



“MEERE STRANGERS”

INDIGENOUS AND URBAN PERFORMANCES IN
ALGONQUIAN LONDON, 1580–1630*Coll Thrush*

In the shadow of the great cathedral, paper moved. It had emerged from printing presses behind shop fronts, been carried through crowded city streets, changed hands in the churchyard and great aisle, and from there returned to the streets, almost as through the church inhaled information into its precincts and then exhaled it back into the city in the form of paper and its echo, gossip. In early modern London, St. Paul's was not just a seat of spiritual power; it was also a hub of the profane and worldly, a great emporium of science and slander, and an engine of political and intellectual ferment. No single fact illustrated this more than the sheer volume of printed materials that circulated in and out of the cathedral and the surrounding closes and yards.

In 1615, one piece of paper must have seemed particularly intriguing. It was a lottery circular entreating citizens to invest their money in the Virginia Company, a struggling venture that, despite great promise, found itself limping along after nearly a decade of colony funding across the Atlantic. Lottery circulars were common enough in the Stuart city; read out in public spaces like St. Paul's churchyard, Smithfields, or Southwark to reach both literate and illiterate audiences, they were not only a kind of entertainment—cheaper than theater seats—but could also raise thousands of pounds.¹ But this one was special. At its top were printed very detailed pictures of two strange men. They each wore a fringed tunic, their naked arms and chests adorned with strings of beads; a turtle crawled near each man's



bare feet. In their hands, each held a bow and arrow as long as he was tall. Their smooth, long hair cascaded onto their shoulders, and they were both crowned with feathers. Most shockingly, each seemed to be wearing a small snake through a hole in his ear. Although standing in poses familiar from classical art, the two men, their names given as Eiakintomino and Matahan, were powerfully foreign and no doubt riveting; beneath their images was printed a text that surely added to the fascination: a heartfelt plea from the two Indians themselves, directed at the citizenry of London.²

Once, in one State, as of one Stem
 Meere Strangers from IERVSALEM,
 As Wee, were Yee; till Others Pittie
 Sought, and brought You to That Cittie.
 Deere Britaines, now, be You as Kinde;
 Bring Light, and Sight, to Vs yet blinde:
 Leade Vs, by Doctrine and Behaviour,
 Into one Sion, to one SAVIOVR.

These “salvages,” for all their benightedness, clearly knew something of English history—its dark and pagan origins, its encounter with Roman civilization, and its triumph as a Christian nation. And, perhaps to the surprise of many reading the lottery circular, the two strange Indians, representatives from the country known to the English as Virginia, now sought a similar transformation.³

Ventriloquism—the word, if not the concept—was invented in the early modern period, and Tudor and Stuart London was filled with words put into others’ mouths. These others very often included Others: the new peoples that England encountered as it began to build something like an empire in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These wordy strangers, with their noble sentiments, misguided beliefs, or savage natures, might come from Ireland, Africa, or “the Orient,” but it was most often Indians, whether from Virginia or the banks of the Orinoco, who captured English imaginations and “spoke” to English audiences in ways that would resonate around the Atlantic and the world for centuries to come.⁴ The 1615 Virginia Company circular was another example of this sort of ventriloquism, in which Matahan and Eiakintomino’s imagined invitation to their own conversion, was no doubt penned by company functionaries. These invisible authors were not unlike a character in Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, which had debuted only four years previously. Prospero, in fact, boasted of speaking through, and on behalf of, Caliban, “When thou didst not, savage, / Know thine own meaning, but

wouldst gabble like / A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes
/ With words that made them known.”⁵

Unlike Caliban, however, Eiakintomino and Matahan were not fictional; they were living men, visitors from the Indigenous polity known as the Powhatan Confederacy, whose territory Tsenacomoco (“the densely peopled land”) the English had renamed Virginia. Whether they had come to London willingly or as captives is unknown; that they were truly interested in becoming Christians—at least in the way the circular suggested—is unlikely. But their presence was part of a larger story, and they mattered to the city’s growing sense of itself as the center of a nascent empire, just as the urban context of their appearance shaped the nature of English incursions into Indigenous territories. We might think of them, then, as residents, if only temporarily, of something called “Algonquian London,”⁶ a place in which, from their first encounter, Indigenous and English worlds became entangled.

While scholars have for the most part treated urban and Indigenous histories as though they have little to do with each other, in the case of Algonquian London, these two kinds of history were hardly “meere strangers”; in fact, they were very well acquainted and are almost impossible to distinguish from each other.⁷ London’s urban realities shaped how the English understood (and attempted, often unsuccessfully, to control) both the Indigenous peoples they encountered and the colonial experience more generally. At the same time, London’s incipient urban imperialism depended upon the participation of Indigenous people, not just aboard English ships or in colonial outposts, but also in England itself. In addition to the multivalent symbols of Indian nobility and savagery in plays and pageants, actual Indigenous people moved among London’s networks of knowledge production, their embodied presence helping the city’s leaders to imagine new possibilities. Despite their small numbers—between 1576 and 1630, perhaps only around 60 Indigenous North Americans came to London⁸—Algonquian people had profound effects on London’s civic culture. Meanwhile, the experiences of Indigenous travelers to London suggest that parallel Indigenous processes of exploration and meaning making were taking place, in which the city played a dominant role, and which would shape the histories of both settler colonies and Indigenous nations.

This new world was neither urban nor Algonquian; it was both, and it was bound together in no small degree by performances—not only Indigenous performances for London audiences, but also urban performances for Indigenous eyes. It is an example of what

Joseph Roach has referred to as the “insufficiently acknowledged cocreations of an oceanic intercultural,” a complex, dynamic Atlantic world in which knowledge, image, and narrative moved on unexpected currents.⁹ At the same time, Algonquian London is often a silent city, its archives ephemeral and its specifics often conjectural at best. In his account of the Atlantic cultural matrix, Roach argues that “one of the best hedges against amnesia is gossip,” and he calls for scholars to unearth “performance genealogies” from fragmentary and far-flung pasts.¹⁰ What follows is such a genealogy, unearthing both Indigenous and urban performances. This genealogy, however, is necessarily built not just of fragments, but also of speculation. Telling the story of Algonquian London involves what Creek-Cherokee literary critic and queer theorist Craig Womack has called “suspicioning,” in which intuition and specific imagining can play key roles in reclaiming pasts that have been hidden or submerged.¹¹ An early modern urban Indigenous history, then, is almost by definition a performance in its own right, an assertion of something that clearly happened but which has left very little trace.

