is monarchical
government, one as Emperour ruleth over many kings or governours" (I, 173). See The Complete Works of Captain John Smith, 3 vols., Ed. Philip L. Barbour (Chapel Hill: Published for The Institute of Early American History and Culture by U of North Carolina P, 1986). In the face of the great diversity amongst the peoples of native America, it would be ludicrous to assume that all native tribes govern their people in the same manner. The similarity between Smith's and Williams' statements point more to the mindsets of those two authors than to the specific governing practices of either the Narragansetts or the Algonquins.


27. The one exception to this statement was, of course, John Eliot, "the famous apostle to the Massachusetts Indians, who made the New Testament available to them in 1661 in their own dialect" (Chupack, 65). Apparently, after the Pequot War in 1637, "a Pequot servant orphan taught his language to John Eliot at Roxbury, whereupon Eliot started his mission at the Indian village of Nonantum, in the northwest part of present-day Newton and so launched his career as Apostle to the Indians" (Covey, 221).

28. One might argue that Chapter XX, "Of their Government," presents Williams' notion of the proper role of the civil magistracy, as opposed to the role of ecclesiastical authorities. In that Chapter, we learn that "The most usuall Custome amongst them in executing punishments, is for the Sachim either to beat, or whip, or put to death with his owne hand, to which the common sort most quietly submit" (166). What we are told here is not about the proper role the sachim plays in meting out civil punishment, if indeed that is the punishment being given. Instead, we are simply told what his role is in this particular punishment, without regard to its propriety.

29. The obvious exception to Williams' emphasis on soul liberty comes in his George Fox Digg'd Out of His Burrowes (See CW, vol. V). That text arose from Williams' refusal to allow the Rhode Island Quakers not to take up arms in defense of the colony. The Quakers claimed their refusal was a matter of religious conscience and should be respected as such, while Williams retorted that the Quakers

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
were in error, thus their collective conscience was faulty and did not deserve full liberty.

30. The irony that is generally overlooked when considering Williams' belief in soul liberty is that Williams only believed in it when varying shades of Christian belief that somewhat coincided with his own were involved. He did not believe that the natives should be allowed to continue in their pre-contact religious practices, else he would not have been so interested in converting them to Christianity. Nor did Williams later believe that the Rhode Island Quakers should be allowed to refuse to help defend the colony because of religious conscience.

31. Apparently Williams was busy on other ventures as well. In The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody, Williams tells us "that when these discussions were prepared for publicke in London, his [Williams'] time was eaten up in attendance upon the service of the Parliament and City, for the supply of the poor of the City with wood (during the stop of coale from Newcastle, and the mutinies of the poor for firing" (IV, 103).

32. The dispute between Williams and Cotton centered, at least initially, around the issue of persecution for one's religious conscience. Williams believed that his treatment at the hands of the Massachusetts authorities represented such persecution, which Williams vehemently opposed, no matter who it was directed against. Cotton's position, generally reflective of the position of the Massachusetts hierarchy, was that a conscience that was in error sinned against itself, and therefore any persecution was directed against the error, not the conscience.

33. Cyclone Covey recounts an episode which conveys the lengths Williams went to in asserting his positions. Roger Williams and one Ralph Smith felt that "unregenerate men" (54) should not be referred as "Goodman." Covey explains their persistence upon this point thusly: "He and Smith had, in fact, begun to disquiet the town with their insistence about this issue, which grew out of the radical economic transition Plymouth found itself undergoing, in which the Pilgrim leaders raised everybody one social rank higher than he or she could have effected in England. The two Separatist clergymen did not object to raising social rank, but they contended that it went against Scripture for the state to designate who was a good man, goodness being a state of the soul and beyond state jurisdiction" (55).

34. The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution was not the first entry in the debate between Williams and Cotton. That
distinction belongs to the "Letter of John Cotton," published without Cotton's knowledge in London in 1643, though written to Williams several years earlier. Roger Williams' response to Cotton's letter came in 1644, even though Williams claimed to have held his response for years, "waiting if it might please the Father of mercies, more to mollifie and soften, and render more humane and mercifull, the eare and heart of that (otherwise) excellent and worthy man" (I, 316).

Rainer Pineas provides a brief overview of European uses of the dialogue in presenting religious controversies, including Thomas More's Dialogue Concernynge Heresyes. See Pineas' Thomas More and Tudor Polemics (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1968), 81-83.

Bloudy Tenent opens with a reprinting of the infamous letter from the Newgate prisoner (III, 29-39) followed by John Cotton's response to that letter (III, 41-54). After responding to Cotton's answer to the letter (III, 55-220), Williams then includes a response to the Model of Church and Civil Power (III, 221-425), which he believed Cotton had a hand in writing.

All textual references to The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution come from Volume 3 (edited by Samuel L. Caldwell) of the Complete Writings of Roger Williams and are cited within the text of the paper as (III, page number).

Williams seems to have been concerned with soul liberty because of two key events in his early life. First, as a one step to receiving a degree from Cambridge in the late 1620s, students were required to sign an oath of allegiance to the principles of the Anglican Church, including supporting the Book of Common Prayer and the 39 Articles of Faith. Williams apparently had no problem signing the oath before he graduated AB in 1627. However, he left the university without his graduate degree just two years later, because he could not in good conscience sign the document.

The second event occurred in the New World. Williams had been offered a position with the church at Salem in 1635, when, as Glenn LaFantasie phrases it, "the Separatist revival [was] reaching its zenith" (I, 19). However, because they viewed Williams' religious opinions as erroneous and potentially dangerous to the salvation of Salem's church membership, the Massachusetts Bay authorities rebuked Salem for offering the position to Williams without consulting them first, and they applied political pressure to Salem to get them to revoke Williams' position. Although Williams voluntarily left the Salem
CHAPTER FOUR

MIRRORING HIS WORLD, MIRRORING HIMSELF:
SATIRE AND SELF-FASHIONING IN THOMAS MORTON'S
NEW ENGLISH CANAAN

Thus far in this study we have seen two of the many levels of self-fashioning which were at work in the colonial New World. John Smith's fashioning of himself via his collecting of other writers' texts demonstrates his belief in the power of human achievement, both his own, which was based on action, and others', based on the written word. Because of his emphasis on individual human activity, Smith represents one level of the humanistic element of English society. Although Roger Williams' writings can be viewed as primarily religious, he also focuses on an individual--himself. Williams demonstrates the possibilities for self-fashioning in the New World as he presents himself in several different, though not mutually exclusive, roles. As we will see throughout this chapter, Thomas Morton's self-fashioning comes about differently from either Smith's or Williams'. Morton refers to the classical past in his most important strategies for self-fashioning as he shows himself both as a man of moderation and a sharp-tongued satirist. Although Morton works to fashion himself, he ultimately turns his attention from himself outward to several of the individuals instrumental in his persecution in New England. Perhaps that outward turn is one reason why the image many
have of Thomas Morton today is the one that his opponents promoted instead of the image Morton himself promoted.

