

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Michael A. Modarelli entitled “The Usable Past: American Saxonhood and the Making of America.” I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in English.

Mary E. Papke, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Dawn Coleman

Katy Chiles

Carolyn R. Hodges

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

The Usable Past:
American Saxonhood and the Making of America

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Michael A. Modarelli
May 2011

Copyright © 2011 by Michael A. Modarelli

DEDICATION

For Elizabeth, my partner in this strange journey we call life.

Ti penso sempre.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout this project and my time at Tennessee, I've been amazed at the generosity of both students and faculty, as well as family, all of whom have helped sustain me, in some way or another, on this long academic journey. Several friends have provided me with the human sustenance to see the light of day, most notably Brian Gempp, my friend, colleague, and confidant. The project would not have been completed at all without the support and guidance of my mentor, advisor, and friend, Dr. Mary E. Papke, who provided me with years of new and interesting jobs, laughter and conversation, miles and miles of editorial comments, and great food every spring. I could not have done it without her support. Thanks also goes to Drs. Dawn Coleman and Katy Chiles, whose unending encouragement and comments provided fuel for the fire of this work. I remain extremely grateful for their help. Also, I'd like to thank Dr. Carolyn Hodges, for not only sitting on my committee but also for employing me during my tenure at Tennessee. Many thanks also goes to Dr. Kay Reed and the rest of the Graduate School staff—I thoroughly enjoyed working with them all. Thanks to my family, as well as my in-laws, who, though they didn't necessarily know what I was doing most of the time (only that I remained a perpetual student, or so it seemed), provided me with love and kindness. Thanks, too, goes to Dr. Claire Culleton, who was always there for me when I needed a friend—and still is.

Finally, thanks goes to my wife, who remained always with me in spirit, even though at times we were hundreds of miles apart for extended periods of time. Elizabeth, we *did* it!

ABSTRACT

The Usable Past: American Saxonhood and the Making of America investigates the historical consciousness that serves as a conduit in the link from Britain to the colonization of New World America. This project traces the mythos of Anglo-Saxonism as it moves from Renaissance England to early America as both a cultural construct and ideological nation-building tool and puts these notions through extensive investigations of both early American and English culture and texts. The ways in which Anglo-Saxon authors envisioned history as unfolding becomes an important ideological model for the later American concept of historical identity. I have chosen to call my theoretical construct “American Saxonhood,” a term that fuses the socio-historical tendencies and aspirations with national concerns and ideologies. Out of a melting pot of English racial groups and perverted ideological notions of power, American Saxonhood sprung into being in the British New World as a shaping force for a new land, an ideology of domination, superiority, and, eventually, national pride, with the intent to forge an imagined community upon its own geographically physical grounds.

The introduction introduces Anglo-Saxonism as a myth and the relevant background studies from which this project moves, announces the ultimate claims it advances, and defines the construct of American Saxonhood. Chapter One examines the socio-historical and cultural context of Anglo-Saxon history and its primary textual models, specifically British and Saxon historians—where they came from, the ideas within them, and the formation of a uniquely New World Saxon identity from the Anglo-Saxon impulse. Chapter Two explores Captain John Smith’s and the Virginia Company’s use of primary Anglo-Saxon material for the New World settlement of Jamestown, developing the idea that out of the ideological content in Anglo-Saxon

texts, prominent members of the Virginia Company formulate a new, romantic nation-building ideology specifically designed for the Virginia venture. Chapter Three examines the New England region's appropriation of the myth, starting with William Bradford and moving through John Winthrop to Cotton Mather. Finally, Chapter Four looks at the way in which Thomas Jefferson extends the mythos of American Saxonhood and weaves it into the national consciousness for succeeding generations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION - REIMAGINING “REMEMBERED HISTORY”:	
ARCHETYPES OF NATION	1
“ANGLO-SAXONISM”: THE CRITICAL CONTEXT	13
“AMERICAN SAXONHOOD” DEFINED	26
 CHAPTER ONE - ORDER IN THE OLD WORLD:	
THE BIRTH OF NEW WORLD ANGLO-SAXONISM	40
THE BRITISH HISTORIES, HISTORIANS, AND NEW WORLD IDENTITIES	43
THE ENGLISH ANTIQUARIANS AND ANGLO-SAXON IDEOLOGY	75
JOHN DEE, WILLIAM CECIL, AND THE NEW WORLD “RECOVERY” PROJECT	87
 CHAPTER TWO - JOHN SMITH AND THE VIRGINIA COMPANY:	
THE STRUGGLE FOR AN “AMERICAN” SAXONHOOD	105
THE <i>MATIÈRE D’AMÉRIQUE</i> : JOHN SMITH AND THE HEROIC SAXON MODEL	111
SMITH AND POCAHONTAS: THE NEW WORLD IDES	131
 CHAPTER THREE - BRADFORD, WINTHROP, AND MATHER:	
THE EMERGENCE OF NEW ENGLAND SAXONHOOD	160
BRADFORD AND WINTHROP: THE “RETURN” OF THE SAXONS	167
COTTON MATHER’S NEW ENGLAND: AMERICAN SAXONHOOD JUSTIFIED	196
 CHAPTER FOUR - MADOC’S LAST HURRAH AND THOMAS JEFFERSON:	
SEALING THE FATE OF AMERICAN SAXONHOOD	230
WILLIAM PENN AND THE WELSH RECOVERY PROJECT	236
THE SAXON MIND OF THOMAS JEFFERSON	247
JEFFERSON’S LANGUAGE OF AMERICAN SAXONHOOD	260
 EPILOGUE - AMERICAN SAXONHOOD AND THE “AMERICAN YOKE”	292
 LIST OF REFERENCES	310
PRIMARY SOURCES	311
SECONDARY SOURCES	320
 VITA	346

INTRODUCTION

REIMAGINING “REMEMBERED HISTORY”: ARCHETYPES OF NATION

Lydia Maria Child’s little-known vignette “The Black Saxons” recounts how one Mr. Duncan, a southern white aristocrat and member of the landowning gentry, surreptitiously follows his slaves to a supposed Methodist church revival, which, in reality, is a secret meeting formed to decide what the slaves will do when the British land in America. “The Black Saxons,” set in Charleston during the Revolutionary period, is a short but loaded tale. Briefly, the action takes place on a warm summer evening during the War of 1812 in Charleston, a city known for black uprisings during the Revolutionary War.¹ We are first introduced to Duncan as he reads “alone in his elegantly furnished parlor”:

Before him lay an open volume of the History of the Norman Conquest. From the natural kindliness of his character, and democratic theories, deeply imbibed in childhood, his thoughts dwelt more with a nation prostrated and kept in base subjection by the strong arm of violence, than with the renowned robbers, who seized their rich possessions, and haughtily trampled on their dearest rights.²

As Duncan reads Jacques Nicolas Augustin Thierry’s *History of the Conquest of England by the Normans*—the standard early history of the Normans and Saxons—with his tea, the pages come to life before readers as well. Duncan’s visions of the Norman conquerors and of the heroic legends that Thierry highlights in his work deal more with, as Child tells us, the prostrated Saxon

¹ The text is from *A Lydia Maria Child Reader*, ed. Carolyn L. Karcher (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 182-91.

² *Ibid.*, 182.

nation kept in “base subjection by the strong arm of violence” of the Normans than with “renowned robbers” (such as Robin Hood, who took refuge in the woods to plot against his oppressors). Immediately, we, too, are sensitized to the plight of the oppressed Saxons. Abruptly, one of the slaves requests permission to attend a prayer meeting that evening in the woods, then another, then yet another. Curious, Duncan decides to follow the slaves to the meeting. He learns that the slaves have voted in unison to join the British should they land on American soil. The question is raised of what to do with the masters. A thoroughly frightened Duncan runs home and, later, “recur[s] to Saxon history, and remember[s] how he had thought that troubled must be the sleep of those who rule a conquered people.”³ His reading informs his interpretation of events, and Duncan’s fear reminds us, as readers, of that powerful wheel of fortune: the highly-regarded Anglo-Saxons were once slaves to the conquering Normans.

The rich Saxon allusions to racial myth, nation, and lineage are powerfully chosen symbols within the text, evident in Child’s concomitant use of static social and political structures—the supposedly categorical relationships between Saxon and English and “American” and “Black”—and the implications of national circular history.⁴ Child’s narrative use of Duncan’s consciousness as a way into these issues works at one level as a way to gain popular sentiment by displacing questions of historical Norman-Saxon race onto colonial American race issues and problems of slavery, an idea to which I will return later in this project, and, at another level, to expose the subverted ideology of a drive that cuts across racial and familial divisions. With its multi-layered plot, “The Black Saxons” impugns as much as it paints: fundamental

³ Ibid., 191.

⁴ I mean “circular history” in the Augustinian sense. In historiography since the Greek historian Polybius (c. 202-120 BCE), there has been the idea that human history repeats itself in cycles, which notion St. Augustine famously Christianized; Friedrich Meinecke, *Historicism: The Rise of a New Historical Outlook*, J. E. Anderson, trans. (London: Herder and Herder, 1972), 322-23.

questions of power, liberty, and lineage rattle about waiting for a readership, a corporeal advocate to form the links Child forges between state, race, and nationhood.

The tale, then, is loaded with implications of cultural lineage. Ideologically, Duncan represents an individual completely trapped within the values of his society; that is, he is caught between a republican “system entailed upon him by his ancestors” and “democratic theories deeply imbibed in since childhood.”⁵ The history of the Saxons, ancestors of the English, shapes Duncan’s “reading” of the chattel system and creates conflict for him concerning the American ideal as it was conceived of during the Revolutionary period in which the story is set. Child’s Duncan connects in some respects (and always unwittingly) ideological implications of nation, ethnicity, and history. “And so that bold and beautiful race became slaves!” he thinks, closing Thierry’s *History*. “The brave and free-souled Harolds,” Duncan reflects, “all sank to the condition of slaves; —and tamely submitted to their lot.”⁶ The startling historical applications Duncan makes are clear: he reads the Black Americans as representative of the cyclical history of nations.

It is precisely what Duncan fails to read, however, that draws my attention. Since Child artfully frames the narrative in the vibrant and romantic undertones of Thierry’s *History*, two things are evident. First, clearly, Child’s work with the narrative relies upon the romantic vision of Thierry, whose history, precipitated by his reading of Walter Scott, exudes the picturesque vision of Saxon liberties quashed by an intrusive Norman state. The aesthetic quality of this romance melds into the mundane world of Duncan’s plantation. This complicated narrative structure reveals much about Duncan’s reading, or *misreading*, habits. A second issue arises on a

⁵ Ibid., 184.