THE CITY CANNOT RELIEVE ENGLAND: THE URBAN ORIGINS OF ENGLISH COLONIALISM

In the business of empire, England was, even by its own accounting, a laggard. While Bristolian fishermen and explorers like Giovanni Caboto had extended an ephemeral English presence in the northwestern Atlantic at the turn of the sixteenth century, such efforts had often ended in ruin and were met with disdain and indifference in London, particularly among merchants, the satisfied masters of a lucrative trade with continental Europe. Meanwhile, the English struggle with Ireland, like Spain’s atrocities in Mexico and Peru, served as a cautionary tale for the costs—economic, moral, and otherwise—of colonialism. By the middle of the sixteenth century, neither profit nor the gospel had compelled England to look beyond the Atlantic in ways that mattered.¹² While Peter Mancall has argued that the English learned much about the larger world from the narratives of sailors, fishermen, and other travelers, like those collected by Richard Hakluyt, the reality was that the notion of an English empire was, as late as the 1570s, a contradiction in terms, largely at odds with the practices and proclivities of English life.¹³

In the late sixteenth century, though, a new reason for colonialism came to the fore: an urban crisis of unprecedented scale. Between 1500 and 1600, London burgeoned in population from perhaps seventy-five

thousand to almost a quarter million as enclosure, famine, and rural economic stagnation unmoored thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children from the English countryside. Masterless and without ties of kinship or place, most headed for London. The result was intense anxiety among the urban elite. In 1587, John Howes decried the “lustie roges and common beggers [who] hearinge of the great lyberallitie of London cometh hither to seke reliefe.” The city, he wrote pointedly, “can not releve England.”¹⁴ In response to such concerns, Parliament and the Crown made attempts, almost always unsuccessful, to curb the bewildering speed and chaotic form of the city’s expansion. Meanwhile, merchants tried to consolidate an urban culture through the use of doles, pageants, funeral feasts, and other rituals, even as fast-growing, noxious, and space-hungry industries such as tanning and shipbuilding dominated the new, ramshackle suburbs, threatening to the merchants’ hold on power. Plague, pollution, and sheer population tested the ability of London’s elites to manage their city.¹⁵

Colonization, some thought, could fix this problem. First articulated by natural philosophers, ministers, and merchants, and often expressed with more urgency than the drive for profit or the call to spread Christianity, the idea of sending the city’s “excess” people overseas became increasingly popular in the late sixteenth century. Hakluyt, for example, called for transportation of “idle persons . . . which having no way to be sett on worke be either mutinous and seeke alteration in the state [and] for trifles may otherwise be devoured by the gallows.”¹⁶ Soldier and naval commander Christopher Carleill similarly argued that colonization could provide hope to English men and women who “fall into sondrie disorders, and . . . to one shamefull ende or other.”¹⁷ In the seventeenth century, such ideas became reality. Edwin Sandys, a member of Parliament and one of the founders of the Virginia Company, described to King James’s secretary in 1619 the process by which London’s merchants would transform the city’s most vulnerable and potentially dangerous residents—children—into civil beings in the colonies: “vnder severe Masters,” he wrote, “they may be brought to goodnes.”¹⁸

If London’s urban realities inspired colonialism, they also framed the experience of it. Early visitors to America often used the city as a reference point for their ambitions and for lands and people they encountered. Instructions to Sir Humphrey Gilbert’s failed 1578 expedition, for example, included admonishments to find “thinges without which no Citie may be made nor people in civill sorte be kept together”: limestone, slate, and clay.¹⁹ Upon arrival, explorers and

colonists saw reflections of both their city and its river on the far side of the Atlantic. In 1603, Martin Pring wrote of Abenaki canoes as being “like a Wherrie of the River of Thames,”²⁰ while John Brereton described the tools carried by Wampanoag people, which included “a flat Emerie stone (wherewith Glasiers cut glasse, and Cutlers glase blades).”²¹ This was not idle language for a culture of exploration with its roots in the merchant trades of London. Englishmen also read their own deep urban past onto the peoples they encountered. A 1612 lottery to fund colonization efforts, for example, opined, “Who knowes not England once was like / a Wildernesse and savage place, / Till government and use of men, / that wildnesse did deface: / And so Virginia may in time, / be made like England now.”²² In fact, as Nicholas Canny has noted, many, if not most, early English advocates of colonialism, whether in Ireland or Virginia, explicitly looked to Romanized models of civil structure and law as they imagined what settlements might look like.²³ London looked west and saw its own past; Roanoke colonist John White’s watercolors, for example, labeled Indigenous communities with the term “*oppidum*,” the ancient word for Romano-British settlements such as Londinium.²⁴ While such ideas are clearly predecessors of the stadial theories that would come to dominate anthropology and doctrines of scientific racism nearly three centuries later—theories that firmly placed Indigenous peoples at one end of a continuum of civilization and cities at the other—in the early modern period, Indigeneity had yet to be defined in European minds as the opposite of urbanity.

However, London also brought with it its present: the urban problems the English sought to escape could follow them to the new lands. Thomas Hariot complained of colonists who “were of a nice bringing up, only in cities or townes . . . the countrey was to them miserable, and their reports thereof according.”²⁵ New England colonist Edward Winslow, meanwhile, criticized those who sent the worst of London’s lower classes to colonies, “not caring how they bee qualified.”²⁶ In the tiny urban outposts of the colonies, laws governing everyday life might well be addressing the realities of the great city back home: streets must be paved, buildings kept decorous, and in Jamestown, laws against laundering in the streets or shitting within the palisades were clearly intended to prevent the reproduction of London’s filth.²⁷ And if such urban challenges could migrate to the colonies, then colonists returning to London could bring stories of colonial problems back into the social networks of the city. In 1609, a Virginia Company broadside warned of disgruntled returned colonists speaking “out in all places . . . most vile and scandalous reports,”

while a company publication the following year referred to such men as "lasciuious sonnes, bad servants," and an "idle crue," the kind of imagery that had inspired colonization in the first place.²⁸

In these ways, London and Indigenous territories were enmeshed from the beginning. Perhaps no term illustrates this better than one that appears so often in the promotional literature and travel accounts of the day: "adventurer." To the modern mind, the word conjures images of manly explorers at the prows of ships, sighting land on the horizon, encountering strange societies, and seeking treasure. But in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, an adventurer could also be an overweight cloth merchant or an aging grocer, a priest or courtier who had no intention whatsoever of going anywhere at all but who might invest in a colony in hopes of eventual profit. In fact, stay-at-home adventurers vastly outnumbered those who traveled beyond England's shores. The word itself, then, sutures together the two sides of the Atlantic, blurring the boundaries between center and periphery, embodied practice and abstract knowledge, and Indigenous and urban places. But in addition to the adventurers (of either kind) and the displaced city dwellers who migrated among these spaces, there was one other kind of migrant, of a very different sort altogether: Indigenous people themselves.