Scholarship on Thomas Morton trips lightly across the critical horizon. While there is no sustained focus in the work, there is, nevertheless, a wide range of scholarship that covers aspects of Thomas Morton's life and writing as varied as his role as an historian and his appropriation of mythology into New English Canaan.¹ Moreover, some scholars look at New English Canaan through the filters of various generic predilections. For example, Robert J. Gangewere presents New English Canaan as an example of a minor American epic.²

Despite the satiric element of Book III of New English Canaan, just one critical work discusses at all the satire found in Morton’s work. Robert D. Arner informs us that in Books I and II, Morton is seen as the May Lord, who is "a mythopoeic persona who presides over the marriage of man and nature" (218), while Book III presents us with Morton as The Lord of Misrule, the persona Morton adapts as a vehicle for presenting his satirical observations (218-19).³ However, throughout his essay, Arner never articulates what is satiric about New English Canaan. Instead, his essay focuses mainly on the text’s pastoral elements and on Morton’s descriptions of the land and its new inhabitants.
In this chapter I will step beyond Arner's work and discuss in detail the satiric elements of Book III of *New English Canaan*, noting how Morton fits his text into several varying satirical traditions in circulation in England during his time, some of which are extensions of classical versions of satire. Morton's use of satire connects to his self-fashioning, because it demonstrates Morton's uncertainty about which level of self would aid his attempt first to convince Royal authorities to revoke the Massachusetts colony's charter and then to gain a position in a reorganized and rechartered Massachusetts Bay colony.

In writing the *New English Canaan*, Morton worked to interrupt the charter earlier awarded to the Puritans and supplant it with a charter more in line with Morton's sympathies: toward the Crown and against the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay authorities. Even though he was the solicitor in the *quo warranto* case brought against Massachusetts Bay in 1635, Morton still needed a way to plead his own case to be a part of a restructured colony. That is at least part of the purpose of his writing and publishing *New English Canaan*. A corollary to this purpose is the opportunity Morton has to satirize the New England Puritans. Ideally, by exposing the follies of the Puritans Morton would enhance the reputation of Anglicans everywhere and demonstrate his loyalty to the Crown, which might
reward that loyalty with a favorable position in a newly re-chartered Massachusetts colony.

Thomas Morton draws upon his experiences in the New World to aid his self-fashioning, much as John Smith does. While John Smith's reliance upon his experiences stems from his early years as a mercenary traveling through Europe--years that gave him confidence in himself and trust in his perceptions and experiences--Thomas Morton's experiences which were relevant to his self-fashioning all occurred in the New World. His experiences in the New World give Morton a background upon which to build his multi-levelled satire. Being in a land that he has had to force to conform to his expectations (by trapping beaver, clearing land to settle, hunting for food, etc.) allows Morton similarly to bring elements of the satiric tradition into conformity with his purpose in writing *New English Canaan*, which is to point out the incongruity between the royal ideal and the Puritans' practice. Had Morton remained in England and not ventured to the New World, he might well have still written satiric works attacking the Puritans. However, in England he would likely have remained in the shadow of satirists of far more renown and skill--Marston and Jonson, just to name two.

****

One might initially consider Thomas Morton an unfit subject for a study of self-fashioning or self-formation.
After all, we have just one work of Morton's to refer to, and most of what we know of him has been gleaned from other sources contemporary to Morton, most of which are hostile toward him. Born around 1579, probably in the West Country, Morton went on to receive legal training at Clifford's Inn. He spent some time as a practicing lawyer before making his first trip to the New World. While there, Morton often was harassed--initially by the Plymouth Colony and later by those in Massachusetts Bay--because he established successful and friendly trade relations with the natives, and because of the May Day revels he helped establish at his settlement. Thrice arrested (each time on what turned out to be spurious charges) and twice deported back to England by the magistrates, Morton finally settled in the Agamenticus settlement in Maine, where he died in 1647.

Morton falls outside the mainstream of New England's seventeenth-century Puritan society, but he provides a counterpoint to what is often considered to be the dominant mindset at work in New England during this time. While Morton shared some affinities with his persecutors, he was also dissimilar in many ways. Morton was a high church Anglican in a land of Puritans, he established amiable trade and friendly relations with the local natives in opposition to colonists who saw fear and trembling (by the natives) as the key to successful trade, and Morton felt
that appropriate governance of the colonies belonged to the Crown and its appointed authorities rather than to the colonists. Each of Morton’s attitudes reflected in a broad sense the attitudes of the English monarchy. Because of his staunch Anglicanism, Morton found himself allied with James I, Charles I, and Archbishop Laud against the Puritans, and Morton’s life even paralleled some aspects of James’. For instance, Leah Marcus informs us that “James I was a curious and contradictory figure, combining a theoretical devotion to Stoic balance and moderation, a 'mean' in all things, with a seemingly ungovernable appetite for excess” (10). Morton demonstrates a similar dichotomy in his own life. Morton displays his reverence for the golden mean in Chapter One of New English Canaan, discussing it at length there. In Book III, Morton details his attempts to erect a maypole and commemorate with revels the renaming of the Pasonagessit settlement to Ma-re Mount. Morton’s revels include drinking, singing and dancing, and frolicking with the native women, whom Morton exhorts by stating

Lasses in beaver coats come away,  
Yee shall be welcome to us night and day.  
To drinke and be merry, &c (91).  

Although Morton’s life can be said to parallel James’ in some ways and although he moved within the social and political circles in England which attempted to write the master narratives for life both in England and in the
colonies, he found himself to be an outsider in New England. There, the colonists, not the authorities in England, determined the shape of the colony, leaving Thomas Morton outside of the seat of power there, but certainly not beyond its grasp.

Thomas Morton's precarious position in New England forced him to grope his way toward a created self—one that would allow him to vent his spleen yet keep his head—in New English Canaan. Buffeted on all sides by those opposed to him, and despised as a radical pagan by many, Morton reacts in just about the only way possible for him to maintain any semblance of stature in either England or the New World: by presenting himself as a moderate man who reflects the mindset of his era. Although there is no way possible for Morton to convince the Massachusetts and Plymouth authorities that he is a moderate man, success in convincing the Crown's representatives of his moderate nature would increase Morton's stature in their eyes and would allow Morton's satire of the New England Puritans a greater chance for widespread acceptance as truthful.