⁶ Ibid., 182.

metanarrational level, for which we must look closer at Duncan's source material. Thierry (1795-1856) did not publish his original version of *History of the Conquest of England by the Normans* (*Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands*) until 1825, more than a dozen years *after* Child's story supposedly takes place. The anachronism is clear—a marked disconnect exists between historical *and* narrated time. Nevertheless, I have not found one commentator of this story who recognizes that there exists a temporal disconnect between the time Thierry's history was written and the point Duncan was supposed to have been reading it. Thus, like Duncan, then, *we* have been misreading, and the problem of Duncan's reading is *our* own problem. Further, as we go into specific studies of Anglo-Saxonism as it relates to colonial American literature and culture, which, to be complete must acknowledge all of the primary texts that we must investigate, we find other discrepancies or gaps. If, for example, we do not look at *when* Thierry's history was written and under *what* type of ideological sway its author produced, we miss out on prominent pieces in this puzzle. This is all to say that unless critical scholarship properly undertakes an account of primary source material, Anglo-Saxon studies in American literature and culture can only go so far to arrive at any fundamentally solid contributions. These additions, I believe, can only benefit our understanding of American national literary heritage. In this study, my focus is to look closely at such primary textual material—including primary British *and* American material, written histories, antiquarians' writings and historical findings, as well as references by colonial American writers to this material—to locate a certain brand of American Anglo-Saxonism that develops first in England and is later displaced in the New World.

In this work, I examine the underlying, albeit often subtle, traces of Anglo-Saxon ideology in the thought and writing of colonial American authors that surface in their

appropriating a certain Anglo-Saxonism for their own ends. While many commentators have successfully argued for a Greco-Roman influence in America, little has been written about any medieval impulse, to borrow Kim Moreland's phrase, or ancient English influence, in early American texts.⁷ My theoretical construct bases itself on the ideological construct of "Anglo-Saxonism." Anglo-Saxonism is a relatively new term for an old ideology: it was quite likely first coined by King Alfred in the ninth century to distinguish members of the Angles and Saxons from Germanic islanders in Britain but has been used only recently in academic scholarship beginning with Reginald Horsman, who revitalized and reconceptualized the term in his landmark study, *Race and Manifest Destiny: Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (1981). Essentially, we may define Anglo-Saxonism through all or at least most of the following descriptors: 1) There was an identified and historic race called the "Anglo-Saxons"; 2) these people enjoyed civil and religious liberties to a fuller extent than any other society; 3) they *believed* they were superior to other races by way of their virtues and talents; and 4) while these Anglo-Saxon attributes were transmittable through generations, there was a possibility of racial degeneration through factors of colonization or blood mixture.⁸ America's New World appropriation of this ideology shares these defining characteristics. Looking at American nation building from this angle—beyond the confines of Greco-Roman influence—gives us a new way to appreciate early American texts and a unique perspective from which we might also examine the reasons for the ensuing divide in American national identity during the nineteenth century.

⁷ Moreland and others have written about this "medieval impulse" as it relates to postbellum America. Moreland's work, *The Medievalist Impulse in American Literature: Twain, Adams, Fitzgerald, and Hemingway* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1996), analyzes American authors through a more medieval lens, claiming that a certain nationalistic tendency to reflect back onto the past occurred as secularization, urbanization, and immigration in America progressed. The authors she highlights—truly, the national consciousness—set the present against the past, positioning themselves as rightful heirs to England's chivalric period.

⁸ L.P. Curtis, *Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of Anti-Irish Prejudice in Victorian England* (Bridgeport: Conference on British Studies, 1968), 11-12.

The New World had no reason to align itself with the Anglo-Saxons as racial cultural memory in its break from England. But it did. Colonial American chroniclers found they profited from some careful borrowing and refashioning of Anglo-Saxonism as theory, an idea that remains central to my study. From the New World designs of the Virginia Company of London to Cotton Mather's New England, Anglo-Saxonism, I argue, becomes a strictly American phenomenon that begs for careful investigation.

Thus, this project seeks to uncover and investigate these nuances and the influence of this adopted American-style Anglo-Saxonism—what I call “American Saxonhood”—in early American literature and the socio-cultural implications that follow upon this influence. Quite simply, it is *a* version of history: American Saxonhood is a term for an invented past that authors in colonial America drew on to legitimate aspects of nation state. To undergird my definition, I borrow from Étienne Balibar's notions of narratives of history and ideology. “The myth of origins and national community,” writes Balibar, is “an effective ideological form, in which the imaginary singularity of national formations is constructed daily, by moving back from the present into the past.”⁹ As Balibar states, repeated and integrated ideas of national character ultimately play a role in the narrative and, subsequently, genesis of new nation states. It is thus my goal to analyze how writers adapted and put to use the historical framework of American Saxonhood in their writings. I have chosen to call my theoretical construct American Saxonhood in part because of the fusion of English socio-historical tendencies and aspirations in the New World with purely “American” national concerns and developing ideologies. As I define it, American Saxonhood consists of three major trends—migration, socio-historical myths, and

⁹ “The Nation Form: History and Ideology,” *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, Étienne Balibar and Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein, eds. (London: Verso, 1991), 88.

political power—all of which I shall address in a moment. We might loosely think of American Saxonhood as an amalgamation of “Anglo-Saxonism,” “Medievalism,” and Arthuriana with notions of an imagined community and of traits positively and quantifiably “American,” meaning *as having arisen or emerging in the New World*. That is, I argue that out of a melting pot of racial groups an ideological notion of power—not defined by race, gender, or, in the strictest sense, even politics—arose, which, through its inception in early Britain, continually developed as the nation evolved. Subsequently, American Saxonhood sprung into being in the New World as a shaping force for a new land, an ideology of domination, superiority, and, eventually, national pride, with the intent to forge an imagined community upon its own geographical space.

The term is not incidental. Etymologically, “Saxon” stands for an imagined racial aspect, one that encompasses *what is conceived to be* the lead race. A correct understanding of “lead race” is important here. By “lead race,” I mean a lineage of peoples known and promoted by later commentators (this includes the early English antiquarians and later well-known historians such as Thierry) to be the prominent example, or archetype, of liberty, a freedom-loving group, and a faction to which all races should strive. It is, for lack of a better term, an archetype. “Hood” derives mostly from the Old English word *hod*, meaning, roughly, “a covering,” or, in the West Germanic Old Frisian, *hode*, a guard, or a protection. Thus, as a composite, “American Saxonhood” defines a specific melding of a New World American identity and an Old World racial *idea*—*not* necessarily a scientifically racial theory—and a covering or shielding ideology in its exploration of nationhood or identity. Since America was not entirely a fixed racial community, per se, I argue that American Saxonhood was the driving and, ultimately, shaping force out of which an *imagined* sense of “Americanness” emerged. The *assumption* of American

Saxonhood, not necessarily as a racial classifier or gender marker, as I intend to argue, sought its own ends using its own definition and redefinition, a mutable, plastic meaning that evolved over three centuries. In a sense, then, American Saxonhood served as what Schopenhauer might have argued is the force of a will, a defining, yet difficult to define, drive that sought to narrow down and sharpen a vision that was to become the American national ideology in the years up to the American Civil War. I end at this point in American history because following the war, American values reflect the last traces of American Saxonhood in a defense of America against immigration, and my project seeks only to define the origins and patterns up to this point.

Before I define American Saxonhood in any depth, it pays to examine briefly what I consider an important idea for this study: the ethnic community, or *ethnie*. According to A.D. Smith, three primary qualities are necessary for a nation to legitimize or define itself as such: 1) a physical area upon which to thrive, or a physical *geography*, 2) a *collective identity* of its members, or a *race*, and 3) a sense of nationalism. Claiming that nations root themselves, first and foremost, in ethnicity, he concludes “nationalism” is a “shift accompanied by power from private to public sphere [so that] nationalism extends the scope of ethnic community from purely cultural and social to economic and political spheres; from predominantly private to public sectors.”¹⁰ Smith also examines nations in terms of their ethnic roots, arguing that a nation has origins in communal *ethnies*.¹¹ The authenticity of a nation, its historical origins, remains rooted in its pedigree through ethnicity, which is largely mythic and symbolic. Often, chroniclers or

¹⁰ *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 19-20.

¹¹ There exist a copious number of theories on nationalism, ranging from the social to philosophical, and a good number of critical works covering these. On the significance of primordialism, the theory Smith espouses, see Walker Connor, “Homelands in a World of States,” *Understanding Nationalism*, Montserrat Guibernau and John Hutchinson, eds. (London: Polity Press, 2001), 53-73. Connor earlier argues that nationalism is essentially nonrational, consisting of emotive and psychological force, in “Beyond Reason: The Nature of the Ethnonational Bond,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16:3 (1993): 374–389.

authors, such as Gildas or Bede, will either knowingly or unknowingly distort an *ethnie* in order to forge and maintain a semblance of a vital nation. *Ethnies*, albeit often transformed from the perceived decay of an historical group or ancient custom, can often be revitalized, thus bringing to the fore a new and unique national identity. And, Smith argues, often for nation building purposes, some lingering memories of “greatness” cause nations to reach back in time and reconstruct identity with some semblance of antique pedigree.¹²

Perhaps the earliest and most general categorization of *ethnie* appears in the Elizabethan struggles with Spain over the New World and the 1493 Bull from Pope Alexander VI dividing the New World pole to pole. All land to the east (i.e. lands of Brazil, etc.) was assigned to Portugal, and all western land (essentially, all of North and South America) was granted to Spain. As is widely known, the piracy struggles of the mid-sixteenth century—well-documented and evident in the voyages of Sir Francis Drake, Martin Frobisher, Sir Richard Grenville (Sir Humphrey Gilbert’s cousin), John Davis and others—resulted in a heated struggle for the latter lands. Following the defeat of the Spanish Armada, the lands were marked as “English territory,” or, more pointedly, “Tudor Territory” (that is, until James’ succession). Despite that brief historical interlude, and setting aside the southern territories such as the Florida lands for the moment, American Saxonhood remains primarily an American phenomenon *as it applies to the New World*. Of course, smaller sects of peoples migrated to the New World, such as the Dutch and Irish, but as far as geography, migratory myths, and political power and race are concerned, the English—as defined by the imagined Saxon racial archetype discussed above—desired to set cultural standards for the New World. Even Germans, who may be called the “true” inheritors of

¹² *Ethnic Origins*, 15-17.

Saxon blood, fit into this slippery category, thus underscoring the pure imagined racial and ideological movement of American Saxonhood.