GIVING LIFE TO ALL OUR PLANTATIONS: PERFORMING ALGONQUIAN KNOWLEDGE IN THE CITY

If Algonquian London is largely unknown, the Indians of the Tudor and Stuart city are all too familiar: they featured prominently in some of its most famous cultural productions, where they served powerful narrative roles that often had little to do with actual Indigenous peoples. However, many, if not most, of these metaphorical Indians reflected quite specific people and peoples involved in early English-Indigenous encounters. For example, Shakespeare's Caliban has long been understood as a thinly veiled stand-in for the people of Tsenacomoco, just as *The Tempest* itself was inspired by the wreck of a Jamestown supply ship, and when Caliban indignantly declares that he will build "no more dams...for fish," his words resonate both with Virginia colonists' accounts of Indigenous weirs and colonial Governor Ralph Lane's commitment to destroying them.²⁹ In *Henry VIII*, a "strange Indian" draws a pressing crowd of curious Englishwomen with his "great tool"; Sidney Lee and Alden Vaughan have identified him as the Wampanoag captive Epenow, who had

been “shewed up and down London for money as a wonder.”³⁰ In *All's Well That Ends Well*, the gentlewoman Helena announces that “Indian-like, / Religious in mine error, I adore / The sun,” paralleling widely circulated accounts of Indigenous peoples of Tsenacomoco and elsewhere who “in the morning by breake of day . . . till the Sunne riseth . . . offer Sacrifice to it.”³¹ Ben Jonson, meanwhile, named names: his 1609 *Epicæne* included an idiot knight who draws “maps of persons” including Namontack, a real Powhatan man who had guided English explorers beyond the boundaries of his people’s confederacy.³² And in Jonson’s 1626 *The Staple of Newes*, one character claims, “I have known a princess, and a great one, / Come forth of a tavern . . . The blessed / Pocahontas (as the historian calls her) / And great king’s daughter of Virginia,” revisiting the memory of Rebecca Rolfe’s visit a decade earlier.³³

Beyond the theaters of London, the city itself was a performance space populated by such symbolic Indians, particularly in pageants staged by the powerful adventurers of the merchant guilds. For example, Inigo Jones’s *The Memorable Mask* of 1613 included musicians “attir’d like Virginean Priests” and “chiefe Maskers, in Indian habits . . . their vizards [masks] of oliue collour; but pleasingly visag’d: their hayre, blacke & large,” and ended with calls for citizens of the Powhatan Confederacy to renounce “superstitious worship of these Sunnes” and turn “to this our Britain Phoebus, whose bright skie / (Enlightend with a Christian Piety) / Is neuer subject to black Errors night.”³⁴ As Rebecca Bach has argued, pageants furthered the connection between city and colony by casting guild members, many of whom never traveled farther than Antwerp or Calais, as “explorer-colonists” and “world-dominators,” just as lists of masque participants match closely the rosters of colony-funding livery companies and the rolls of English soldiers returned from colonial campaigns.³⁵ Masques and pageants not only reflected colonial imaginings, but also that they grew out of colonial experience, and illustrate how, from their first engagements, London and Indigenous territories quickly became entangled.

Actual Indigenous people, mostly from Algonquian nations, played a central role in this process through their presence in the city. Some came as prisoners; James Rosier, aboard the *Archangel* during its wanderings along the coast of what is now New England in 1605, later wrote that the capture of several Abenaki and Wampanoag men had been “a matter of great importance for the accomplishment of our voyage.”³⁶ Four years later, Virginia Company instructions to Governor Thomas Gates included directives to remove Powhatan

children from their families and, if necessary to the task, allowed for the murder of religious and political leaders.³⁷ Occasionally, however, Indigenous people openly sought to be taken aboard English ships. According to Samuel Purchas's account of an expedition to the Abenaki Dawnland, for example, the chronicler wrote that “one of the savages, called Aminquin . . . would also have come with them for England,” likely to conduct reconnaissance or to increase his own social status.³⁸ While Aminquin never reached England, other travelers did, including a 1616 Powhatan Confederacy delegation that famously included Pocahontas. Whether crossing the Atlantic by force or choice, Indigenous visitors to London served a set of very specific and urgent colonial purposes. Headed home with his five captives, Rosier laid it out clearly: Indigenous people “may be able to give us further instruction . . . which by no meanes otherwise we could by any observation of our selves learne in a long time.”³⁹ Similarly, Ferdinando Gorges, an adventurer who never left England but who oversaw the funding of a failed colony in the Abenaki Dawnland, believed that the “accident” of the capture of five Indigenous men “must be acknowledged as the meanes under God of . . . giving life to all our Plantations.”⁴⁰ Without Indigenous knowledge, it would be impossible to transform Tsenacomoco, the Dawnland, or any other Algonquian homeland into a subject realm. What Gorges could not foresee were the ways in which Indigenous knowledge and presence in the cultural crucible of London would also transform his own society.

One of the most obvious transformations came in January of 1617, following the Twelfth Night debut of a new masque by Ben Jonson *The Vision of Delight* at the court of King James. The audience included the young Powhatan noblewoman Rebecca Rolfe, who sat on the royal dais near James and his queen Anne. In the weeks prior to the performance, she had been the talk of the town, with throngs clamoring outside the aptly named Bell Sauvage playhouse and coaching inn in Ludgate, where she and at least some of her entourage were housed during their stay. Explorer and colonist John Smith wrote of taking “divers courtiers and others my acquaintances to see her,” and she was received by the Bishop of London at Lambeth Palace with, according to Samuel Purchas, “festival state and pomp, beyond what I have seen in his great hospitality to other ladies.” She also visited Sir Walter Raleigh and the Earl of Northumberland (whose brother she had known in Virginia), both incarcerated in the tower. That she was under intense scrutiny is without question; her portrait was made during visit, and one observer snipped that she was “no fair

lady and yet with her tricking up and her high style you might think her and her worshipful husband to be somebody.”⁴¹ Such criticisms were no doubt influenced by the broad sense of disillusionment with the unsuccessful colony in Virginia. *Twelfth Night* changed all this. Challenging the complaints of ne’er-do-wells returned from Virginia and the naysaying of civic loudmouths, Pocahontas’s appearance at court was a public relations coup. Historian L. H. Roper has called January 18, 1617, a “highly significant date in the history of Jacobean England and its empire,” nothing that public criticism of colonization dropped off significantly after the event.⁴² Ladylike, intelligent, Christian, and having borne a child to her English husband, Rebecca Rolfe—manners, mind, soul, and body—seemed proof that the project of English empire might bear civilized fruit. (Less than two months later, she was dead, struck down by an unknown illness she contracted in the city.)