Morton goes to great pains in the opening chapter of New English Canaan to set up in his readers' minds the idea of moderation. In amplifying his conception of the golden mean, Morton discusses temperateness in climate and centrality of geographical position—both of which New England enjoys—placing the colony in the perfect position

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
for habitability. Morton tells us New England is neither too hot, nor too cold, and it is "by all judicious men, accounted the principall part of all America, for habitation and the commodiousnesse of the Sea, Ships there not being subject to wormes, as in Virginea and other places, and not to be paralleled in all Christendome" (14, my emphasis). By noting that "judicious men" see the advantages of New England over other areas, Morton implies that those in Virginia, for instance, do not see those advantages, making the Virginia colonists less judicious than others. As we will see in the discussion of Book III, however, Morton views few of the inhabitants of New England as judicious either, mainly because of the lack of Christian charity they demonstrate toward others. If the Virginia colonists are not judicious men--because they settled in a humid, swampy area--and the New England colonists Morton criticizes are not judicious either--because of their persecution of anyone disagreeing with them--that seems to leave Thomas Morton as one of a very few judicious men in the New World--an admirable position for an author to place himself in.

By presenting himself as a man of moderation early in New English Canaan, Morton draws his readers into his argument, causing them to accept his position as reasonable long before he presents his anti-puritan satire to us in Book III. If we accept Morton’s early assertions about the
natives and the New World as reasonable, then we must also accept his later assertions about the excesses of the Puritans as truthful and reasonable, else we are guilty of inconsistency in our reasoning. This is a strategy similar to the one Thomas Jefferson employs some 140 years later in *The Declaration of Independence*. Having an entire chapter devoted to moderation early in *New English Canaan* makes the actions of the Plymouth colonists against Morton that he later presents in Book III appear even more extreme than they might otherwise appear, and it allows readers to reinforce for themselves Morton's fashioned image as a moderate man. The rhetorical strategy of moderation helps Morton to ensure that his caustic commentary against the Puritans would not be dismissed and that his cause would be addressed by English authorities and embraced by the rank and file Anglicans and Royalists. Simultaneously, Morton's strategy of moderation sets the stage for his self-fashioning in Book III. Often satirists present themselves as moderate, reasonable people in order to also present the greatest degree of contrast between themselves and the victims of their satire. One need only think of the tone adapted by Jonathan Swift in defense of cannibalizing Irish children in his "A Modest Proposal" to see the satirical efficacy of setting a tone of moderation.

Beyond presenting himself as a moderate man, Morton carefully placed himself in opposition his adversaries in
New England. As part of his defining of himself in opposition to the Plymouth and Massachusetts colonists, Thomas Morton represents himself as an individual conscience fighting the collectivizing impulses of the authorities around him. In Book III of *New English Canaan*, Morton presents himself as the victim of the excesses of the Puritans' collective identity. Morton finds himself one of those who are "without," as he terms it. He is "without" for several reasons, including his Anglicanism, his success in the beaver trade, and his establishment of revels at Merry Mount. By repeatedly referring to himself as "mine host of Mare Mount" while giving every Puritan authority figure a satirical name, Morton at once displays his individuality—he is one going against the rule of others—and his subsumption by the collective identity—he alone has no "proper" name. By causing himself to appear as an anonymous "host" and as an outsider, Thomas Morton also sets himself up to be the "impartial" satirical observer of Puritan society in New England. Furthermore, by placing all references to himself in the third person, Morton diverts attention from the fact that he is the author of his story in this book, thus removing Morton from his narrative and giving him the appearance of objectivity and the space to openly criticize the colonial authorities and fashion himself.
Thomas Morton’s *New English Canaan; Or, New Canaan* was published in 1637 by the Amsterdam-based printer Jacob Frederick Stam. Donald Connor tells us that although there is "an entry in the Registers of the Stationers of London for November 18, 1633, next to the name ‘Charles Greene’ pertaining to a book 'called New England's Canaan[,] composed in 3. bookes &c by THOMAS MOORETON'" (31), there is no direct evidence that Morton’s work was ever published in England. For years many scholars believed that Greene actually published the work in England, mainly because Peter Force printed *New English Canaan* in volume two of his *Tracts and Other Papers Relating Principally to...America...* with Greene listed as publisher, and a 1632 date, on the title page. However, a scholar analyzing the various extant copies of *New English Canaan* bearing the Greene imprint concluded "that the date was written in, that the paper on which the title page was printed was different from that used throughout the rest of the book, and that several words were spelled differently from the same words on the title page of the British Museum copy" (DeCosta, cited in Connor 32). Minor Wallace Major believes Morton published his *New English Canaan* in Amsterdam for economic reasons and because the satire against Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonists in Book III would give an English publisher pause, not wanting the
wrath of the colonists, or their supporters in England, to come against him (Major, cited in Connor 136 n.6). However, if Morton were really that concerned about political fallout from publishing *New English Canaan* in England, would he have entered it in the Stationer’s Register back in 1633?

Let me suggest an alternative reason for Morton’s publishing *New English Canaan* in Amsterdam. A man possessing both the knowledge of the law and the sense of satire and humor that Thomas Morton apparently did would see tremendous strategic advantage to publishing an indictment of the New England Puritans in Amsterdam. William Bradford and many of the Plymouth settlers had sought refuge in Holland from the persecution they suffered in England, and in Amsterdam, many refined the religious ideas they eventually brought to New England. And, I am assuming, the targets of Morton’s criticism would not fail to recognize the coup an Amsterdam publication represented. This assertion does not undermine Morton’s recognition of the power his adversaries wielded in England and the New World. Instead, it represents Morton’s recognition of that power and his attempts to present as direct an attack as possible against them. If, as Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse assert, the English "state lost control of published information" in the 1640s (114), one can assume that the state exerted control in the mid-1630s, when
Morton published his text. Since Morton was a Royalist and the crown controlled publication, it is unlikely that New English Canaan would have been strongly censored had it been published in England. Had Morton published his text in England, though, it could easily have been construed by his enemies as an attempt to sway the outcome of the quo warranto proceedings against Massachusetts Bay which Morton had helped instigate. By publishing New English Canaan in Amsterdam, Morton gave the appearance of impartiality in the legal question at hand, while scoring a symbolic victory against the colonists.

The rationale I have suggested for Morton's choice of publication location seems to me to offer a more realistic explanation of Morton's situation than any other. It also suggests that Morton has a more important role in the publication of his work than has previously been believed. Recognizing Morton's active role in the writing and publication of New English Canaan helps to suggest the possibility that many New World writers had influence upon the publication of their works, in much the same way as they attempted to have control over the self-conceptions they released to the public.

While my main focus is Thomas Morton's implementation of the satiric traditions available to him in his efforts to self-fashion, I do not intend to imply that satire is the only element at work in New English Canaan. Book I of
Morton's text is primarily concerned with presenting information about the natives in Morton's region. We learn, for example, about native personalities, their strong sense of honor and reputation, and their reverence for the elderly. Morton also strives to show balance in this section, though his "balance" in presenting both positive and negative aspects of native life and culture is more likely the result of his Christian and English prejudices than any sense of objectivity. For instance, any time Morton relates an occurrence he cannot explain, that event is dismissed as satanic. In one example, Morton reports the story of an Englishman suffering from a swollen hand. A native took the man into the woods, and when the Englishman reappeared, his hand was cured. Morton tells us this cure came "with the helpe of the devill (as may be conjectured)" (26). Thomas Morton's rhetorical positioning relative to the natives is never fixed for long, demonstrating a similar level of flexible positional superiority to that of Roger Williams. Morton's shifting is determined by the particular self he represents at a given point in his text. Through the course of New English Canaan, Morton shows himself in three main roles: expert on the natives, promoter of the New World, and social satirist. That is not to say that the three different roles Morton assumes throughout New English Canaan are always mutually exclusive of each other, but rather it
points out the difficulty any self-fashioner would have in representing himself in multiple roles simultaneously. Those roles are likely not completely separate from each other, because each of them achieves generally the same effect: placing Thomas Morton at the center of colonial activity while attempting to influence Royal opinion against the Massachusetts colonists.