Thus, it remains important to think of the amalgamation of these races that I will discuss or consider in light of this ideological construct. Essentially, anyone with a Welsh, British, English, Saxon, or even French (Norman) lineage is favored over any other race. Although there will be minor divisions within these groups that turn up in later chapters—for example, “Saxon” might not always be the case of the genetic race, and Welsh ancestry may be deemed as a worthy lead race and fit in with other fundamental American Saxonhood qualities—this generalization remains the fundamental principle under which all members of the dominant *ethnie* gather together. Once again, the racial categories, whether they are Welsh, Celtic, or Saxon, are somewhat generalized in that they all, at certain times, align themselves with the fundamental principles of American Saxonhood. It has nothing to do with race scientifically; it has everything to do with propaganda. Hence, the New World opened the door for the formation of an ideology—indeed, it *necessitated* it—such as American Saxonhood, for in order to integrate *English* successfully into the New World, there must have been a promise of this national goal. I propose that there are at least three important rules for the theory of American Saxonhood, which are as follows. As has been noted above, race is the primary principle. Although the lines may be obfuscated, switched, or merged in some way, the racial standard is this: Inhabitants must be of *some* English descent. The lines here may blur; for example, French Norman may be loosely perceived as “English” while Slavic is decidedly not. Saxon remains the fundamental archetype, yet Celtic is often employed as an equally tenable race. A corollary to this rule follows: Those that *are* of that descent must convert the “natives,” if there remain any on the conquered geographical space, to one system of beliefs, namely, that of the primary race. This

rule applies to both major lines of settlement in the New World I will be discussing: New England and Virginia, both aptly named after a racial heritage. The second rule or condition involves geography. The land in question must be a part of the grand religious historical plan of the primary race as seen—however loosely, incorrectly, or obscurely—sometime before, linked to some grand, apostolic vision of the future. Cotton Mather serves as the quintessential arbiter of this rule. For example, in line with Augustine, Eusebius, and other early church historians, Mather argues for a corporeal “Christiano-graphy.” Essentially, this type of thought follows Augustine’s Platonic “City of God” (Winthrop’s “City on the Hill” follows this as well). There is more evidence for this phenomenon in New England, where the primary rule is to relocate for religious purposes, than in Smith. Finally, there exists an element of power—a “good” type of oppression that feeds the new land and people with a quantifiable mission. This is the third rule. The dominant race here must show *why* the oppression is good. With this power comes commerce, industry, and settlement, all part of the dominant plan, the archetypal vision of freedom and liberty as necessitated by and acquired through racial lineage. One final matter remains to be defined: the accepted ideological myth of deserved migration. This propelled an ethnic structure in the New World that, once crystallized from seeds of Anglo-Saxon ideology, politically, socially, and ideologically shaped the path of the American nation for later generations.

What is at stake here is the origin myth of a nation, a tale of beginnings from which everything else flowered. Previous studies of Anglo-Saxon influence on American ideology remain important ways to look at the influence of culture transmitted from what might be argued as the American “motherland” to the New World. However, the Anglo-Saxon connection remains missing. “Our history of ideas,” A.N. Whitehead writes, “is derivative from our ideas of

history.”¹³ The voice of historical inquiry dominates the history itself. In fact, as David Douglas has pointed out, the words “Norman Conquest” and “1066” have been battled about for centuries, the concern over who speaks them and *how* they speak them.¹⁴ Semiotic usage remains equally problematic in the case of “Anglo-Saxon.” Naturally, bringing a coinage like Anglo-Saxon forward from the past creates a host of socio-historical issues, including matters of origin, and ideological problems. This study is an attempt to explore its power in the creation of America through the literature within which it was promoted and to offer reasons *behind* the creation of a cultural legacy that was largely borrowed from the migrating natures of a geographical people. Drawing on a primarily socio-historical context of myth, my definition of the type of linear migration myth as it relates to the American-Saxonhood that colonial Americans drew on can be summarized as follows: *It is a form of memory, not wholly migratory but based upon migration, a linear idea traced back to the biblical exodus through the struggles of the land of Briton, which involves at its core the idea of a chosen people, who, with respect to an historical lineage, are designated a certain destiny. Further, as a fundamentally social instrument, it connects one culture to an origin, bonding the society for communal purposes—and the arrangement, or narrative, reveals the truth of land possession and cultural dominance.* American Saxonhood connects linear, mythical, and political ideas. The ultimate geographical connection is the isle of Briton: it was both the isle of the first Saxon conquering and the primary point of migration to the “New Britain”—dubbed the “New World,” but, essentially, the newly “conquered land.” For that reason, Britain remains embedded within the cultural memory of the people destined for migration to America.

¹³ *Adventures of Ideas* (New York: MacMillan, 1933), 15.

¹⁴ *The Norman Conquest and British Historians* (Glasgow: Jackson & Son, 1946), 8.

“ANGLO-SAXONISM”: THE CRITICAL CONTEXT

As is well known, the founding of the United States brought with it many conceptions of “Englishness” simply because the majority that had traveled across the sea to the new land *was* English, so that was the heritage that assimilated into the new country. Any radical change of habitation—here, the move to a New World, complete with all the ensuing fears, concerns, and expectations—carries with it certain attitudes of a collective memory or “remembered history,” to use Bernard Lewis’s term. Lewis defines remembered history as a kind of cultural memory, including “statements about the past [that] rulers, leaders, poets and sages, choose to remember as significant, both as reality and symbol.”¹⁵ It was the propulsion of this cultural memory, from the earliest population of America, which helped to shape the new continent. Consequently, the imaginings of a “remembered history” for America meant an inevitable link back to Britain, which became a remembering and *re*-remembering—or, as I argue in the present project, a refashioning à la Stephen Greenblatt’s Renaissance Self-Fashioning—of English or Anglo-Saxon ideals that provided a framework through which American “progress” might be understood.

To be “American,” then, was decidedly ambiguous, since the early Americans traced their lineage directly back to the British Isles from whence they arrived, an ancestry that led, inevitably, to the tenuous settlement of Britain itself. One line of scholarship into this matter focuses particularly on the Greco-Roman influence in American literature and culture. However, I must offer a certain caveat concerning the Greco-Roman influence as it exists in both past and present scholarship arising in response to cultural memory and remembered histories. It is not my intent to dismiss this scholarship casually, which argues for the impact of Greece and Rome in sundry aspects of North American literature and culture. As early, and even some

¹⁵ *History: Remembered, Recovered, Invented* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 11-12.

contemporary, scholarship argues, American authors made much use of the Greco-Roman model. Historically speaking, in fact, we might all agree that every “new” prominent nation uses the past; to some extent, the past remains usable because it is mined for nuggets that can buttress certain aspirations of the new nation. Just as Rome borrowed from Greece, Greece made use of Etruscan culture. Great cultures borrow from one another, altering the cultural landscape, and eventually changing the direction of the future. To view the nature of history in this way, as the Hegelians saw it, is to see the dialectic shape: the pattern is to draw on or bring into play a certain characteristic, pit it against a new environment, and create a new identity. Looking at it this way, we do not claim that the Romans had a sense of “Greekism” any more than we say that early Britons—or the English, in its many manifestations, Saxons, or other tribes, for that matter—had a perverted, or even altered, sense of “Romanism.” There are geographical issues, though, with the socio-historical label “American” that seem to parallel better struggles among the Welsh, Britons, and Anglo-Saxons of the medieval period rather than those of Greco-Roman culture. First of all, America is a land that was peopled by natives *prior* to the arrival of anyone else—the English, Norse, Dutch, even Celts (as we shall see in the later arguments of antiquarian John Dee). Further, contrary to that of the British Isles, the physical geography of North America had a cultural sense of place long before it was populated by American “colonial stock.”¹⁶ There are at present differing North American migration theories, but there is no doubt that American indigenous peoples had a shared culture long before the arrival of Europeans; North America had

¹⁶ David Hackett Fischer (*Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* [Oxford University Press, 1989]) concludes there were four types of what he terms “colonial stock” from which “Americans” emerged: The East Anglican Puritans, “Cavalier” Virginia gentry from southern England, Quakers, and Scots-Irish. Each had a decisive impact upon the struggles for America identity, as they all brought with them certain beliefs and ideologies; 787.

inhabitants at least some 20,000-30,000 years before the coming of Europeans.¹⁷ The arrival of foreigners was an enormous migratory shift. In recent memory we have no documentation of a shift of this magnitude before. Historically, there is no parallel. Where eventually the Mediterranean became to the Romans *mare nostrum*, other cultures, such as Greece to the south and Egypt to the east, already had developed cultures. Rome developed insularly, meaning it formed *out* of a place. Conversely, Britain's tempestuous history shaped the island *and* its inhabitants, and the Europeans migrating to North America forcibly shaped the land into an imaginative community for their own ends, modeling an empire upon an imperfect and destructive lineage. *This* was colonial America's model.

It is also crucial to recognize that, historically, primary national powers aren't always "winners": victors in national struggles of empire exist often as mere variables, not primary links in culture and civilization. The Greek city/state Sparta serves as one example. Following the Persian War in the fifth century (490 BCE-480 BCE), the two super states that emerged were Sparta, the traditional land-based power with an oligarchic government, and Athens, a sea-based, democratic empire. While Sparta eventually won the Peloponnesian War, Athens, with its art, religion, and literature, became the foundation for western culture from that time forward (thus, we do not think of the influence of Sparta upon western civilization so much as we do Athens in its Golden Age). There are reasons for this, probably the best one being the differences in

¹⁷ While no one knows for certain when or how America was peopled, one argument is that the majority of the indigenous peoples in North America migrated across the Bering land bridge from Asia during the last ice age. For more, see David Moody Hopkins, *The Bering Land Bridge* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1967). Most archeologists agree on a "three pulse model," whereby indigenous American people could be placed into three archeological classifications, three genetic groupings, and three language families, all resulting from three major migrations, the last of which was the Last Glacial Maximum; see J.H. Greenberg, C.G. Turner II, S.L. Zegura, "The Settlement of the Americas: A Comparison of the Linguistic, Dental and Genetic Evidence," *Current Anthropology* 27 (1986): 477-497.

political styles and the production of culture.¹⁸ Similarly, in North American history, it might be too simplistic to argue that the early American New England and Virginia regions served in some respects as the same model and that one served as “victor” much the way Athens did, but the idea rings true in a sense. The dominant power emerging from the American Civil War gained a foothold in the shaping of the national ideology or identity. Granted, in each historical case, there were smaller players involved—for instance, the ruling oligarchic cities on Lesbos, and the Boiotians and Thebans in the formation and outcome of the Peloponnesian War, to name a few. Naturally, in any national struggle some players are better known than others. In America, for example, we might argue, as I do in the following pages, that William Penn and the Quakers of Pennsylvania were exponentially important to American Anglo-Saxonhood in part because of Penn’s reconceptualization of the Madoc myth for geographical purposes.

Even when the barbaric invasions crumpled Rome sometime in the early fifth century, the people who remained in the physical geographical limits of Rome, while not the leaders of the world, were still Romans. Ultimately, Rome lingers in the imagination because the *concept* or idea of Rome became important to later political institutions. And though much has been written about the Greco-Roman influence on America, we must remember that while some of these notions may seem to fit, North America was peopled by groups of a different past. While Rome

¹⁸ While this assertion is general, Athens’ cultural impact on western civilization is indisputable. Politically speaking, the diametric poles of government in the two city-states, democracy and oligarchy, are often seen at odds with each other. There have been, in fact, numerous claims for Spartan influence on Western culture. The definitive work at present remains Elizabeth Rawson’s *The Spartan Tradition in European Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991). Rawson concludes that, beginning in the Renaissance, the case of Sparta was used in the oppositions between contemplative and active thought, becoming especially evident in the work of Machiavelli and later French revolutionaries. In France, Indulgents believed themselves to be in a dual struggle with the Robespierrists, the former modeled on Athenians and the latter on Spartans. One problem with Spartan history, argues Rawson, is that “Sparta” and “Spartan” remain slippery terms, connoting variant definitions. Since the 1840s, when High German culture was heavily influenced by the beauty and refinement of Classical Athenian civilization, Sparta has been seen as the rebellious, power-hungry foe in strict opposition to Athens.

and some of its institutions may have indeed served as a model in a number of respects for the development of the New World, it was outside the racial realm of true lineage—the English were not Roman descendents. Most prominent New World citizens were, first and foremost, English, or *Englisc*, as was first designated by King Alfred. This point makes any identification with Rome that much more difficult. The differences are simply too great.