Beyond the enactments of symbolic Indians like Caliban and the spectacles of people like Pocahontas, there was another kind of Indigenous performance taking place in London, in private homes and in the meeting rooms of the charter companies. While unscripted and with much smaller audiences, these were everyday performances in which Indigenous men, women, and children, living and working alongside Londoners who were deeply involved in colonial ventures, informed those ventures and made them tangible. While hardly a Lord Mayor’s pageant or a new play at the Globe, these moments likely did as much to facilitate colonization through quotidian, vernacular (and ultimately, undocumented) face-to-face encounters in which knowledge was exchanged and the very presence of Indigenous people suggested the possibilities of English plantations.

The best documented of such encounters took place between Thomas Hariot, a scientist and natural philosopher who had been involved in the first voyages of the Roanoke Colony, and Manteo and Wanchese, two Roanoke men who returned to London with Hariot in 1584. Together, the three exchanged knowledge of their respective homelands, learned each other’s languages, and crafted an alphabet for the Roanoke language. Most of this work took place not in the Roanoke towns of Ossomocomuck or the English outpost nearby, but in Durham House, Sir Walter Raleigh’s home on the Strand, where Hariot lived, worked, and entertained his peers and colleagues, and where Manteo and Wanchese received visitors from the upper echelons of London society. Although published only under Hariot’s name, the resulting descriptions of the “new world” and its inhabitants would play a key role in making the initial case for English colonialism.⁴³

Similarly, when the abducted Abenaki sagamore Tahanedo arrived in London in 1605, he was placed in the home of jurist and Speaker of the House of Commons Sir John Popham, a primary investor in several colonial ventures. Having Tahanedo in his household empowered Popham to express his optimism for colonization. "It should be made known to your Majesty," he wrote shortly after Tahanedo had returned home, "that among the Virginians and Moassons [Abenaki] there is no one in the world more admired that King James...Tahanida, one of the natives who was in Britain, has here proclaimed to them your praises and virtues."⁴⁴ Tahanedo's Abenaki compatriot Amoret was sent to live with John Slaney, a merchant in Cornhill and a member of the Newfoundland Company; a few years later, Slaney hosted the Wampanoag man Tisquantum during at least one of his two sojourns in London.⁴⁵ And when Epenow was not being "shewed up and down," he and his four fellow captives (two his Wampanoag brethren Coneconam and Sakaweston, and the others the Abenakis Manawet and Pennekimme) lived with Sir Ferdinando Gorges, who credited the men with inspiring him to seek charters for the London and Plymouth companies.⁴⁶ Indigenous presence in the homes of these Londoners was not so much a result of colonial ventures, as it was a constitutive element of them.

Women, children, and young men from Tsenacomoco lived with merchants and ministers throughout the city, and played particularly important roles in such everyday performances. In 1613, captain Christopher Newport brought a young boy named Totakins from the Powhatan Confederacy to the Gracechurch Street home of Thomas Smythe, the treasurer of the Virginia Company and one of London's great power brokers. It is unlikely that Smythe had much time for Totakins, but we can imagine that he gained some benefit from having in his home a living example of Virginia's future.⁴⁷ Three years later, a female member of the delegation that included Pocahontas, christened Mary, went to live as a servant in the home of a mercer in Cheapside. She did not stay long; ill with tuberculosis, she was taken in by one of London's most celebrated Puritan preachers, William Gouge, who raised a subscription for her treatment and upkeep.⁴⁸ A third member of the 1616 Powhatan delegation, meanwhile, was placed in the home of minister and Virginia Company member George Thorpe. Baptized rather unimaginatively as Georgius Thorpe, the boy served as an amanuensis for his namesake, copying patents and other communications between London and the colony.⁴⁹ Indigenous people like these lived in a network of Londoners engaged in the business of empire, even if at times the specific ways in which they influenced

that network are hard to see in the archive: the ripple of gossip up and down streets as a tall brown stranger passed by, carrying ideas about “savage” vigor and nobility; the impassioned plea of a minister on behalf of an ailing young “maid of Virginia” in need of Christian charity (who, if not too ill, was likely to be seen in a nearby pew); or a young boy trotted out now and again in an alderman’s parlor as evidence of investment potential. Such moments are not unimportant; indeed, they are almost certainly one of the central ways London came to first know itself as a colonial center.

Ephemeral as it may be, this network of colonial knowledge production parallels the better-documented networks of early modern science in London, in which embodied practices, social relationships, and local and nonelite knowledge played key parts.⁵⁰ Deborah Harkness has described a metropolis of everyday experimentation in “landmark buildings, on the streets around them, behind shopfronts, and upstairs in residences throughout the City [where] men and women were studying and manipulating nature.” Part of an urban sensibility that crossed class, ethnic, and even gender boundaries, such networks, Harkness writes, “can be mapped onto the terrain of Elizabethan London in ways that illuminate the blind alleys and surprising twists and turns taken as science became the field of knowledge we recognize today.”⁵¹ Harkness might just as easily be describing Algonquian London. While much of the decision making regarding the colonies rested in the hands and minds of a small network of elites—men like Popham, Gorges, and others—the actual business of knowledge production about Algonquian territories was also done by malcontent excolonists, returning seamen, and Indigenous people themselves, in everyday encounters that for all their quotidian nature, were also performances. But we have to imagine most of these encounters, because they are largely absent from the archival record. All we have are fragments, suspicions, and the sutures of suspicioning.

EPENOW’S LAUGHTER: CIVIC PERFORMANCES AND INDIGENOUS CRITIQUES

If Algonquian people performed for the city, it is possible to think about London and its inhabitants performing for them in return. This leads to the most difficult question in the history of Algonquian London: What did Indigenous visitors think of the city and its people? Is it possible to recreate their subjective experiences, informed by Algonquian ways of knowing and conducted according to Wampanoag, Powhatan, or other agendas? Certainly,

modern Indigenous scholars have attempted to reclaim some of these earlier travelers using Indigenist approaches. Laguna Pueblo scholar Paula Gunn Allen, for example, drew upon pan-Algonquian teachings, feminist theory, and the documentary record to retell the story of Pocahontas, a Beloved Woman, in the broader sweep of colonial and world history. Rather than focusing on Christianized captivity, doomed naiveté, or sexual metaphors of racial and colonial union, Allen reinterpreted the voyage of Pocahontas and her delegation to London as an extension of Tsenacomoco’s political and spiritual power into the heart of empire.⁵² Such scholarship returns Indigenous perspectives and concerns to the center of the story, but still struggles with the thorniest questions inherent in the idea of an Algonquian London: What did Algonquian travelers from these various homelands make of England’s metropolis, and how might such histories reframe the history of the city itself?