While Thomas Morton’s positioning against the Puritans never changes— he always despises their actions— he often slides himself around in various positionings relative to the local natives. He thinks highly enough of the natives to engage in mutually beneficial trade with them, yet he often denigrates their lifeways, and their very existences in New English Canaan. In Chapter III of Book I, Morton briefly relates a story about a "great mortality" (18) among the natives. However, after detailing some of the suffering the natives underwent, Morton abruptly shifts tone again by noting that because of the decimation of the tribe, "the place is made so much the more fitt, for the English Nation to inhabit in, and erect in it Temples to the Glory of God" (19), presenting the view that the natives stood in the way of the advancement of the Christian English nation. At another point, Morton claims that, in many ways, the natives’ actions are superior to the activities of the English, yet he reveals his view of them as simple and inferior to himself, telling us that "if
any thinge bring them to civility, it will be the use of Salte, to have food in store, which is a chiefe benefit in a civilized Commonwealth" (31). In Morton’s eyes, the native peoples are able to be made into civilized beings simply through the introduction of salt into their culinary repertoire. Morton presents a convenient mercantile solution in attempting to open new markets for sales of salt for the preservation of meat, but that solution hardly demonstrates the respect for native culture that Roger Williams displays in his _Key Into the Language of America_. On several occasions Williams admires aspects of native life as they actually were rather than as filtered through his biases as an Englishman, while Morton seems to prefer to have the natives become English.

In Book I, then, Thomas Morton fashions himself into an expert on the natives, providing information about their culture and their day-to-day existence, much as John Smith does in his _Map of Virginia_ and as many other promotional writers did. He also causes readers to view him as a moderate man, a posture that could help him in the court case against the Massachusetts Bay colonists and in his satiric attacks against them later in _New English Canaan_.

In Book II of his text, Morton spends a great deal of time promoting the material advantages of the land. In Chapter II of Book II, Morton enumerates nearly twenty different types of trees he found in New England, and he
generally provides several potential uses for each tree he presents. For example, Morton notes that the spruce tree is common, "especially in the Northerne parts of the Country; and they have bin approved by workemen in England, to be more tough, then those that they have out of the east country: from whence wee have them for masts and yards of shippes" (44). While Morton can be said to be simply promoting settlement and investment in the New World, he also indirectly promotes himself as an authority on the area, in much the same way that Smith and Williams both do. Morton’s analysis also could lead his readers back in England to ask "who else is providing such useful information to the English about New England?" Certainly not the Separatists, whose excesses Morton presents in Book III, and certainly not other writers of promotional tracts, like the Puritan sympathizer William Wood, whose *New England’s Prospect* (1634) Morton ridicules on several occasions by referring to it as a "wooden prospect" (44). As Morton demonstrates this role of authority to his readers, he fashions himself as such relative to the alien status of the other New England colonists. Without New Englanders’ example of inaction on this front, Morton’s role as authority would not be as effective as it is, because his authoritative voice would simply be one among many others.
Much like his oppositional self-fashioning in Book II, Book III of *New English Canaan* is largely Morton's defining of himself in opposition to the New England Puritans, whom he refers to on many occasions as the "Separatists." In that third book, Morton relates in painstaking detail his treatment at the hands of his adversaries in New England along with their excesses against others. For instance, we learn that several "Separatists" were sent to Merry Mount to arrest Morton. When none of the men would take Morton to the ship after his arrest, they instead "set mine Host upon an Island without gunne, powther, or shotte, or dogge, or so much as a knife to get any thing to feede upon or any other cloathes to shelter him with at winter then a thinne suite which hee had at one time" (97). Fortunately for Morton the local natives brought provisions to him to aid his survival, which Morton acknowledged by noting "so full of humanity are these infidels before these Christians" (97). His observations about the "Separatists" in Book III also contribute to the raising of Morton's worth in the eyes of his audience in England. As a Royalist and an Anglican, Morton might expect his catalogue of Puritan excesses to fuel the zeal of Archbishop Laud's moves against the Puritans of both Old and New England, and it did. By detailing the practices of the New England churches, Morton makes obvious the discrepancies between
Anglican practice as authorized by the Crown and the actual activities of the colonists.

Thomas Morton wrote Book III of *New English Canaan* within a relatively short-lived, yet prolific English tradition of anti-puritan satire, the great outpouring of which began in response to the publication in the late 1580s of several texts under the name Martin Marprelate. The Marprelate texts generally attacked the corruption of the Anglican church, and they resulted in numerous counter-attacks on the reformers who wrote under the pseudonym of Marprelate. As William P. Holden notes, the many responses to Marprelate "fail generally to refute Martin's charges of corruption in the church and, still more seriously, they fall far short of Martin in force, wit, and variety of expression" (46). What is worse, Holden goes on to report, is that "with few exceptions [the responses] depend on abuse, obscenity, quips, and puns, many of which have become meaningless with the passing of time" (46).

Despite the weak response in prose to the Marprelate tracts, dramatists fared much better against the Puritan, as "stage satire of the Puritan reach[e]d, in richness of detail, variety of character, and wealth of situation, a position often superior to that in prose or nondramatic verse" (101). In the main, Holden adverts, there were four charges made against the Puritans: they were extremists, they accepted the Bible as the literal word of God, they
were precise or overscrupulous, they were hypocrites (40-41). Each of these charges came out at some point in the satiric literature. Playwrights ranging from D’Avenant to Dekker, from Beaumont and Fletcher to Middleton, from Shackerley Marmion to Thomas Randolph, all attempted to satirize different aspects of the peculiar Puritan personality. However, by far the most accomplished satirist of the Puritans was Ben Jonson. Jonson’s prodigious learning gave him a wide range of allusions to include in his writings, and his broad reading exposed him to a great many styles which he often incorporated into his works.