American nation building can be viewed in other ways, however, than simply by these historical comparisons to the Greco-Roman tradition. Sacvan Bercovitch's seminal study *The Rites of Assent: Transformations in the Symbolic Construction of America* (1993) argues that by invoking a myth of the republic, writers and authors such as Cotton Mather consciously attempted to fuse nationalism with a sense of sacred mission, an idea continued by later American critics. This remains an important argument. Since religion played such a fundamental role in the shaping of Anglo-Saxon culture, it remains important to examine its impact as part of the New World ideology. Another variant branch of scholarship identifying Americanness focuses on the advent and issues of society and religion in America. The forerunners of this method of investigation, still in practice in small circles today, are Bercovitch, Sidney Mead, and Robert Bellah.¹⁹ Arguably, it was Bellah's work in the late 1960s that began the trend of

¹⁹ These three scholars represent divergent voices from various disciplines in the now nearly defunct area of civil religious studies in America. Sociologist Robert Bellah set the foundation for the study of civil religion. For Bellah, America was founded on religious hopes and fears whether God would protect the new inhabitants. In *The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial* (New York: Seabury, 1975), he invokes older religious myths, often arguing that the capitalist form replaced religious motivations, thus weakening the social structure of America. His later work strove more to tie civil religion from the past to the present in American society, and he argued famously for a collective set of religious beliefs and practices that defined American civil society, one that might emerge anew in the later years of the twentieth century. Historian Sidney Mead, in *The Nation with the Soul of a Church* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), argues that the tension between politics and religion stems from the plurality of religions imported from the Old World to the New. The theology represented in the Revolutionary Period, the "Religion of the Republic," represented Enlightenment values, such as divine and natural law. The failure to come through with arguments of theology from that point on has weakened the church in America. Bercovitch's work relies on language, focusing largely on the jeremiad sermon as it relates to the political nature of the then-emerging republic.

highlighting the parallels between sixteenth-century Protestants' mission and that of the ancient Israelites, and bypassing ideas of transatlantic migration or other issues. In his recent attempt to revive these civic religious arguments, Richard T. Hughes claims, "since the days of Tyndale, English Protestants had drawn a parallel between England and ancient Israel. Now, in their migration to New England, Puritans found that parallel even more compelling."²⁰ Similarly, Joseph A. Conforti repeats this familiar assertion in his study of the New England region: "scholars who have examined the religious motives for New England settlements have often located in the region's founding the birth of an *American* identity, not the reaffirmation of English identity."²¹ While both Hughes' and Conforti's projects continue to develop the tantalizing ideas regarding myths and national identity begun by Bellah, they unfortunately omit recognition of a fundamental link in the transnational crossing of identity, or *folc*, in the Anglo-Saxon vernacular, issues of civilized migrations, a foundational point in the occupation of this new geographic place. It is the goal of this project to excavate deeper than notions concerning civic religion and to show the relevance of notions of migration held by the Anglo-Saxon peoples, ideas incorporated into the New World via old texts and received ideas, to the making of American identity.

Though there exists great possibility for research and scholarship in the field of American Studies, work in "Anglo-Saxonism" as an ideology is a relatively new field. Much of the

²⁰ *Myths America Lives By* (Urbana: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 30. Hughes claims he wants to reexamine voices that were previously marginalized, including those of other ethnicities. His argument seems to be a direct link to the ideas of Bellah, who wrote the preface to his work.

²¹ *Imagining New England: Explorations of Regional Identity from the Pilgrims to the Mid-Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 27. Both the work of Conforti and Hughes suffer from what I believe is the undue influence of carrying theologian Paul Tillich's idea of culture and religion to an extreme and misapplying it. Tillich was alluding to the circular growth of each through the other, remarking, quite fervently, that "religion is the essence of culture, and culture is the form of religion," in *Theology of Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959), 42.

academic work that has been done deals with English literature. As has been noted, Horsman coined the term in the early 1980s in his pioneering study. Horsman's project, still the definitive work on Anglo-Saxon appropriations in antebellum America, was also one of the first to argue for a more insidious side of Anglo-Saxonism. For Horsman, Anglo-Saxonism represents a more sophisticated elaboration of white racial lineage as a cultural concept beyond that based on racial typing. Among other things, he argues that Anglo-Saxonism is the culmination of cultural capital, heightened to its acme in the nineteenth century, which claims superior innate endowments as a marker of and reason for national dominance and world power.²² In the years following the Civil War, Horsman argues, Americans saw themselves as an elite and supreme race, an ideology carried forward from earlier periods in American history when North Americans had fused notions of Anglo-Saxonism with ideas of Aryan supremacy. Horsman links this attitude with American westward expansion, where the supposed innate supremacy of the white race was destined to rule all lands on which it could lay its hands. In other words, Anglo-Saxon was at the root of ethnocentric Manifest Destiny. Drawing on numerous examples, Horsman claims that "inferior" races were thought to be subject to the wealth, commercial power, and industrial strength the Caucasian race brought.

Naturally, academic medievalists were intrigued by Horsman's thesis. Allen Frantzen and John Niles improved upon Horsman's definition to arrive at an even more detailed concept of the term. Frantzen and Niles, whose collection *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of National Identity* (1997) presents nine essays focusing on Anglo-Saxon culture and ideology and its relation to various notions of power, argue for a qualitative and more concentrated examination

²² Here I mean "cultural capital" in Bourdieu's sense of the term: generally speaking, anything that facilitates further appropriation of a culture's "heritage," most often through embodied or objectified signs; see Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, Richard Nice, trans. (London: Routledge, 1984), 2.

of “Anglo-Saxonism,” one to which I will return below. Similarly, Frantzen’s monograph, *Desire for Origins: New Language, Old English, and Teaching the Tradition* (1990), assesses the more recent state of Anglo-Saxonism as well as offering historical analysis of past Anglo-Saxon studies. Importantly, he connects Anglo-Saxonism to past arguments about political ideology and argues that Anglo-Saxonism has encompassed and continues to include the “study and the construction of history, language, and literature, in an attempt to articulate the national values of English culture.”²³ Frantzen also identifies various trends of Anglo-Saxonism throughout the ages, from the Renaissance through the nineteenth century to the present day, examining each ideological manifestation.

A couple of scholarly works focus explicitly on literary connections to Victorian Anglo-Saxonism. In *A Dream of Order: The Medieval Ideal in Nineteenth-Century English Literature* (1970), Alice Chandler explores the “hard primitivism” in early Anglo-Saxon England, arguing that nineteenth-century Saxonists attempted to align their views with the lineage of Anglo-Saxon laws and religion in relation to English Protestantism. Following in Chandler’s wake, in *Reversing the Conquest: History and Myth in 19th-Century British Literature* (1990), Clare Simmons analyzes the Norman Saxon oppositions in a number of British and American texts, arguing the depiction was often contradictory. Simmons’ study, which explores these oppositions in various figures (Richard I and John I, and King Alfred and Queen Victoria, to name two figures she uses as examples), examines how unstable these seemingly fixed semiotic notions are. Still, American Studies has yet to offer any in-depth treatment of the influence of Anglo-Saxon England on the New World.

²³ *Desire for Origins: New Language, Old English, and Teaching the Tradition* (Camden: Rutgers University Press, 1990), 30.

A new strain of genealogical transatlantic scholarship investigates the import of transnational and racial theories, such as “Anglo-Saxonism,” in content. Recently, two new studies have focused on specific Anglo-Saxon issues within American culture: Laura Doyle’s *Freedom’s Empire: Race and the Rise of the Novel in Atlantic Modernity, 1640-1940* (2008) and Ritchie Devon Watson’s *Normans and Saxons: Southern Race Mythology and the Intellectual History of the American Civil War* (2008). *Freedom’s Empire* follows the recent transnational “Atlantic” body of work—some of the landmark primary works in this area of scholarship include Ian Baucom’s *Out of Place: Englishness, Empire and the Locations of Identity* (1999) and Clement Hawes’s *The British Eighteenth Century and Global Critique* (2005)—that argues for a literary and historical intersection of globalization, race, and political economy from the seventeenth century to the early twentieth century. Doyle further pushes the claim for a genealogy and dialectic of race, namely “Anglo-Saxon” versus the Other, arguing that her investigation focuses on the kernel of “freedom,” in this case, race. For Doyle, race arises from seventeenth-century British rhetoric taking into account the transatlantic movement. As a modernist, Doyle focuses on the origins of racial ideology in order to read later modern texts. She marks the beginning of her notion of primary racial superiority with James Thomson’s *Rule Britannia* (1740), wherein she claims to discover the true link to an ideal past, based upon the foundation of racial Anglo-Saxonism. The complex relationships between nationalism, racialism, and liberty are represented both literally and imaginatively as they play out in crossing trips on the Atlantic Ocean. *Freedom’s Empire* reflects a great breadth of material: Doyle groups the novels in her study according to certain reflections of racial order, which then provide narrative entry points into racial ideologies first set forth by Thompson.

Focusing more on America and less on the transnational theme, Ritchie Devon Watson's *Saxons and Normans* examines the differences within the two divergently developing regions of the country, the North and the South. Watson's project follows up on the thesis of his earlier work, *Yeoman Versus Cavalier: The Old Southwest's Fictional Road to Rebellion* (1993). In *Yeoman Versus Cavalier*, he focuses his readings on the Old South and Southwest and the inherent cultural intricacies and inconstancies of ideological constructs, such as the stalwart Jeffersonian "yeoman" and the southern "cavalier." In his recent work, Watson extends this thesis to include the Yankee in the form of the industrious American Saxon, while the chivalric southern cavalier is morphed into the Norman aristocrat. Concentrating once again largely on the nineteenth century, as he does in his previous work, *Saxons and Normans* attempts to answer the age-old conundrum: Why were northerners and southerners in the years prior the Civil War so fundamentally different? Watson claims the differences, which he illustrates by an account of the South Carolinian Preston Brooks's caning of Senator Charles Sumner on the floor of the senate in 1856, came as nothing surprisingly new. Watson's claim is simple. This event was nothing out of the ordinary given the brewing tumultuous attitudes of the polar North and South. The tags "Saxon" and "Norman" explain the polarity: Southern aristocrats were descended from Norman landowners and Northerners from Saxons. Watson's main thesis—that this racial elitism grew to augment arguments for and against slavery and involved two separate and contesting ideologies within America at the time of the Civil War—fits in line with other southern theorists, such as Bertram Wyatt-Brown's *The Shaping of Southern Culture Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1880s* (2001), Michael O'Brien's *Conjectures of Order Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810-1860* (2004), and Elizabeth Fox Genovese's and Eugene D. Genovese's *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholders' Worldview* (2005).