To begin to answer such questions, we might begin by returning to the Twelfth Night performance of *The Vision of Delight*, an extravagant assertion of English confidence. The performance began with Delight, Sport, Wonder, and other personifications dancing in idealized London street scenes, followed by Night arriving in a starred chariot to announce that the audience was now in the realm of dreams. Then Peace appeared and sang of the coming year, followed by Aurora, goddess of the dawn. To close the masque, the character “Phant’sie” offered a paean to the benevolence of a king “whose presence maketh this perpetuall *Spring*, the glories of which . . . are the marks and beauties of his power,” while a choir sang of the “lord of the foure Seas [and] King of the lesse and greater Iles.”⁵³ So what might Pocahontas have made of *The Vision of Delight*, which so crudely made the case for King James’ Christian dominion over her people? Certainly, the peoples of Tsenacomoco had their own sophisticated traditions of performance—John Smith referred to one such event he witnessed as a “maske” and an “anticke” in his memoirs⁵⁴—and the religion of the Powhatan Confederacy included a creator being, Ahone, associated with the sun and the stars, who was responsible for the abundance and wealth of the world.⁵⁵ Such parallels would no doubt have made the Twelfth Night spectacle legible to an Algonquian noblewoman. But what did she actually think of it? Was she impressed and entertained? Did she see straight through the ham-handed attempt to establish English authority over her father’s confederacy? Or was she bored, tired, or struggling with the early symptoms of the illness that would soon kill her? That we have no record of her reaction is no doubt an artifact of an imperfect archive,

but may also be a result of her own circumspection: trained as an elite woman and political emissary, and under intense scrutiny, it may simply not have been in her or her people's interest to express a strong reaction one way or the other.

Pocahontas had not been alone on that dais with James and Anne and their favorites, however. Her kinsman Uttamattomakin, statesman and shaman, had been there with her, and his opinions on London, England, the king, and the Christian God—unlike Rebecca Rolfe's—stand out sharply, if briefly, in the archive. According to accounts by John Smith and Samuel Purchas, Uttamattomakin had been disappointed in the English religion, seeing little evidence of the Christian God in London and coming to despise the missionary impulse among many of the people he met, leading Purchas to call him a “blasphemer.” He had also been entirely underwhelmed by the king's own performances, complaining with disdain that James did not stand out in a crowd. He also lamented to Purchas that he would not be able to enter the temples of Tsenacomoco until called by manitou, likely because his time in London and among the English had polluted him spiritually.⁵⁶ But it is Uttamattomakin's actions after returning to the Powhatan Confederacy in the summer of 1617 that speak most eloquently of his conclusions. With several members of his retinue left behind in the city, and having watched Pocahontas die, Uttamattomakin immediately began to foment an uprising against the Virginians after his return, presaging the eventual collapse of Anglo-Powhatan relations into a devastating series of wars. Thus ended the optimism that had begun on Twelfth Night six years earlier, the Virginia Company's control of the colony, and, after a few more decades of conflict, the Powhatan Confederacy itself.⁵⁷

So if we want to understand the Algonquian experience of London, we should look to what happened after (or more to the point, if) Indigenous people left the city. The outcomes of their individual stories, where visible to us, suggest that there was no single experience of London, even among those who lived and worked together or who came from the same Indigenous polity. The Roanoke men Manteo and Wanchese, who had lived and worked with Thomas Hariot at Durham House, followed very different paths upon returning to Roanoke territory: Manteo assisted the English colonists as a translator and trader, while Wanchese became a militant anti-English leader who may have been partially responsible for the eventual destruction of the colony.⁵⁸ A generation later, Epenow and Tisquantum, both citizens of the Wampanoag Confederacy, would diverge in similar ways. While Ferdinando Gorges claimed that Epenow had learned

to shout “Welcome! Welcome!” while being paraded in the streets, the Wampanoag man’s actions suggest altogether different feelings. Having convinced Gorges that gold could be found on his home island of Capawack (Martha’s Vineyard), Epenow joined an expedition back home in 1614, three years after his capture, and promptly escaped. Five years later, he would laugh as he told this story to another English captain, Thomas Dermer, whom he later killed before going on to lead resistance against English settlers who arrived on the *Mayflower* soon after.⁵⁹ Dermer’s crew included Tisquantum, who had escaped slavery in Spain and lived in London with colonial adventurer John Slaney before finally returning home to find his community wiped out by an epidemic. He then cast his lot with the Puritans, placing him in conflict with his fellow Wampanoag and survivor of London.⁶⁰ While ending their days on opposite sides of a war, Epenow and Tisquantum were part of a single story in which London’s urban crisis had spurred colonial ventures that demanded Indigenous captives, and in which those captives’ experiences in the city in turn shaped the future of Indigenous-settler relations in America.

In the end, the time spent in London by Indigenous people might have not only shaped English knowledge about America and attitudes toward colonization, but it also did little to facilitate colonialism itself. If anything, the spectacles and rituals of London—crowds, religious ceremonies, poverty, pollution, and pageants—seem to have confirmed the concerns of many Indigenous visitors that the English were not only powerful and populous, but also alien, unpleasant, and unworthy of alliance. In 1606, the Abenaki Tahanedo, whose host Sir John Popham claimed was happy to make his people subject to King James, returned to the Dawnland to help found a colony, likely accompanied by Amoret. Two years later, the colony was abandoned, its population starving and impoverished after being almost totally ignored by the Abenaki. Tahanedo and Amoret clearly had not done their job, and while they disappear from the historical record, stories remained of Glooskap, the Abenaki culture hero, traveling to London, where hordes of strange people ogled him. Such stories were surely inflected by the experiences of the men who had gone to England as captives and returned home as enemies to the English.⁶¹ Two decades later, “Jack Strawe,” a Pequot who lived in London with the Puritan adventurer Sir Walter Erle in the 1620s, “went native” immediately upon returning home, serving as a translator for his people in their fraught, and ultimately genocidal, relations the colonists of Connecticut.⁶² Just as Londoners had learned a great deal from Indigenous visitors that would inform English colonialism, so had

those visitors much that would inform their own responses to English intrusions into their homelands.