The poet William Carlos Williams, in his provocative work *In the American Grain*, notes that *New English Canaan* was written in England by Morton, "an acquaintance of Ben Jonson and others at The Mermaid" (79). Williams does not provide documentation for his assertion, nor could I find any reference in my research on Morton and Jonson to a demonstrable personal link between the two men. However, Thomas Morton’s *New English Canaan* evidences some affinities with Jonson’s works, so at the very least, Morton was familiar with the form Jonson’s work took. For instance, Jonsonian satire is often didactic, while Morton’s satire in Book III of *New English Canaan* is occasionally didactic. Morton’s didacticism, like Jonson’s, demonstrates weaknesses of the Puritan position.
Throughout Book III, Morton makes parenthetical comments designed to teach us about the flaws in the Puritan character. At one point, Morton tells us that Captain Littleworth, or John Endicott, "thinking none so worthy as himselfe, tooke upon him infinitely: and made warrants in his owne name (without relation to his Majesties authority in that place,) and summoned a generall apparance at the worshipfull towne of Salem" (105, my emphasis). Endicott ignored the king's authority in the region and, in fact, assumed that authority for himself when he called the meeting at Salem. Morton also uses parenthetical interruption to insert his own editorial comments about the events in New England. In Chapter XV of Book III, Morton relates how the Plymouth colonists planned to re-arrest him after his initial escape from Captain Shrimp (Miles Standish) and his forces. We learn that Standish "takes eight persons more to him, and (like the nine Worthies of New Canaan) they imbarque with preparation against Ma-re Mount, where this Monster of a man (as theire phrase was) had his denne" (95). Here, we see Morton as the victim of the Puritans, one man attacked by at least nine adversaries, and we see Morton's thoughts on their opinion of him.

At another level, Jonson uses symbolic names for his characters, and he links those names with a specific trait of the character. In Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*, the main
Puritan character is named Zeal-of-the-Land Busy. According to William P. Holden, Jonson's attack on Busy, and by extension all Puritans, "was centered on the immoderation of the Puritan and the old charge of preciseness" (140-41). Busy, for instance, finds himself at the fair trying to convince other fairgoers that his version of morality is one they should also adhere to. After his offstage admonitions to Knockem and Knockem's promise to "take your counsel" (III, vi, 23), Busy relates the particulars of his moral philosophy. He tells us that long hair, it is an ensign of pride, a banner, and the world is full of those banners, very full of banners. And bottle-ale is a drink of Satan's, a diet-drink of Satan's, devised to puff us up and make us swell in this latter age of vanity, as the smoke of tobacco to keep us in mist and error; but the fleshly woman (which you call Urs'la) is above all to be avoided, having the marks upon her, of the three enemies of man: the world, as being in the Fair; the devil, as being in the fire; and the flesh, as being herself (III, vi, 27-36).

Throughout Bartholomew Fair, Busy's precision regarding religious and moral matters is overturned by the other characters and, often, by Busy's own actions and words.

Thomas Morton also appropriates Jonson's symbolic naming practices in New English Canaan. Morton mingles a presentation of the events surrounding his controversy with the colonists at Plymouth and Massachusetts with his satiric attacks against them. For instance, as we learn about how the Separatists planned and executed their attack on Morton and his settlement, we also learn Morton's
comical names of some of his adversaries. To help to
denigrate his adversaries, Morton provides them with
satirical names; he calls Endicott "Captain Littleworth,"
and Miles Standish is "Captain Shrimp." In both cases, the
names reflect Morton's disdain for his targets, and those
names reflect aspects of Endicott's and Standish's
personalities that Morton wished to emphasize. We have
already seen Morton's most pointed attack against Endicott,
and in Morton's satire, Standish fares little better than
Endicott. Captain Shrimp, of course, refers to Standish's
diminutive stature, but it also satirizes the size of
Standish's influence relative to his perceptions of his own
importance. In much the same way that John Dryden's naming
Thomas Shadwell "Macflecknoe" burdens Shadwell with the
weight of the poor poetry of Richard Flecknoe, so does
Morton's naming of Standish burden that man with all the
connotations of shrimpism--particularly, in this case, the
tiny degree of reputation and influence. After Morton
escaped from Standish, who had been sent to arrest him,
"Captaine Shrimp, the first Captaine in the Land (as hee
supposed,) must doe some new act to repaire this losse, and
to vindicate his reputation, who had sustained blemish, by
this oversight" (95). In his symbolic naming practices,
Morton attempts, as Jonson did before him, to make his
adversaries appear ridiculous, thus undercutting any
authority they might have, in either England or the New World.

In addition, Morton calls John Winthrop "Joshua Temperwell." The name Joshua carries a great deal of significance, because Joshua succeeded Moses as leader of the Israelites and was commissioned by God to bring them into the promised land. Just as Joshua crossed the river Jordan "to the land which I [God] am giving to them, to the sons of Israel" (Josh 1:2, NAS), so did Winthrop and his followers cross the Atlantic aboard the Arabella to establish a godly community in the New World, a land they believed God had provided for them. The name Temperwell also seems to be an ironic twist, based upon how Morton presents Winthrop's actions in the colony. One would expect a person named Temperwell to maintain a moderate even-handed approach to all aspects of life and governance—to be well-tempered, or temperate. However, Winthrop is far from such a moderate man in Morton's account. We initially encounter Winthrop as he brings his authority and rule to the New World. Morton asserts that Winthrop and his fellow travellers

are the men that come prepared to ridd the Land, of all pollution. These are more subtile, then the Cunning, that did refuse a goodly heap of gold. These men have brought a very snare indeed; and now mine Host must suffer. The book of Common Prayer which hee used to be despised: and hee must not be spared (108-9).
A second mention of Winthrop casts further aspersion on his well-temperedness. When one Philip Ratcliffe (aka Innocence Pairecloath), "a member of the Church of England" Morton tells us, allowed several Puritans to assume debt with him and later asked for repayment, none was forthcoming. To this, Ratcliffe responded angrily by questioning godliness of the Puritan church. Endecott and others took exception to Ratcliffe's remarks and charged him with heresy. When Ratcliffe was covenanted before Winthrop and the other members of the Court, he was found guilty and sentenced by them to have his tongue bored through; his nose slit; his face branded; his eares cut; his body to be whip'd in every severall plantation in their Jurisdiction: and a fine of forty pounds impo'd with perpetuall banishment (113).

Even with the pleading of Sir Christopher Gardiner on Ratcliffe's behalf, Winthrop only reduced the sentence partially, enforcing just "that whipping, and the cutting of parte of his eares [and] to send Innocence going, with the losse of all his goods to pay the fine imposed, and perpetuall banishment out of their Lands of New Canaan in terrorem populi" (113-14). In this instance, "Temperwell" refers to the vitality or wellness of Winthrop's temper, rather than to Winthrop being well-tempered or moderate.