These recent forays into Anglo-Saxon racial attitudes and ideologies have at their core a certain American-heavy historical application, which focuses more on the American reception aspect but less on the early English textual side. I would like to return to an important element in “hard” Anglo-Saxon theory—an idea hinted at in Horsman but fleshed out even more in Frantzen and Niles—in application to early American texts. To begin with, Frantzen and Niles mark a distinction between “Medievalism” and “Anglo-Saxonism,” claiming that the former deals specifically with the reception of the Middle Ages in a later period, while the latter is a feature of consciousness, an *idea* rather than a tangible cultural source.²⁴ I would add that “Medievalism” is comprised more of ideas of *character* within genres of texts written in English during the Medieval period (i.e. the English *romans*, tales of Arthur, etc.) that, when brought forward, can play an ideological role in nation making simply as written relics and touchstones. “Anglo-Saxonism,” while differing slightly, makes a similar impact but through another mechanism and in a more complex fashion. Niles argues that “Anglo-Saxonism” is more of a process—rather than characterological types—through which, via scholarship and investigation, “a self-conscious national and racial identity first came into being among the early peoples of the region that we now call England,” and over time “that identity was transformed into an originary myth available to a wide range of political and social interests.”²⁵ In other words, Anglo-Saxonism is an idea, on the verge of becoming ideology, politically charged and socially shaped, as manifested in history by humans, a conceptualization extremely useful in nation building. With this I agree.

²⁴ Allen J. Frantzen and John D. Niles, eds., *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of Social Identity* (University Press of Florida, 1997), 209.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.

I disagree with Frantzen and Niles, however, on the bifurcation of “Medievalism” and “Anglo-Saxonism” simply because the changes in thought about these differing ideological mechanisms from the Middle Ages to nineteenth-century America indicate a theory of progress of its own. The history of early Britain was fashioned and appropriated throughout the centuries, as it still is today. Yet, the degree to which early American authors used Anglo-Saxonism as *their* idea or theory of progress for America as the New England and the New *Southron*—a term created out of the chivalric themes in Scott’s novels and adopted by American Southerners—generated definite differences in the shaping of Anglo-Saxonism, and it is these differences this project seeks to examine. As such, I am hesitant to use such broad terms as “Anglo-Saxonism” and “medievalism” in this study.

Instead, I trace a more localized brand of medievalism via the socio-historical idea of Benedict Anderson’s “imagined communities” and Hedley Buell’s notion of “neo-medievalism.” Both ideas are politically charged. For Anderson, a nation is a community imaginatively constructed, meaning the people who see themselves *as* that community actively construct *that* particular nation. Further, claims Anderson, because these communities define themselves through the printed vernacular, they are able to project this imagined community onto other members whom they may never even meet. Buell, in turn, defines “neo-medievalism” as “a system of overlapping authorities and criss-crossing loyalties” that eliminates any absolute authority claimed and exercised by sovereign states.²⁶ Neo-medievalism in this sense imaginatively undoes political society, transforms political life, and returns it to something analogous to medieval life, where there supposedly existed a lack of mutual recognition among

²⁶ *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, 2nd ed. (Columbia University Press, New York, 1977), 4.

entities, “an absence of ‘anarchy’ in a Waltzian neo-Realist sense, and a more complex pattern of relationships to consider.”²⁷ Together, these two ideas merge to form one cohesive reality—namely, that a community, inhabited and imaginatively formed by its members, teases out variants of authority based on records of the past in order to come, in a Hegelian sense, to an antithesis that supersedes that past and a synthesis that envisions a new community, or nation state. Essentially, one of the key elements of a nation is its vernacular literature—and I would argue Arthurian literature, as mentioned above, would serve as a prime example. The Bible provided for the Western Christian world the first model of a nation, and Buell rightly argues that without it, our notion of nation would be quite different. Subsequent literatures, then, as Anderson observes, then seek to shape new imaginative communities, and such would be the case of Arthurian literature, that nevertheless reflect the originary text.

Borrowing largely from these ideas and those of Horsman, I claim something different happened in America’s adaptation of the Saxon racial myth, a new blend of these notions of literature, cultural capital, power, and the past. As Horsman has noted, “Anglo-Saxon” as a term, which is to say a definition of a race of people, has a long history of misuse.²⁸ There is a troubling issue here, for example, when we use “Anglo-Saxon” as a socio-demographic label, since there was no fixed race of Anglo-Saxon peoples. The conglomeration of the variant tribes designated as “Anglo-Saxons” did not simply eradicate and replace the Britons (Celts) and become *folc-fryg* (free people); both groups merged together as a people living on the same land. While studies such as Doyle’s and Watson’s are remarkable in their pioneering efforts, they tend

²⁷ *Neo-Medievalism and Civil Wars* (Portland: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 2004), 1.

²⁸ *Race and Manifest Destiny*, 4.

to avoid the type of inquiry seen above in the Thierry example, which offers both intertextual *and* metatextual proofs along with claims for a racial ideology such as Anglo-Saxonism.

This project focuses on the attitudes of medievalism, specifically a certain *type* of American medievalism that includes both “medieval” and “Anglo-Saxonism” that helped shape American culture and identity from the point of entry into the British New World to the nineteenth century. A sense of medievalist textual balance seems lacking in previous studies, and, I would argue, we need better textual avenues into these arguments. Medievalist Keith Stringer, interested in these cultural ties of which I write, observes that perhaps medievalists and scholars of later periods can learn from each other, especially by studying these texts in relation to nationalism.²⁹ I agree. In this project, I argue that the struggle over the roots of early English nationalism, especially evident in America’s understanding and appropriation of early medieval texts, was used as an ideological front for the shaping of American history. Ultimately, this led not only to deep schisms concerning national character between the North and the South but also between America and the rest of the world *as well as* among “Americans” themselves as to what they are nationally, ideologically and temporally.

“AMERICAN SAXONHOOD” DEFINED

There is an idea of cultural memory through the use of myth and race that remains fundamental for Anglo-Saxonism as an ideological theory. Hugh MacDougall has explained how basic elements of Anglo-Saxonism function as a racial ideology, a way for people of Saxon descent to

²⁹ “Social and Political Communities in European History: Some Reflections on Recent Studies,” *Nations, Nationalism, and Patriotism in the European Past* (Copenhagen: Academic Press, 1994), 22-3.

trace a common lineage.³⁰ MacDougall acknowledges British history in his work; he also points to a transition period in which “Arthurianism,” should we call it that, or the historical reality of an Arthur, as Geoffrey of Monmouth writes, no longer served as tenable political discourse, historically speaking. According to this theory, Arthur and his story served as a link to a past that held the British in high esteem, a national myth for a culture that united it against the encroaching Norman overlords. This myth-making began in Geoffrey’s account, a myth of national origin linking Britain to Rome, and continued through the Renaissance. Each version, from Gildas to Thomas Malory, historically documented the unity of the English nation, with Malory’s version being the last. However, during the English Civil War (1641-51), this belief reached a climax, with those supporting the Arthurian cultural myth on the side of the monarchy, while the proponents of Anglo-Saxonism, as outlined above, supported the English Parliament.³¹ (These shifts, as I later argue, become problematized in the separation from the king and in the formation of the American government.)

Also, the nature of migration further carries with it the myths of origin and racial continuation. We might claim, for example, as Mircea Éliade does, that nations are fictive creations: “The creation of the world is the exemplar for all constructions,” Éliade argues, “every new town, every new house that is built, imitates afresh, and in a sense repeats, the creation of the world.”³² American Saxonhood is one such creation. It is a view of an imagined history

³⁰ MacDougall lists four: 1) Germanic peoples, on account of their unmixed origins and universal civilizing mission, are inherently superior to all others, both in individual character and in their institutions; 2) The English are, in the main, of Germanic origin, and their history begins with the landing of Hengist and Horsa at Ebbsfield, Kent, in 449; 3) The qualities that render English political and religious institutions the freest in the world are an inheritance from Germanic forefathers; and 4) The English, better than any other Germanic people, represent the traditional genius of their ancestors and thereby carry a special burden of leadership in the world community; *Racial Myth in English History: Trojans, Teutons, and Anglo-Saxons* (Montreal: Harvest House, 1982), 2.

³¹ MacDougall, 4-28.

³² *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, Rosemary Sheedy, trans. (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1963), 379.

carried forward in the New World. National culture never remains fixed; that is, national identity grows through its own sense of ethnic identity, shaped in part by its past. Smith contends, in turn, that ethnic communities are not physical in lineage but also somewhat constructed: they are “constituted not by lines of physical descent, but by the sense of continuity, shared memory and collective destiny.”³³ Migration, by definition, has cultural, political, or economic causes. Theoretically, one may speak of *macro* migration (involving largely political and economic ties, and historically-rooted cultural reasons), *micro* migration (based on individual values or needs), and *meso* migration (bound toward kinship). Unlike the previous two, meso migration is a form of immigration that symbolically adjudicates between both political and social purposes, often forming or refashioning history for ancestral support and justification of future progress.

One of the central ideas to grow from all types of migrations and that seems especially pronounced in meso migrators is an *ethnie*, to borrow from Smith: “human populations with shared ancestry myths, histories and cultures, having an association with a specific territory and a sense of solidarity.”³⁴ American Saxonhood serves as a myth that carries the history of the dominant *ethnie* forward as an archetype for the fashioning of a new geographical space. My work here focuses on what Frantzen describes as the very heart of Anglo-Saxon studies—the interplay of reception through a certain period of time. Frantzen notes that textual study comprises half of Anglo-Saxon studies, and by studying the interplay of actions, ideas, and the

³³ *National Identity*, 29.

³⁴ *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism* (London: Routledge, 1998), 191. Scholarship on migration theories, such as the “push pull,” where there exists a “push” *from* the land (because of low living standards, economic hardship, etc.) and a “pull” *toward* a new land, were at one time dominant in the literature on migration theory. See, for example, G.J. Borjas, “Economic Theory and International Migration,” *International Migration Review* 23:3 (1987): 457-85. Much literature exists on general notions of migration; however, recently there are critics who suggest migratory movements arise from the existence of cultural ties, imperialism, and political issues, such as rapid and sustained economic loss or education. For my purposes, however, Smith’s work on *ethnies* and ethnic communities remains most relevant.

like within texts as they correspond to the actions without, we see that “Anglo-Saxon studies is not extraneous to the subjects of Anglo-Saxon language, literature, and history [but that the] scholarship of each generation *becomes* part of the subject that the next generation then studies.”³⁵ And, in fact, the generation of mid- to late-nineteenth-century Americans that struggled with reception, academic and otherwise, and “control” of Anglo-Saxon texts was comprised of factions within the very divided nation struggling to come to grips with its divided self. Ultimately, I hope to show, what cultures *do* with history often involves a kind of *poiesis*, meaning the act of history-making and writing involves the creation and maintenance of certain values. As Christopher Canon observes, historical relics and writings actually “are the past, brought forward in our own present, but not made here.”³⁶ Canon’s larger thesis—that “English literature” as a body has romance at its core, that, historically speaking, the “consciousness” of a text is shaped by its readership—promotes a historicist view and offers a variation on that same theme.