At the same time, the evidence for such urban experiences, as well as the actions that followed when and if Indigenous people returned home, is scant at best. With the exceptions perhaps of Uttamattomakin and Epenow, it is virtually impossible to ascribe specific motivations to individual Indigenous men and women regarding colonial ventures, to infer in any meaningful way their perceptions of London, or even to map in detail their activities in the city. Like the ways in which they must have participated in urban networks of colonial knowledge production—if only by simply being “meere strangers”—the means by which Algonquian people understood and responded to London and to English ambitions are largely lost to the historical record, including Indigenous oral traditions. At the same time, it seems clear that the city, the place in which most Algonquian visitors spent most of their time, deeply informed their peoples’ first experiences of English presence in North America. That these vernacular urban encounters are difficult to see does not mean that they did not happen.

THE “LOST COLONY” OF ALGONQUIAN LONDON

Uttamattomakin, Epenow, Tisquantum, and “Jack Strawe” were the lucky ones: they made it home, carrying what they had learned through their experiences in London. Other Algonquian visitors never returned. A handful ended up following other routes in England’s growing global reach; for example, two female members of the Powhatan delegation of 1616—including Mary, who had survived her illness under Reverend Gouge’s care—were sent to Bermuda. But many more, like Rebecca Rolfe, died. In 1610, Virginia Company officer and MP Sir Edwin Sandys complained that Nanawack, a young Powhatan boy, had been “living here a yeare or two in houses where hee . . . saw and heard many times examples of drinking, swearing, and like evils, remained as he was a meere Pagan.” Sandys saw that Nanawack was “removed into a godly family” where he soon died, leaving behind “such testimonies of his desire of Gods favour, that it mooved such godly Christians as knew him, to conceive well of his condition.” A similar fate probably befell Totatkins, the young boy sent to live with Thomas Smythe; in fact, at least two Powhatan children appear to have died in Smythe’s custody. And Georgius Thorpe, the member of the Powhatan delegation who stayed on to live with his namesake, died soon after his baptism in 1619, the phrase

“Homo Virginiae” written in the parish register of deaths next to his Christian name.⁶³

More often, though, Indigenous travelers simply vanish from the historical record, which almost certainly means that they died in England. In September of 1603, for example, several “Virginians”—a term that at that point could refer to someone from almost anywhere in North America—were lodging in the home of Sir Robert Cecil on the Strand and thrilling audiences with a performance of their canoe skills on the Thames. Their canoe might be the one that ended up in the private collection of Cecil’s friend Sir Walter Cope, but of the canoeists’ fate we know nothing. We do know, however, that a plague was raging in London at the time, forcing the newly crowned King James and many other elites to escape the city; it is not difficult to imagine the epidemic killing Cecil’s Algonquian houseguests.⁶⁴ A similar silence remains regarding three of Epenow’s fellow Wampanoag captives, and there are confusing accounts of Indigenous youths, many likely from Tsenacomoco, living with ministers and adventurers into the 1630s, their fates unknown.⁶⁵ In some ways, the disappeared of Algonquian London are a mirror to the lost English colony of Roanoke, whose 118 colonists vanished sometime between 1587 and 1590. Indigenous travelers lost to the city, Londoners lost somewhere in an Indigenous homeland: such are the parallels and entanglements of early Atlantic encounters.

Eiakintomino and Matahan, the two Powhatan Confederacy diplomats from the Virginia Company lottery circular, disappeared as well. Despite their high profile during their time in London, no record exists of what happened to them after their likenesses were passed around the city. A second, color image of Eiakintomino sets him among a menagerie of animals in St. James Park: a fat-tailed sheep, a ram, a crane, and other waterfowl. Painted by a visiting Dutch soldier, the image is obviously based on lottery circular, suggesting that Michael van Meer saw it during his time in the city, likely through acquaintances with merchant adventurers with connections to the Netherlands. However, the image also includes a caption added after the artist’s death, which notes that the man and the animals “were seen in 1615–1616 in St. James Park in the zoo by Westminster before the City of London,” demonstrating that the portrayal was not just the recapitulation of a symbolic Indian, but the record of an actual Indigenous man’s presence. It is in fact the only document that proves Eiakintomino ever actually set foot in the city. Beyond that, we know nothing. Was he visiting St. James’s Park to observe the pastoral scenery? Or was he himself on display? (Or both?)

We do not even know if Eiakintomino appeared in person as part of Virginia Company fundraising efforts, and Matahan's very existence can only be inferred from his appearance alongside Eiakintomino on the circular.⁶⁶

Herein lies the great irony of Algonquian London: even highly visible Indigenous people—the ones who inspired both investment and invention—could be lost among the dangers and silences of early encounter. Aside from fragmentary documentary mentions, literary and theatrical references, and a handful of visual images, virtually no evidence of Algonquian London exists. There are, however, two other physical remnants of this ephemeral Indigenous urbanism that remain, not far from London. The first is a purse or satchel, held in the collections of Oxford's Ashmolean Museum, that bears a striking resemblance to the ones shown hanging from Eiakintomino and Matahan's shoulders in the lottery circular illustration. The first archival record of the purse's existence, however, comes from 1630, so whether it had belonged to either man 15 years earlier is unknowable. The second is an object made up of four deerskins sewn together with sinews and bearing the images of a deer and a second large animal—possibly a mountain lion—along with more than 30 circles, all embroidered in shell beads. Also held by the Ashmolean, it has been described for centuries as a mantle belonging to Wahunsunacawh, Pocahontas's father and the leader of the Powhatan Confederacy. However, it is more likely a map of Tsenacomoco, with each circle representing a community under Wahunsunacawh's leadership. Certainly, very similar maps collected later among Indigenous peoples of southeastern North America display designs with almost identical circles, including some representing England.⁶⁷

The purse without an owner and the mantle map are in many ways metonyms for Algonquian London itself. Their provenance—indeed, for one of the objects, its very function—is lost, just as the identities and fates of many Algonquian travelers are in many cases irretrievable from the historical record. All the evidence regarding the two objects is suspect and ambiguous, just as any account of the specific experiences of Indigenous people in London must be based largely on conjecture and speculation. And yet for all their mystery, they were without doubt things of performance: of political and spiritual power, of social status, and of personal wealth and skill. Algonquian London was likewise a place of performances: of Indigenous performances for urban audiences and of urban performances for Indigenous audiences, with consequences for everyone involved. One of those consequences has been the tendency to see urban and Indigenous histories

as estranged from each other, even when they were deeply enmeshed from their first encounters. And so even writing of something called “Algonquian London” ends up being a performance in its own right, an attempt to imagine urban and Indigenous histories not as “meere strangers” but as part of a single, and dramatic, unfolding of which was merely the first act. While Algonquian travel to London would largely cease during the devastating civil and colonial wars that marred much of the seventeenth century, by the early eighteenth century, Indigenous visitors from other nations would begin to make their mark on the city, even as English migration to the colonies gathered speed. The early entanglements begun in Algonquian London would become deeper, more complex, and ever more tragic over the decades and centuries to come.