Morton's symbolic naming practices relate back to his original fashioning of himself as a moderate man in Book I. As we view Morton as moderate, both the unusual names he
gives his adversaries and their extreme positions stand out even more. Morton reinforces our view of him as moderate as he fashions the other colonists as his exact opposite. While, as Greenblatt reminds us, all self-fashioning is done in opposition to some "threatening Other" (9), Morton's case is different from those of Smith and Williams, both of whom also fashion themselves in opposition to others--Smith to the "gentlemen" of his colony and Williams to John Cotton and the Massachusetts authorities. Morton differs from Smith and Williams in exhaustively discussing those to whom he opposes himself. While Smith mentions his adversaries, he mainly focuses on himself and his actions. Williams also presents Cotton's positions to us, but he spends the majority of his text in a point-by-point refutation of those ideas. However, Morton focuses as much on fashioning his adversaries as he does on fashioning himself, which is a function of the genre Morton uses for his own self-fashioning: satire. It would be difficult for any writer to satirize others without mentioning them.

Thomas Morton's satire, then, can be accurately described as Jonsonian. What other categories of satire might it fall into? In a broad sense, Book III of New English Canaan is also a Menippean satire. As Northrop Frye describes it, "Menippean satire appears to have developed out of verse satire through the practice of
adding prose interludes, though one of its recurrent features (seen in Peacock) is the use of incidental verse\(^\text{26}\) (309).\(^\text{26}\) Around the time of Morton's era, and on into our own, the Menippean satire metamorphosed into a prose satire categorized by interruptions of verse. Book III of \textit{New English Canaan} clearly fits into a broad definition of the Menippean satire, as the main text is interrupted by a verse epitaph, five poems,\(^\text{27}\) and a drinking song. At the same time however, Morton's work can be viewed as a pastiche of different satiric forms. For instance, it can be viewed as a satiric monologue, but it occurs in third person rather than the more traditional first person. \textit{New English Canaan} is partly satiric invective, in that Morton rails bitterly against individuals, but that is not always the main focus. As David Worcester points out, generally "satiric invective shows detachment, indirection, and complexity in the author's attitude" (19). Thomas Morton, though, is not always able to remain detached or indirect when criticizing the Puritans. Morton's work is also partly didactic, because he attempts to teach his readers in England about the excesses of the New England Puritans. However, Morton's didactic purposes are only occasionally evident and are often supplanted by invective. And only in the broadest sense possible could \textit{New English Canaan} be called corrective. This text is much more descriptive than prescriptive, but Morton frames his discussion so readers
will easily understand the proper correctives for the excesses he describes.

What do we learn about Thomas Morton and his self-fashioning through this understanding of the various levels of his satire? At one level, Morton can be viewed as an educated man, well-informed about the classical art of satire. Secondly, noting the many levels at which Morton's satire operates, and especially noting that it operates at nearly all those levels incompletely, informs us that Morton was ambivalent as to how to go about fashioning himself fully in his text. Had he had a clearer sense of a self that he wanted to fashion, Morton might have been able to focus more on that self and less on his opponents. Because he did not possess that clear sense, we can hardly wonder why the Puritan version of Thomas Morton—as a slave to pleasurable excess—rather than the version he fashioned himself—as a moderate man—is the one most of us are familiar with today.

Aside from his obvious place within the tradition of satirical writing, Morton places himself within several other traditions which came out of imperialist discourses. For instance, Morton speculates on the origins of the natives, concluding that they are descendants of Brutus, after his departure from Latium (18). Also, he includes several sections on the lifeways of the natives, following such examples as Captain John Smith and William Wood.
Furthermore, Morton discusses the bounty of the land he inhabits, providing information about the commodities available to the English for their use and consumption, like his predecessor Columbus and his contemporary Wood. Morton also places himself within the authority of writers from antiquity, citing Cicero and Ovid, among others, as support for his assertions.28

Being a part of so many different rhetorical traditions gives Morton the appearance of being a kind of intellectual, or at the very least a man educated enough to be aware of the traditions in circulation during his time, which places him in opposition to many of his adversaries. Morton notes that the Separatists are opposed to the kind of learning he displays in New English Canaan, and he pokes fun at those without substantial education as he introduces "Rise Oedipus," noting that the poem, "being Enigmattically composed pusselled the Seperatists most pitifully to expound it" (90). He challenges them to solve the riddle of his "Rise Oedipus" poem. According to his account, they cannot, so he glosses it for them and for us (a little anyway).29 Morton, of course, assumes a certain level of literacy in his audience, which explains the large number of classical and biblical allusions in his text. Without the requisite level of literacy, readers would not be able to comprehend "Rise Oedipus" and a good bit of the rest of New English Canaan.
Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse posit that similar assumptions about audience literacy were made by members of the Royal Society as they espoused what later became known as the plain style of writing. The ascendancy of the plain style, we learn, is seen as "the emergence of a new language of power, one that could not only expand the political sphere well beyond court and Parliament but also restrict the production of truth to those who possessed a particular brand of literacy" (117). In other words, the emergence of the plain style will bring language to a more common level, but the plain style will not totally democratize writing. If one was illiterate, the intricacies of style would not matter at all.

Twenty-five years before the Royal Society was formed in the reorganization of the Philosophical Society, Thomas Morton achieves a similar rhetorical effect. *New English Canaan* makes his case in print against the excesses of the Puritans, despite their attempts to banish him from their midst. Morton simultaneously makes his case publicly and limits its accessibility to many members of that public, while also using a learned and deliberately opaque language in "Rise Oedipus" as a new language of power--his intellectual power over the Puritans. In Chapter 27 of Book III, Morton details the practices of the church in New England, and that chapter seems to be directed to Archbishop Laud as evidence of the heretical activities of
the colonists. In presenting the New England church's practices in detail, Morton makes the practices clear enough, but only for those who possess literacy and the knowledge of the controversy between the Anglicans and the Puritans to begin with.

*****

There are several levels of self-fashioning occurring in *New English Canaan*. First, we come to view Thomas Morton as a credible and dedicated reporter on the lifeways of the natives in the region. Throughout Book I, Morton tells us about various aspects of native lives, generally from his own observation. John Smith and Roger Williams do likewise in their works, and each sets great store upon personal observation. Both Williams and Morton can be said to demonstrate what Kevin Dunn calls "classical modesty," which "basses itself on a simple inversion: the less physical, social, or political power one presents oneself as having, the more rhetorical power one has" (6).¹⁰

The "man on the scene" posture Morton assumes early in his text could easily mislead readers to assume the same level of careful observation and veracity in Book III, which would cause them to unquestioningly accept Morton's characterization of the Puritans. However, as we observe the satire in that section of Morton's text, we can also see the partisanship that triggered the satire. We can learn an important lesson about Morton by noting the
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variety of satiric elements in his work: Morton was a learned man and he valued and knew how to utilize his education. That becomes evident in the numerous classical and biblical references in *New English Canaan*, and it places him in opposition to many of the Puritans he ridicules. While some New Englanders had received University educations--John Winthrop, for example, spent two years at Cambridge--many others, William Bradford included, did not, and Morton capitalizes on that fact.

Morton enhances his education by intertwining it with a satiric point, and his satiric point demonstrates the degree to which he was involved with the events of his time. By attempting to bring to light the folly of one possible method for running the new colonies, Morton implied that there was a better way to establish a new nation in New England. That his call was silenced is less a denigration of his ideas than it is a testimony to the ability of the New Englanders to enforce their vision onto future generations.