These ideas become increasingly clear in the emergent early American national literature. The creation of a historical *ethnie* involves an active process. As Anderson claims, when national identities forge into “imagined communities” various “cultural artifacts,” such as national literatures, emerge.³⁷ For Anderson, nations are cultural processes because “nation” as a construct is timeless and spaceless. Communities increase in power to inhabit a *Weltanschauung*, or worldview, and once empowered by print, the present lived history becomes the extension of a national past—a powerful narrative of an imagined territory. Alfred, King of the Saxons,

³⁵ Frantzen, *Desire for Origins*, 125.

³⁶ *The Grounds of English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 31.

³⁷ *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), 4. Anderson’s view is mainly constructivist; however, his work has sparked numerous debates and become the dominant work in social scientific nation studies.

recognized this power in early England and used it to shape a nation state. Similarly, I argue, colonial American authors drew from the well, refashioning the ideology into its purely American form. With the advent of historical nation-writing, *poiesis* becomes a national biographical process, and present nations explain, justify themselves, and find their anchor in an historic past, moving, as Balibar observes, from past to present. Yet, as is evident from the examples of Gildas and Bede, during the early British and English periods of historical writing, “nation” remained a slippery term.³⁸ In medieval Europe, for example, the rise of Christianity aided in imperial notions, thus combining the sacred and the secular. Essentially, then, *ethnies* are reconstituted but never destroyed. In colonial America, I argue, American Saxonhood transfers the imagined Saxon *ethnie* and refashions it as a national ideology for conquest, settlement, and, finally, land acquisition and westward expansion.

* * * * *

My plan for this project is chronological. Following an introduction that explores the primary historical importance of race and Anglo-Saxon history in England, the first chapter, “Order in the Old World: The Birth of New World Anglo-Saxonism,” explores the socio-historical and cultural context of Anglo-Saxon history and its primary texts, or those important to the development of American Saxonhood—where they came from, the ideas within them, and the formation of New World “identities” from the Anglo-Saxon impulse. I look at the Anglo-Saxon migration myth and the various important British figures—namely British and Saxon

³⁸ So much so that Liah Greenfeld has argued that the fundamentals of “nationhood” as we know it today were first evident in the fifteenth century, when the idea of nobility as a birthright was challenged, questioned, and began to be reversed; see *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 47.

historians (mostly Geoffrey of Monmouth and Bede) and ancient British writers (such as Gildas)—who formulated this groundwork. It is important to trace a historical process by which any type of Anglo-Saxon ideology arose in the British Isles. Since British historiography, comprised of both real and imagined history, remains the foundation for American Saxonhood, I must focus, at times, directly on the theme of migration and ideological intent. Naturally, a large number of these theoretical and historical ideas are housed in the introductory chapters of this project.

Here, it also becomes necessary to elaborate upon the “historical imagination,” to borrow the term from Robert Hanning, of early Anglo-Saxon authors, such as Eusebius, Gildas, Bede, and Geoffrey of Monmouth. The historical imagination, according to Hanning, “minimizes the temporal distance between past and present, and emphasizes instead their proximity and continuity.”³⁹ Historical consciousness serves as a conduit in the link from Britain to the British colonies in the New World. I outline the ways in which these Anglo-Saxon authors saw history as unfolding, an important ideological model for later American conceptual history and early colonial American chroniclers’ appropriation of their modeling. Next, I explain the rise of interest in medieval and Anglo-Saxon texts in England, beginning with the earliest English antiquaries. Many of the seventeenth-century antiquaries and authors I draw on—men like John Foxe, William Lambarde, and Matthew Parker—not only scoured England’s monasteries and abbeys searching for these texts, they also preserved them and then published editions and commentaries on them. They were often motivated by very radical political agendas. My focus will be plain: To trace the making of ideology from the written and historical records in ancient

³⁹ *The Vision of History in Early Britain: From Gildas to Geoffrey of Monmouth* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966), 3.

Britain through to Elizabethan England that emphasizes looking at the past to justify the present and the means by which early antiquarians achieved this beginning. It is crucial to discuss the collection of texts by Robert Cotton, Matthew Parker, and others and investigate *why* this remains especially important for later evolutions of Anglo-Saxonism and, in America, Anglo-Saxonhood. Ultimately, I hope to make clear in my examination the depth with which English writers employed the “Saxon” argument, in its various and early manifestations, for justification of New World exploration, conquest, and settlement.

Chapter Two, “John Smith and The Virginia Company: The Struggle for ‘American’ Saxonhood,” explores the first fork of American Saxonhood in the New World—the Virginia project. I examine Smith’s and the Virginia Company of London’s use of primary Anglo-Saxon material for the New World settlement of Jamestown. Smith positions the hero squarely in the New World. In Smith, I argue, we see the development of the American *romans* on New World soil, marking the introduction of the *Matière d’Amérique*. Further developing the idea that out of the ideological content in Welsh texts, specifically those focusing on the myth of Prince Madoc of Wales who allegedly “discovered” North America in the twelfth century, I argue that prominent members of the Virginia Company formulate a new, romantic nation-building ideology specifically designed for the Virginia venture. This early archetype of American Saxonhood finds its best literary representation in a duality: Smith as an early and private hero-chronicler of American history and the power structure within which he operates. What emerges is the chivalric figure of Smith as depicted in his writings. In Smith’s major works that I consider, especially in his depictions of the Pocahontas narrative, we find intricate issues of power and conquest in American Saxonhood that shape its course for later authors.

In Chapter Three, “Bradford, Winthrop, and Mather: The Emergence of New England Saxonhood,” I examine the second of two forks in the development of American Saxonhood that culminates in the New England promotion of the ideology for geographically religious modeling. In reading these specific authors, I argue, we can see how the New England region used American Saxonhood. Starting with William Bradford and moving through John Winthrop to Cotton Mather, New England emerges as an historical and physical place that would provide the foundation for an Anglo-Saxon-based “Christianography.” As Perry Miller has shown, the metaphor of the “errand into the wilderness” was a second generation creation, originating, in context, in Samuel Danforth’s 1670 sermon. Though critics have found holes in Miller’s thesis, as Mark A. Peterson notes, “relatively little energy has been devoted to creating a coherent new interpretation with the ... explanatory scope and ‘memorable quality’ as Miller’s original claims.”⁴⁰ This section strives to do that. Here, I argue that there existed a conscious borrowing and reformulation of the Anglo-Saxon notion of Christendom in these authors’ use of American Saxonhood.

This New England re-development of American Saxonhood combines the Saxon ideas of Christendom with rightful crossing, as witnessed in the migration myth, to create a newer England, thus linking both in a temporally identical socio-historical memory. Mather becomes its most profound and influential proponent. In his writings we see specific linkage from Anglo-Saxon ideas to his own New England for the specific purposes of nation-building and national unity. Mather’s historiography copies that of Saxon historian Bede, which, in turn, follows those of Eusebius and Orosius, thus fitting American history into a larger history of salvation. Further,

⁴⁰ *The Price of Redemption: The Spiritual Economy of Puritan New England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 6.

shaping his vision of the present on a subjective version of the past, Mather invokes an “historical imagination,” which Hanning defines thus: “the faculty which perceives the reality of the past; the response, evoked by the record (accurate or inaccurate) of history, which identifies that record with the human condition, seen as a timeless and continuing phenomena.”⁴¹ Mather’s borrowing of Saxon themes and ideas—as was the case in The Virginia Company of London’s use of Welsh Madoc myth for nation building plans—employs often inaccurate representations of Saxon archetypes for the creation of New England as the new Christian Saxon state in North America.

It pays to observe that early Americans such as Increase Mather, along with the other prominent early generation shapers of America, also had an identifiable political agenda, although I am not arguing here that Mather and others studied Anglo-Saxon texts in depth for purely political purposes—the religious claims were equally, if not even more, important. The Mathers, especially Cotton Mather, did, however, prize certain texts, texts that remain key to understanding history as they knew it and American history as they shaped it (as did the English in the years prior to American settlement). For example, Cotton Mather often references Bede and was well acquainted with his history (and, subsequently, Bede’s “history making”); Mather also had access to Tacitus (as his works were quite popular and would later prove important to Thomas Jefferson), whose *Germania* put forth perhaps one of the first histories of the Anglo-Saxons. He references these histories to show the dangers of non-conversion with relation to the North American Indians. Miller has already pointed out Mather’s reluctance to transform the New World, per se; instead, he defines Mather as a pious reactionary for the old ways. While this may be true, I see Mather as one of two early dominant forces of the American Saxonhood

⁴¹ *Vision of History*, 2-3.

ideology (the other being Smith) and largely responsible for the New England Saxon model, which later culminates in the writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Finally, Chapter Four, “Madoc’s Last Hurrah and Thomas Jefferson: Sealing the Fate of American Saxonhood,” traces the last wisps of the Madoc myth in America through William Penn’s Welsh designs for his American territory. Once again, the myth of Madoc serves as a lynchpin to North America; this time, in Thomas Jefferson’s quest for Madoc’s lost descendants. But Jefferson moves beyond the Madoc model and embraces the Saxon. From him, we can trace the political lineage of American Saxonhood that sought to unite distant and differing communities, in some ways basing itself from the outset on Anglo-Saxon laws and ideologies as they were interpreted by early English antiquarians and, later, Americans. Jefferson and others—Thomas Paine, for example, who equates the Peasant’s Revolt with American freedom—attempted to define American Saxonhood mostly through the writings of such antiquarians as Edward Coke, John Foxe, and William Lambarde. Although Foxe and, to a lesser degree, Lambarde played a prominent role in the shaping of American revolutionary literature and ideology, it was Coke, through his understanding, and often *mis*understanding, of Anglo-Saxon texts that most influenced early statesmen. In fact, Coke’s writings actually traveled over on the Mayflower and, subsequently, significantly influenced the New England Whig tradition. John Adams often referenced him, and Jefferson admired him as “old Cooke.” It was, essentially, Coke’s writings that gave Jefferson, Adams and other revolutionary forefathers a legal frame within which to work and on which to base most of their political ideas. In his study of America’s past, Jefferson saw fundamental problems with the structure of the land tenure system as the Virginia Company had set it up and, wishing to restore the Saxon foundation in America

that he believed had been previously corrupted, set out to rectify this error: to do this, Jefferson had to envision a new Saxon model on older historic evidence.