NOTES

1. Rebecca Ann Bach, *Colonial Transformations: The Cultural Production of the New Atlantic World, 1580–1640* (New York: Palgrave, 2000), 125–26. For discussion of the relationship between print and oral culture in places such as Stuart London, see Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500–1700* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 2000).
2. In this chapter, I use “Indians” to refer to imaginary and representational forms such as “Virginians” in a pageant, and “Indigenous” (in addition to specific ethnic or national terms such as Abenaki or Roanoke) to refer to living people.
3. The circular is reprinted in Alexander Brown, *The Genesis of the United States* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1890), following 760, and is discussed in Alden T. Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters: American Indians in Britain, 1500–1776* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 53–54.
4. For the long history of symbolic Indians in the British Atlantic world, the classic work remains Robert F. Berkhofer, *The White Man’s Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979). For more recent interpretations of specific periods, see Joyce Chaplin, *Subject Matter: Technology, the Body, and Science on the Anglo-American Frontier, 1500–1676* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); Troy Bickham, *Savages within the Empire: Representations of American Indians in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 2006); Tim Fulford, *Romantic Indians: Native Americans, British Literature, and Transatlantic Culture 1756–1830* (Oxford, UK, and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); Kevin Hutchings, *Romantic Ecologies and Colonial Cultures in the British Atlantic World, 1770–1850* (Kingston, Canada: Queen’s Policy Studies, 2009); Tim Fulford and Kevin Hutchings,

- eds., *Native Americans and Anglo-American Culture, 1750–1850: The Indian Atlantic* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009); and Kate Flint, *The Transatlantic Indian, 1776–1930* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008).
5. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest* (1611), Act 1, Scene 2, lines 508–11.
 6. “Algonquian” is a category created by anthropologists to identify a group of distinct linguistically and culturally related peoples in North America. It is not an Indigenous term per se, although it is ultimately derived from a word in the Maliseet language that means “they are our relatives,” and it should not be confused with the Algonquin, an Indigenous nation—and member of the larger linguistic family—whose traditional territories at the time of European contact lay on the shores of the Great Lakes. All of the peoples and nations included in this chapter are considered by anthropologists to be part of the category “Eastern Algonquian.” From south to north, they include the Roanoke, whose territory, known to them as Ossomocomuck, is in present-day North Carolina; the communities that made up the Powhatan Confederacy; the Wampanoag Confederacy of what is now Massachusetts and Rhode Island; and the Abenaki of the territory they called the Dawnland, now Maine and Vermont.
 7. There are a number of ways to read this use of the word “meere” and what (or whom) it refers to. First, it may frame stranger-ness as something that can easily be overcome: “We are merely strangers and will soon know each other well.” Second, the word may modify the Powhatan men themselves, with “mere” signifying an inferior level or civilization or a state of subjecthood. A now-archaic meaning of the word, still in use in the early seventeenth century, was “unadulterated,” which applies quite well to this context of the first decade of English-Powhatan encounter. Exactly what the anonymous author of the poem—no doubt a functionary or associate of the Virginia Company—meant by the use of this word is of course impossible to know, but its possible valences parallel the ambiguous and complex nature of early Algonquian history in London. Perhaps, it is even a particularly sophisticated play on words.
 8. During the 1570s, four Inuit people and several Indigenous men from the Caribbean and the coast of northern South America also appeared in England during this period, all associated with either Martin Frobisher or Sir Walter Raleigh. For discussion of these travelers, see Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters*, 1–41.
 9. Joseph Roach, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 5.
 10. *Ibid.*, 30.
 11. Craig Womack, “Suspicioning: Imagining a Debate between Those Who Get Confused, and Those Who Don’t, When They Read Critical Responses to the Poems of Joy Harjo, or What’s an Old-Timey Gay Boy Like Me to Do?” *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16 (2010): 133–55.

12. See Mary C. Fuller, *Voyages in Print: English Narratives of Travel to America 1576–1624* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007); and Kenneth R. Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480–1630* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 157.
13. Peter C. Mancall, *Hakluyt’s Promise: An Elizabethan’s Obsession for an English America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007), 104.
14. R. H. Tawney and E. Power, eds., *Tudor Economic Documents* (London: Longman, Greens, and Co., 1924), 3:431 and 438; quoted in Stephen Inwood, *A History of London* (New York: Basic Books, 1999), 161–62.
15. Inwood, *A History of London*, 181–84 and 192–94.
16. David B. Quinn, *The Roanoke Voyages, 1584–1590: Documents to Illustrate the English Voyages to North America under the Patent Granted to Walter Rale* (London: The Hakluyt Society, 2010), 325 and 337.
17. Christopher Carleill, “A Breef and Sommarie Discourse upon the Entended Voyage to the Hethermoste Partes of America” (1583), in *New American World: A Documentary History of North America to 1612*, ed. David B. Quinn (New York: Arno Press, 1979), 3:31.
18. Susan Myra Kingsbury, ed., *The Records of the Virginia Company of London* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1933), 3:259. See also Nicholas Canny, “The Permissive Frontier: The Problem of Social Control in English Settlements in Ireland and Virginia, 1550–1650,” in *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America, 1480–1650*, ed. K. R. Andrews, N. P. Canny, and P. E. H. Hair (Liverpool, UK: Liverpool University Press, 1978), 25–26.
19. “Notes Prepared by Richard Hakluyt the Elder for Sir Humphrey Gilbert” (1578), *New American World*, 3:24 and 26.
20. “Martin Pring’s Voyage to North Virginia with the Speedwell and the Discoverer, April 10 to October 2, 1603” (1625), *New American World*, 3:361.
21. “John Brereton’s Narrative of Bartholomew Gosnold’s Voyage to North Virginia, March to July, 1602,” *New American World*, 3:350.
22. “The Second Port of London’s Lotterie” (1612) in *An American Garland*, ed. C. H. Firth (Oxford, UK: B. H. Blackwell, 1915), 24.
23. Canny, “The Permissive Frontier,” 18.
24. Reproductions of John White’s watercolors of the Roanoke “oppida” of Pomeiooc and Secota can be found in Thomas Hariot, *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2007), 158–61.
25. Thomas Hariot, “A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia” (1588), *New American World*, 3:141.
26. Edward Winslow, *Good Newes from New England* (1624), cited in Michael Leroy Oberg, *Dominion and Civility: English Imperialism and Native America, 1585–1685* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), 88.
27. “Instructions to Sir Thomas Gates for the Government of Virginia, May 1609,” *New American World*, 5:214; “Lawes Divine, Morall,