Because there are a wide variety of styles and levels of satire in his text, Thomas Morton’s *New English Canaan* takes us beyond works utilizing just one branch of satire and into a more broadly based satire that allows for authors to fuse seemingly disparate elements into a satiric whole. While Book III presents an episodic tale reminiscent of the picaresque tradition, the satiric vision
appears to remain consistent throughout Morton's text--anti-Puritan. In some ways, *New English Canaan* can be viewed as novelistic, particularly because of its fusion of divergent elements and because of its sense of unity in the narrative. However, this text is certainly also Rabelaisian in its wide-ranging allusive nature and in its sometimes bitter personal invective. In fashioning both himself and his text in the manner he does, Thomas Morton demonstrates a predilection to view the classical models as authoritative, and he positions himself as precursor to the neoclassicism which was to flourish in both England and its colonies in the eighteenth century.

Morton's nearly constantly shifting self-construction throughout *New English Canaan* makes him the most successful of all my subjects at taking full advantage of the fluidity of the self-fashioning process. As Morton dances back and forth between authority and alien, he demonstrates both the possibilities and the limitations of a purely fluid construction of self. On the one hand, Morton's shifting self-construction indicates the freedom he has to adapt to situations occurring around him. He can attempt to place himself into the most advantageous position possible, regardless of who opposes him in much the same way that Roger Williams is able to. However, having a completely fluid self-construction also allows one's opponents the opportunity to negate one's construction at almost any
time, because that construction has little to anchor it firmly into public consciousness. Hence, the New England Puritans are the ones who provide the image of Thomas Morton that most are familiar with—the heathen who threatened the continued welfare of New England—rather than Thomas Morton himself providing that image for us.

Notes to Chapter Four


4. In this study, I broadly define satire as a work which causes its readers or audience to recognize and possibly laugh at the folly of our fellow human beings, regardless of whether that recognition and/or laughter stems from a pointed, personal satire or a broader-based social satire.

5. While the Puritan attitude towards trade with the natives differed from Morton's activities, Morton believed that one reason the Massachusetts colonists persecuted him
was because his fur trading post at Merry Mount was so successful. As Morton relates it, "the Separatists envying the prosperity, and hope of the Plantation at Ma-re Mount (which they perceaved beganne to come forward, and to be in a good way for gaine in the Beaver trade) conspired together against mine Host especially, (who was the owner of that Plantation) and made up a party against him; and mustred up what aide they could; accounting of him, as a great Monster" (93).

All biographical information is taken from Donald Connor Thomas Morton, Twayne United States Authors Series No. 146 (New York: Twayne, 1969).

The most famous manifestation of this attitude toward the New England Puritans is Perry Miller's The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century (New York: Macmillan, 1939). In the second paragraph of this monumental work, Miller asserts that "the first three generations in New England paid almost unbroken allegiance to a unified body of thought," and "individual differences among particular writers or theorists were merely minor variations within a general frame" (vii). Miller's works on the New England "mind" continue to provide fuel for scholarly delving into early New England.


All references to New English Canaan are from the text published in Peter Force's Tracts and Other Papers Relating Principally to the Origin, Settlement, and Progress of the Colonies in North America... Washington: Printed by P. Force, 1836-46. New English Canaan appears in Volume II as the fifth selection. Each selection in Force is individually paginated, so future in-text parenthetical references to the text will simply indicate page number. In each case you may assume the quotation appears in Vol II, No. 5 of Force, unless otherwise indicated.

Although the accuracy of the title page of Force's edition of New English Canaan is suspect, the text itself is identical to that found in other editions of Morton's work, except for the alteration of the long S. I rely on Force's edition because it is currently the most easily accessible to scholars. The 1883 edition of New English Canaan, Charles Francis Adams, ed. (Boston: The Prince Society, 1883) contains useful commentary by the editor, but it was not nearly as widely circulated as Force's compilation.
Of course, the Anglican faction in England did not retain a high level of power for long. By the time Morton published *New English Canaan* in 1637, J.A. Sharpe points out, Charles I's period of Personal Rule had entered its eighth year, and "his attempt to introduce the English prayer book into his northern kingdom provoked first a riot in Edinburgh, then a national rebellion" (17). See J.A. Sharpe's *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550-1760* (London: Edward Arnold, 1987).

Although each colony, including Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay was granted a charter which usually outlined the goals for and expectations of the colony, the wording of the charter certainly did not ensure that the colony would follow it. Much of the time, the colony itself decided its own method of governance regardless of the provisions of its charter. Massachusetts Bay, for instance, simply did not return its charter to England despite being ordered to do so by a court decision rendered in favor of the King against the colony in 1637.

Obviously Thomas Jefferson did not employ satire in the *Declaration*. However, he did begin that text with a moderate, carefully reasoned approach to his audience, which he followed up with his more radical call to separation. Once readers accepted his opening assertion that "whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends [life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness], it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it" (232), Jefferson proceeded to detail precisely how George III trampled upon the rights of the colonists, and he closed the *Declaration* as we all know, with the announcement that the colonies were now no longer subject to the monarchy of Great Britain. The full text of the *Declaration of Independence*, including the alterations made to Jefferson's original draft, is found in Nina Baym, et al., eds., *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*, Shorter 2nd. ed. (New York: Norton, 1986), 232-37.


15. Even during the Commonwealth, Royalists were able to publish works supporting their political positions, but they usually had to mask their sentiments. See Lois Potter's *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990).
Although Morton refers to the colonists in New England as Separatists, technically, that name is inaccurate. Though many believe the New England colonists displayed a single mind regarding religious matters, a closer look reveals a variety of perspectives. Darrett B. Rutman expands the ideas of Perry Miller in *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1933) and of Edmund S. Morgan in *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea* (New York: New York UP, 1963) by asserting only "that basic congregational notions were familiar to some of the leaders of the 1630 migration, but not all, and the main reason for their leaving England was not necessarily to effect congregationalism, but a broad desire to live a godly life" (285). In other words, Rutman posits, one clearly articulated dogma regarding congregationalism, separatism, or any other aspect of religious life in New England did not exist. See Rutman's *Winthrop's Boston: A Portrait of a Puritan Town, 1630-1649* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute for Early American History and Culture by the U of North Carolina P, 1965). Just one contemporary example that helps illustrate Rutman's point is Roger Williams' refusal to accept a calling to the church in Boston, noting that he "durst not officiate to an unseparated people...as I found them to be." This despite Williams being considered "a godly minister" by Winthrop and others. Qtd. in Raymond L. Camp, *Roger Williams, God's Apostle of Advocacy: Biography and Rhetoric* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellon P, 1989), 113.