It remains important for this study to note that Jefferson was very much a product of his generation. During the eighteenth century, Saxon arguments dominated the public discourse; pamphlets and broadsides depicted the historic Saxons as heroic figures in the various national uprisings of the period. The “Anglo-Saxon” came to represent certain values of freedom and democracy lost since the Norman Yoke, the invasion of William that allegedly ended this halcyonic period. More than any other reconceptualizations of the Saxon argument, Jefferson’s American Saxonhood grounded itself heavily on the newly emerging primary Anglo-Saxon texts and textual scholarship. His studies in the Anglo-Saxon language buttress his larger Saxon vision for America. Eager to provide this rich literary history to the American public, he composed *An Essay Towards Facilitating Instruction in the Anglo-Saxon and Modern Dialects of the English Language*. With this textual evidence, he fashioned an American Saxonhood that promotes geographical right as an inheritance and makes a claim for America as the new land for Saxon dominance.

Although the present study does not focus explicitly on racial matters, in the conclusion, I address the implications of eighteenth-century racial theories, the ugly roots of which crop up in America in relation to Native Americans and slaves. It is also here during the early nation building period that new Americans seem to have plugged certain justifications for racial discrimination by way of lineage into the equation of American Anglo-Saxonhood, a strain that then plays out largely *within* the country later in divergent views of racial identity in the North and South as well as in terms of relations to other countries. The myths of American Saxonhood, much like Saxon myths of Alfred or Celtic stories of Arthur, serve to unite the race against the

Other. My research here concludes with a brief treatment of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Frederick Douglass, two writers whom I believe highlight the antipodal poles of American Anglo-Saxonhood in the years just prior to the American Civil War and simultaneously extend and problematize the American Saxonhood strain set forth in New England by both Smith and Mather earlier in North American history.

My critical focus throughout concerns America's refashioning of the myth of American Saxonhood from the forests of ancient England to the New World shores. In my theoretical and social explorations of nation, myth, and migration, and primary textual material, I have sought to investigate and explain the formation of American Saxonhood as an imaginative ideology from this inception to its splintering in the antebellum period. Despite these efforts, I believe there remains fruitful work to be done in this area. The impressive work done by scholars such as those mentioned above, the balance between English—including post-Roman Britain up to the fifteenth century—and American textual examination in Anglo-Saxon studies still does not adequately represent the possibilities of scholarship in this area. Much previous work in Anglo-Saxonism and American Studies, I believe, has been simply too American-heavy and one-sided: there exists a paucity of studies that serve to explore English ideologies through an American lens in any textual depth. The reasons for this are many. Certainly, as I have mentioned, there needs to be a thorough reading of primary texts. Another issue stems from notions of "remembered history." A certain remembered history influences diverse settlement areas in manifold ways. Naturally, when speaking of nations, regions, and general cultural ideologies, one runs a risk of overgeneralization. To argue that the New England and Virginia (Southern) regions can be encapsulated and split into two diverse entities seems, *prima facie*, to be one such example. Such labeling might surely draw criticisms pointing to the omission of certain other

major groups or, in the south, the coastal regions of Florida and Georgia, for example. Again, there is room for further investigation. My aim is not complete topical coverage, per se; the focus remains to provide an ample foundation off of which perhaps other studies might branch. Thus, while my goal has been to investigate specific examples in early American texts and authors, this study is certainly not, nor could it possibly be, a survey of every work even marginally related to “Anglo-Saxonism”; my examples represent the major links from the past to the present that inform this inquiry. Granted, the careful reader might become aware of the paucity of writings from sources other than those mentioned; or, conversely, a source ripe for examination might be overlooked. In some respects, I anticipate this. It is my goal that this project help buttress and work in concert with other recent studies by providing more of a substantial textual background and by offering to fill in the gaps in recent scholarship, which work will inevitably lead to further investigations. Again, I return to the idea of beneficial evidence and critical examination of pertinent primary cultural relics.

An Anglo-Saxon myth of nation building might better illuminate this idea. There is a point in *Beowulf* when Hrothgar, king of the Geats, hands a sword to Beowulf, indicating a transfer of power between rulers. Before he grants this accession, however, he reflects on the ancestral artifact:

Hrothgar spoke; he examined the (sword’s) hilt, the ancient relic. It was engraved all over and showed how war first came into the world and the early giant tribes were destroyed by the flood. They suffered a terrible severance from the Lord. The Almighty made the waters rise, they were drowned in the deluge for their sins. In pure gold inlay on the sword-guards there were rune-markings accurately incised, stating and recording for

whom the sword had been first made and decorated (for witness) with its ornamental hilt.⁴²

In this scene, Hrothgar carefully examines the narrative storyline engraved in the sword's hilt, a myth of ancestral migration, conquest, and political import, before bestowing it upon Beowulf in the subsequent ceremony—a model of proper cultural transmission. At a meta-level, the poet ensures here that *we* understand the ideological undertones of what is occurring, as do Beowulf and the other tribesmen. The absolute importance of the physical ancestral transference, in this case as engraved on the sword, takes precedent over the ceremony, thus dissolving any ambiguities over the meaning of past to present. In a like manner, Child's "The Black Saxon" reflects rich tensions played out in the emergent American identity: the combination of allusions to racial myth, nation, and lineage reflect symbolic tensions of past and present and problematize the simple categorical relationships among identities. Like that of Hrothgar, Duncan's act of reading reflects on the past; however, Child's adds his experience *within* the narrative. The space between Duncan's reading and his active involvement, then, highlights these historical reflections on race and nation and the questions of Saxon, English, American, and Black American. In this project, I argue that we similarly must connect our readings from myth and history to narrative nation building ideologies. If we begin to turn over ancestral rocks in our quest to link Anglo-Saxonism with nation building and critically examine the myths engraved therein, we might unravel the ideological nuances that helped to shape the creation of American identity. At least this is my hope.

⁴² *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*, Friedrich Klaeber, trans. and ed., 3rd ed. (Boston: D.C. Heath, 1950); lines 1687-98.

CHAPTER ONE

ORDER IN THE OLD WORLD: THE BIRTH OF NEW WORLD ANGLO-SAXONISM

On Monday night, September 9, 1583, in a gale somewhere off the southwestern coast of Cape Breton Island, Sir Humphrey Gilbert was struggling for his life aboard the *Squirrel*, one of three ships bound for the New World.⁴³ As the storm thrashed the *Squirrel* and its sister ship, the *Delight*, Gilbert could only watch the battering waves, pray his ship might find its way back to England, bereft of riches, and bark useless orders to seamen over the thundering storm. Not long before, Gilbert and his half-brother Sir Walter Raleigh, along with Richard Hakluyt, then-famed author of *Divers Voyages Touching the Discoverie of America and the Ilands Adjacent unto the Same, Made First of all by our Englishmen and Afterwards by the Frenchmen and Britons* (1582), and Sir George Peckham, had been settled in the comforts of the mysterious Dr. John Dee's Mortlake house discussing plans and plotting for a second voyage to the New World. Gilbert was a well-connected man in Elizabeth's court; he had access to a huge body of correspondence and accounts of travels in the Americas, mostly accumulated by Hakluyt, and even had the support of Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester, for a settlement of the lands. The Queen had given Gilbert a term patent of six years in 1578. Since the first failed attempt, however, he had become financially strapped. In order to bolster finances for another passage, Gilbert had had to sell half his lands north of the fiftieth parallel, granted him by the Queen, to the necromancer Dee. Not only was Gilbert broke, he was running out of backers *and* time on his

⁴³ A large Atlantic island in the province of Nova Scotia, Cape Breton today boasts a strong Celtic heritage and culture.

patent. Luckily, the change in political atmosphere with the advent of the Throckmorton affair offered Gilbert a chance to get more deeply involved in the current political intricacies, which could help his cause.⁴⁴ Like Gilbert, the young Sir Philip Sidney had possessed a patent of his own, worth a considerable amount of money; however, as he was poor and vying for the hand of Walsingham's daughter (who favored the match but believed Sidney's poverty was an insurmountable obstacle), Sidney sold his rights to Peckham, who had desired a chance to explore the New World region for years. After the purchase, Peckham, in turn, offered Gilbert a way to receive funding by helping rid their country of Protestant opposition. Originated by Sir Francis Walsingham, the Catholic "transport" scheme would offer some two million acres to Peckham's Catholics, provide Gilbert with funding, help Elizabeth with the exportation of Protestant opposition, and give the Catholics a new life in the New World (Williams 158-9). Gilbert would be Lord Proprietor of this new colony, and he and Peckham together with one Sir Thomas Gerard would serve as well as a primitive triumvirate or council.

On that stormy September night in 1583, Gilbert was pulling out of Newfoundland, where, if we can believe the detailed narrative set forth by Richard Hakluyt the Younger, he had defiantly announced claim to all territories from thence forward (meaning, of course, the New World, too, once he arrived) as property of the Crown of England for purposes, he claimed, of advancing the Christian religion. Gilbert's commission—indeed, the very *reason* for his voyage—was to "inhabit and possesse at his choice all remote and heathen lands not in the actual possession of any Christian prince," or anyone else, for that matter.⁴⁵ Believing

⁴⁴ The Throckmorton Affair was the second plot on Queen Elizabeth's life, thwarted by Sir Francis Walsingham in 1586, which resulted in the death of Mary Queen of Scots. Sir Francis Throckmorton, cousin of Bess, Sir Walter Raleigh's future wife, was the lead conspirator.

⁴⁵ This was the "official" account given by Captain Edward Haies and published in Hakluyt's work *Principal Navigations* (London, 1600) 3:145-46.

Newfoundland to be the gateway to an utopian world, Gilbert landed there to claim it. He had earlier summoned the captains of all remaining ships, in a grand ceremonial fashion, and with great pomp and flash, granted them, their families, and their heirs possession of the very soil upon which they stood. After the lands were consecrated, Gilbert proclaimed three laws, arguably the first legal record of the British New World: 1) The Church of England had supreme religious power in this new place; 2) England, under the aegis of the Queen, possessed *all land* for Britain from thence forward because it had all rights; and 3) no man thenceforth could deny the first two laws, lest he suffer severe punishment. With that pomp and flair over with, Gilbert headed out to sea, to the storm-tossed, pitching ocean that September evening. He had just claimed for the British Isles under Elizabeth *all* territories west of Britain all the way to Drake's claimed San Francisco Bay area—literally, half of the world—and he believed he had secured British rights to the New World indefinitely. However, after that night Sir Humphrey Gilbert was never seen or heard from again.