- and Martiall Promulgated for the Colony of Virginia by Sir Thomas Dale, Marshal and Deputy Governor of Virginia, June 22, 1611," *New American World*, 5:225.
28. Broadside by the Council of Virginia, 1610 (Society of Antiquaries, London, Broadside 122), cited in Canny, "The Permissive Frontier," 29; and Bach, *Colonial Transformations*, 126.
 29. Sidney Lee, "The American Indian in Elizabethan England," in *Elizabethan and Other Essays*, ed. Frederick S. Boas (Freeport, NY: Book for Libraries Press, Inc., 1968), 297–99.
 30. *Ibid.*, 284; and Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters*, 65–67.
 31. George Percy, "A Discourse of the Plantation of the Southern Colonie in Virginia" (1606–1607), *New American World*, 5:274.
 32. Ben Jonson, *Epicoene: Or, the Silent Woman* (1609), Act 5, Scene 1; and "William Strachey's Description of the Commodities of Virginia," *New American World*, 5:351–58.
 33. Ben Jonson, *The Staple of Newes* (1626), Act 2, Scene 5.
 34. Cited in Bach, *Colonial Transformations*, 175.
 35. *Ibid.*, 33–34 and 148–90.
 36. James Rosier, "A True Relation of the Most Prosperous Voyage Made in this Present Yeere 1605, by Captaine George Waymouth" (1605), in *New American World*, 3:374.
 37. "Instructions to Sir Thomas Gates for the Government of Virginia, May 1609," *New American World*, 5:213; and "Instructions to Thomas West, Lord De La Warr, Governor of Virginia, 1610," *New American World*, 5:220.
 38. "Samuel Purchas's Account of the Sagadahoc Colony," *New American World*, 3:427.
 39. Rosier, "A true relation," *New American World*, 3:378.
 40. Ferdinando Gorges et al., *A Voyage into New England, Begun in 1623, and Ended in 1624* (Portland, ME: Historical Society of Maine, 1847), 17.
 41. See Helen C. Rountree, *Pocahontas, Powhatan, Opechancanough: Three Indian Lives Changed by Jamestown* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2005), 177–79; and Paula Gunn Allen, *Pocahontas: Medicine Woman, Spy, Entrepreneur, Diplomat* (New York: Harper Collins, 2004), 283–84.
 42. L. H. Roper, *The English Empire in America, 1602–1658: Beyond Jamestown* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009), 17 and 73.
 43. For discussion of Manteo and Wanchese, and their relationship with Hariot, see Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters*, 21–29.
 44. George Popham to James I, December 13, 1607, *New American World*, 3:439.
 45. Robert Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550–1653* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 110.
 46. For discussion of Epenow, see David J. Silverman, *Faith and Boundaries: Colonists, Christianity, and Community among the Wampanoag*

- Indians of Martha's Vineyard, 1600–1871* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1–15.
47. Edward Wright Haile, ed., *Jamestown Narratives: Eyewitness Accounts of the Virginia Colony: The First Decade, 1607–1617* (Brighton, UK: RoundHouse, 1998), 760–65.
 48. Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, 146; and Lee, “The American Indian in Elizabethan England,” 287.
 49. Frederic W. Gleach, *Powhatan's World and Colonial Virginia: A Conflict of Cultures* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 144; Eric Gethyn-Jones, *George Thorpe and the Berkeley Company: A Gloucestershire Enterprise in Virginia* (Gloucester, UK: Alan Sutton, 1982) 55–58; and Myra Kingsbury, ed., *Records of the Virginia Company*, 3:136.
 50. For discussion of these networks, see Pamela H. Smith and Benjamin Schmidt, eds., *Making Knowledge in Early Modern Europe: Practices, Objects, and Texts, 1400–1800* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007); and Steven Shapin, *Never Pure: Historical Studies of Science as If It Was Produced by People with Bodies, Situated in Time, Space, Culture, and Society, and Struggling for Credibility and Authority* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010).
 51. Deborah Harkness, *The Jewel House: Elizabethan London and the Scientific Revolution* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007), 6–11.
 52. Allen, *Pocahontas*, 60.
 53. C. H. Herford, ed., *Ben Jonson* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1961), 7:463–71.
 54. Bach, *Colonial Transformations*, 191–219.
 55. Allen, *Pocahontas*, 264–66.
 56. Helen C. Rountree, *The Powhatan Indians of Virginia: Their Traditional Culture* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989), 117, 131, and 137; Helen C. Rountree, *Pocahontas's People: The Powhatan Indians of Virginia through Four Centuries* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990), 62; and Rountree, *Pocahontas, Powhatan, Opechancanough*, 179.
 57. Bruce Lenman, *England's Colonial Wars, 1550–1688: Conflicts, Empire, and National Identity* (Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Ltd, 2001), 232; Rountree, *Pocahontas, Powhatan, Opechancanough*, 179; and Stephen R. Potter, “Early English Effects on Virginia Algonquian Exchange and Tribute in the Tidewater Potomac,” in *Powhatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast*, ed. Gregory A. Waselkov, Peter H. Wood, and Tom Hatley (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), 222.
 58. Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters*, 27–29.
 59. For Epenow, see Silverman, *Faith and Boundaries*, 13; and for Tisquantum, see David G. Sweet and Gary B. Nash, eds., *Struggle and Survival in Colonial America* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981), 234 and 236–37.
 60. Nathaniel Morton, *New England's Memorial: Or, A Brief Relation of the Most Memorable and Remarkable Passages of the Providence of God,*

- Manifested to the Planters of New-England, in America; with Special Reference to the First Colony Thereof, Called New-Plymouth* (Cambridge, MA, 1669), 25.
61. Charles G. Leland, *The Algonquin Legends of New England: Myths and Folk Lore of the Micmac, Passamaquoddy, and Penobscot Tribes* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1884), 127–29.
 62. Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters*, 97–99.
 63. *Ibid.*, 51–52 and 93–94; Haile, ed., *Jamestown Narratives*, 760–61; Gleach, *Powhatan's World*, 144; and Gethyn-Jones, *George Thorpe and the Berkeley Company*, 55–58.
 64. David B. Quinn, “Virginians’ on the Thames in 1603,” *Terrae Incognitae* 2 (1970): 7–14.
 65. Rountree, *Pocahontas's People*, 73–74; and Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters*, 99–100.
 66. Album amicorum of Michael van Meer, Edinburgh University Library, shelfmark La.II.283.f.254v, cited and reprinted in Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters*, 54.
 67. For discussion of these objects, see Gregory A. Waselkov, “Indian Maps of the Colonial Southeast” in *Powhatan's Mantle*, ed., M. T. Hatley, G. A. Waselkov, and P. H. Wood, Rev. edn., (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), 435–502.