Among many others, see *Anti-Martinus* (1589); *A Whip for an Ape* (n.d.); *Martins Months Mind* (1589); *A Mirrour for Martinists* (1589); *Pappye with an Hatchett* (1589); *A Countercuffe Given to Martin Junior* (1589), *The Returne of the Renowned Cavaliero Pasquill of England* (1589) and *The First Parte of Pasouils Apologie* (1590), all by Thomas Nashe; and *A Friendly Admonition to Martine Marprelate and His Mates* (1590). For discussion of each of these texts and other examples of early English satire against the Puritans, see William P. Holden, *Anti-Puritan Satire, 1572-1642* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1954), esp. Chapter Two, 44-93.


24. Others in Morton's cast of characters include Matthew Craddock as "Mathias Charterparty," Dr. Samuel Fuller as "Eacus" and "Doctor Noddy," and John Grant as "Master Weathercock."

25. Gilbert Highet asserts that there are three broad categories of satire: monologue, parody, and the distorting mirror stories. Within those broad groupings can be discovered a wide range of subgroups of satiric works, some of which I briefly mention in conjunction with New English Canaan. See Gilbert Highet, The Anatomy of Satire (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1962). David Worcester also notes three broad categories of satire, each of which Highet roughly corresponds to in his own formulation of the genre. Worcester's categories are invective, burlesque, and irony, and detailed considerations of them can be found in his still-important work The Art of Satire (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1940).


27. The five poems, in order, are "Carmen Elegiacum" (88-89), "Rise, Oedipus" (90), "Baccanall Triumph" (98-100), "What ailes Pigmalion" (111), and the sonnet "Wolfes in Sheeps clothing" (122).

28. Morton asserts that "It has been a common receaved opinion from Cicero, that there is no people so barbarous, but have some worship," (21) and that "it is the Stone so much commended by Ovid" (57). In other instances, Morton refers to Tully, Aristotle, and others.

29. Robert Arner sets "Rise Oedipus" into historical context, revealing Morton's use of a catalogue of sea
deities and noting similar catalogues in works by Morton’s contemporaries: Milton’s *Comus*, Poussin’s "The Triumph of Neptune and Amphitrite," and Spenser’s *The Faerie Queen*. Arner also questions Morton’s gloss of the poem, noting that "most of the explanation is delivered in a mocking and ironic tone of voice, so that it is difficult to say for certain what Morton’s attitude toward his own explication is" (163 n. 3). See Robert D. Arner, "Mythology and the Maypole of Merrymount: Some Notes on Thomas Morton’s ‘Rise Oedipus,’" *Early American Literature* 6.2 (1971): 156-164. Like Arner, I believe that if we accept Book III of *New English Canaan* as a satire, then we must also judge "Rise Oedipus" and Morton’s explication of it as potentially (actually most likely) misleading.

CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

When John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton landed on the shores of the New World, they encountered a land whose possibilities they did not fully comprehend. Each of them, however, seemed to sense the potential the colonial arena presented for him. John Smith inserted himself into the preparations for the initial efforts at colonizing Virginia as a logical extension of his prior life of action. Roger Williams followed close on the heels of the initial settlers in Massachusetts Bay in his search for a pure church and a godly community. And Thomas Morton came to the New World to advance the colonization efforts led by Sir Ferdinando Gorges and to establish trade for his own benefit.

The New World colonial arena provided a profound impact on those who wrote to fashion themselves, because it allowed writers the opportunity for fluid constructions of self, rather than binding them into the more rigidified power structure of self/authority/alien that Greenblatt proposes. Each of the writers I have studied takes advantage of that fluidity in different ways. John Smith constantly reinvents himself in the attempt to gain stature in the English colonial effort. Smith, however, is ultimately unsuccessful, because although he is able to maintain some control over the self-image he projects in his writings, that image does not help Smith achieve what
he hoped it would. Roger Williams represents the greatest range of the potential of self-fashioning as seen in his moves through various religious sects during his life. Like Smith, Williams provides an overriding structure for his sense of self as he uses the utopia to help to construct his version of the ideal religious society. That overall structure helped Williams to maintain his focus on religious matters, and it ultimately aided Williams in securing a charter for the Providence Plantation. Thomas Morton's self-fashioning is the most free form of all my subjects in that he shifts positionings a great deal, but he does not attempt to bring those differing positions into some sense of coherence as both Smith and Williams ultimately do. By diffusing his self-constructions into so many different directions, Morton allows his adversaries the opportunity to dictate what Morton's image would finally be, because his opponents presented a unified front in promulgating Morton's image as a heathen.

The very different attempts at self-fashioning that Smith, Williams, and Morton demonstrate indicate that by studying other colonialist figures' fashionings of self as fluid, critics can gain a more thorough understanding of the wide range of influences that the New World had on those involved in the earliest stages of colonizing it. My hope is that as more colonial figures from various European nations are studied, a more inclusive and comparative
picture of European colonialism in the New World will emerge.

If the attempts at self-fashioning of writers in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were studied, I believe that the range of self-fashioning possibilities available to them would be much more limited than the options Smith, Williams, and Morton had, narrowing as the colonies moved toward independence. As the United States was being formed, there certainly were disagreements over the correct path for the people to take, as the Federalist/Anti-Federalist controversy points out. However, those disagreeing tended to polarize themselves and by polarizing thus fashion themselves into members of such sharply opposed groups as the Federalists and the Anti-Federalists. This polarization rigidifies power relations into the distinct and immutable areas of self, authority, and alien that Greenblatt discusses, and it reflects the move toward nationhood as colonists attempted to articulate a unified—and in some senses rigid—national government.

Colonialism contributes to the self-fashioning efforts of John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton, because it gives each man the opportunity to fashion himself. Colonialism also sets the precedent of radical upheaval. The very fact of the New World's "discovery" by Europeans exploded previously-held assumptions about the nature and
size of the world. In the same way, colonial writers brought literary traditions from England, and expanded the possibilities for those traditions. While other fashioners of self had access to the same literary traditions that were available to Smith, Williams, and Morton, those who remained in England were able to self-fashion, but they found themselves constricted by the close proximity of the very power structures they were simultaneously attracted to and repulsed by. In the same manner that English colonists in Ireland were able to start to throw off the mantle of English-ness, colonists in the New World were even more able to do so, even as they retained many aspects of English culture in their new home. By viewing how three colonialist writers both strive to reflect the traditions of their homeland and their historical era and attempt to transcend the mores of their time, we learn that the New World was a space that offered the hint of unlimited possibility to the colonist. At the same time, we can see clearly how other colonists worked equally hard to channel that possibility into directions that maintained the status quo, which usually translated into maintaining power for themselves. In the end, then, a fashioned self is constantly locked in battle with other fashioned selves.

Because the self is generally in flux and transition, the battle between authorities, aliens, and selves is never really over. For as soon as one fashions oneself in a
particular way, another person complicates and interrogates the previous construction, leading to an ongoing cycle of construction and reconstruction of the self, a cycle clearly evident in the lives and writings of John Smith, Roger Williams, and Thomas Morton.
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