The myth of Gilbert would, however, live on in the Tudor New World propaganda literature, along with that of one Prince Madoc ab Owain Gwynedd, a supposed Welsh royal who had, according to an originary Celtic myth that was fast growing in popularity in Elizabethan England, originally discovered America before either Vespucci or Columbus. Peckham would later author a small pamphlet, *A true Report of the late discoveries and possession, taken in the right of the Crown of England of the Newfound Lands: by that valiant and worthy gentleman, Sir Humphrey Gilbert knight*, which he dedicated to Sir Francis Walsingham (as well as Frobisher and others) and published in 1583, that set out to “prove Queen Elizabeth's lawful title to the New Worlde, based on not onlie upon Sir Humphrey Gilbert's discoveries, but also those of

Madoc.”⁴⁶ Peckham’s work would serve as the first coupling of Gilbert, Madoc, and the New World and also as source material for David Powel’s *Historie of Cambria* (1584) and, most famously, Richard Hakluyt’s widely-read *The Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589), a compendium the readership and claimed veracity of which reached staggering heights in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Amidst all of this, Gilbert stood at the fore of Elizabethan conquest and expansion: his declarations possessing *all land* for Britain from thence forward echoed across the seas. Unwittingly and seemingly overnight, he had become the *fons et origo* for the Tudor expansionist movement, a movement linking Gilbert to Madoc, Britain to the New World, and the mythic idea of migration to the Elizabethan world. Britain as an island had been fought over and passed through by civilizations for hundreds of years before the then-current “English” had been able to flourish: the English would look to its struggles and racial history in its development of identity in the New World British colonies. Even more, Britain would use its tenuous claims, first put forward by Gilbert, as ideological support for the cause and justification of its rights to the New World.

THE BRITISH HISTORIES, HISTORIANS, AND NEW WORLD IDENTITIES

The Anglo-Saxon impulse from which early English migrants to America drew originated, of course, in the primary Saxon race. Because of its central role in migration, mythmaking, and nationalism within British culture, for America, the British Isles were a powerful archetype.

The idea of nation in a literate culture results in part from the written records. Historians such as Gildas and Bede and, later, Geoffrey of Monmouth provide examples of what Hanning calls the “historical imagination” and what I call in this particular case “Saxonhood.” Like

⁴⁶ This is reprinted in Hakluyt’s *Principal Navigations*, 12 vols. (Glasgow: Hakluyt Society, 1903-5) 8:94.

Anderson's imagined community, historical imagination served as one way to further the migration myth of a people. Hanning describes it like this: "the faculty which perceives the reality of the past; the response, evoked by the record (accurate or inaccurate) of history, which identifies that record within the human condition, seen as a timeless and continuing phenomenon."⁴⁷ Bede's historical vision consisted of saints—his three "heroes" are Gregory, Germanus, and Augustine—who remain closely bound by their penchant for spreading the gospel; for Bede, the duty of the Christian hero is to fight, pray, and educate his society. Whereas Gildas equated the Britons with the new Israelites, Bede equates the Britons with the *old* Israelites. In a sense, then, the flux, or plasticity, of historical imagination minimizes the temporality between past and present and highlights their proximity and continuity by creating a *vision* of reality, intellectual, spiritual, and sensual, which is equally relevant to both then and now. This vision varies as writing and history progress. In his creation, the historian joins knowledge and judgment to illuminate the past (or, as Hanning argues, to distort it) and thus fires the imagination of a nation.

As is evident from the examples of Gildas and Bede, however, during these early periods, "nation" remained a slippery term; fundamentals of "nationhood" as we know it today first became evident in the fifteenth century, when the idea of nobility as a birthright was challenged, questioned, and began to be reversed.⁴⁸ Following the struggles of the early Britons, Celts, and Saxons, and other invaders on the land, a sense of English nation—and with it, a new ideological understanding of race, culture, politics, laws, and geographical power *within* that sense—began to emerge. This drive toward nationhood became increasingly more evident as ancient texts were

⁴⁷ *Vision of History*, 2-3

⁴⁸ Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 47.

unearthed and examined. As MacDougall puts it, “Anglo-Saxonism [was] born in the 16th century in response to a need to demonstrate an historical continuity for the national church, and flourished in the 17th in debates over royal supremacies, finally triumphed and became the dominant myth that fired the national imagination.”⁴⁹ In the 1530s, when Henry VIII used the Saxon church to justify his break with Rome, he claimed he was returning to the pure practices of the church pre-Conquest, cleansing it of Roman Catholic corruption. The religious myth of the pure Saxon church would open the doors for important political arguments later in the following centuries.⁵⁰ Thus did history merge with Saxon ideology.

Only by looking closely at these early nationalist movements—through the ecclesiastical and secular, the myths and histories, and the conflation of both—can the level of British, or English, influence on America’s myth of Anglo-Saxonism be properly understood. There are two reasons for this. First, much of the history of the British Isles was embroiled in conquests and migrations, continuous evolutions that led directly to the forming of a British national consciousness that would eventually disseminate in the British colonies. The model, or progeny, of this history, warts and all, was Britain’s contribution to colonial America’s nation building. Second, and perhaps even more importantly, the *written histories*, first in religious documents but later in *all* forms, the past used by the shapers of the then present time, were instrumental in the formation of what I call American Saxonhood. Colonial Americans looked back, as Balibar argues, to an Anglo-Saxon model for inspiration to the future. Thus, the actions of America’s now native ancestors are, *res gestae*, the actions of America’s past. In order to flesh out *America’s* brand of Anglo-Saxonism in all of its scope—evident in American political,

⁴⁹ *Racial Myth*, 26.

⁵⁰ Stephanie L. Barczewski, *Myth and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century Britain: The Legends of King Arthur and Robin Hood* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000), 126-8.

imaginative, and historical writings—we must carefully investigate the earlier English history and writers and later historical and antiquarian trends.

But what exactly was the “Anglo-Saxon” state?⁵¹ Up to the time of the Norman Conquest, there was no “England”; the country was simply a territory in South Britain, comprised of a number of competing Anglo-Saxon kingdoms and *Brittones*, or native inhabitants. The “Anglo-Saxons,” as a “race,” settled in Britain in the fifth century and began collectively calling themselves “Englisc.” This group, composed of primarily Angles and Saxons, coalesced into a few kingdoms, and, before the seventh century was over, had accepted Christianity as their religion. Still, no formal state existed, and no Anglo-Saxon king claimed to be the supreme “King of England.” In the ninth century, a series of Viking attacks collapsed the emerging state, and Scandinavian presence resisted against these settlements. Only the English of Wessex remained. Beginning with Alfred (c. 849-99), England unified, and rulers proclaimed kingship over the entire region, seeking to reconquer lands stolen by the Danes. The apex came with Athelstan (c. 894-939), grandson of Alfred and son of Edward the Elder. Crowned in 925—the first English king to have that honor—Athelstan designated himself *rex totius Britanniae* (king of all the Britons), put the seal on the nation, and named the geographical region of Britain

⁵¹ In a provocative essay, Susan Reynolds asks what ‘Anglo-Saxon’ and ‘Anglo-Saxons’ actually mean, “What Do We Mean by ‘Anglo-Saxon’ and Anglo-Saxons?” (*Journal of British Studies* 24 [1985], 395–414). According to Reynolds, the *OED* definition—meaning “those of Teutonic descent in Britain” and “all of this descent in the world, whether subjects of Great Britain or of the United States”—pertained especially to the earlier periods of antiquarianism to the nineteenth century. She is, of course, alluding to the period when nationalism was developing in Europe, primarily through philology. As Reynolds observes, “The philologists themselves, of course, started from the universal assumption that language and descent went together, so that when they divided languages into Germanic, Latin, Celtic, and so forth, they thought that they were also dividing mankind into ‘races’ of common descent and common inherited characteristics”; 395–96.

“England” in honor of the victors. William of Normandy decisively integrated the English as a nation state a century later.⁵²

“Anglo-Saxon” was most likely coined by King Alfred in the ninth century to distinguish members of the Angle and Saxon tribes from other Germanic islanders in Britain. Earlier, the British Bishop Gildas’ *De Excidio Britanniae* recounted this Anglo-Saxon invasion, which drove the Britons from their land.⁵³ According to Gildas, God decreed the “Saxon” revolt in direct retribution for the sins of the Britons—thus, in its first incarnation, the term “Saxon” served as heathen foil to the inconstant Briton. The term gained religious currency in Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* (731). Ecclesiastic in nature, Bede’s Saxons rose and fell in relation to Christianity, eventually converted by Pope Gregory the Great. Bede famously coalesced the English groups, such as the Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and Picts, into one *gens Anglorum*, a literary portrait of the new Israel. By the time of Alfred, the “Anglo-Saxons” became national protagonists, battling against the Vikings, saving the homeland, and representing freedom and liberty. Alfred established culture in England. Through his laws and educational system, Alfred surpassed Bede’s *gens Anglorum*—he sought to create a single and entirely new *gens*, not a composite, called the *Angelcynn*. As Sarah Foot observes, “the Alfredian ‘nation’ was ... defined in terms of its difference from the other (here clearly understood to be both the Christian Welsh and, more significantly, the pagan Dane).”⁵⁴ In the years following the Norman invasion of 1066, “Anglo-Saxon” began to represent an institution, an *idea* of unified national autonomy clearly separate from the “other”—the myth spoke of a regional golden age

⁵² Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 40-3.

⁵³ Although he dated nothing, we can assume Gildas refers to the period around the late 440s to the early 450s. Modern dating trends figure Gildas authored *De Excidio* sometime near 520 AD, Thomas D. O’ Sullivan, *The De Excidio of Gildas: Its Authenticity and Date* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 7, Leiden, 1978).

⁵⁴ “The Making of *Angelcynn*: English Identity Before the Norman Conquest,” *Old English Literature: Critical Essays*, ed. Roy M. Liuzza (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 56.

wherein Anglo-Saxon England had enjoyed freedoms and liberties unknown since the unfortunate invasion. Thus, the infamous “Norman Yoke” theory emerged, claiming a mythic continuity of law from the free and democratic community that existed prior to the Conquest. This is a battle the English have waged ever since.

The prehistory of the late eighteenth-century terms Teutonic, Goth, and Anglo-Saxonism emerged in England within the religious, legal, and political period of the Reformation and Revolution. Seventeenth-century Protestant dissidents recast the debate over property and rights in Anglo-Saxon roots as evidence in their debates with throne and papacy. In this revolutionary period, Anglo-Saxon texts unearthed mostly from old monasteries quickly became powerful political tools. Battling against the Stuart kings, Edward Coke and other common lawyers borrowed freely from the libraries of Sir Robert Cotton and others, often using transcriptions of ancient texts in support of the Protestant cause. William Lambarde’s *Archaionomia* was one such compilation. The *Archaionomia*, a compendium consisting of all the Anglo-Saxon laws Lambarde had been able to collect and finally published in 1568, was “one of the key books of the common law interpretation.”⁵⁵ Richard Verstegan’s *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* was another source of historical authority for dissenters. Importantly, Verstegan firmly connected Anglo-Saxons and English by recounting the Christian conversion (borrowing, as he frequently did, from Bede), where in 800 AD King Egbert of the West Saxons decreed “Saxon” would be

⁵⁵ J. G. A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), 43. Pocock’s work on medievalism in America, especially *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), marks a distinction from earlier myth-and-symbol theorists. R.C. De Prospeo has observed that in contradistinction to the latter “organic model” of American cultural historiography, or the common idea in eighteenth-century thought that history was thought of as an unfolding, the cycles of history much like a flower in bloom, studies such as Pocock’s American work pitted medievalism and modern America in a dialectic. One offshoot of this phenomenological criticism, argues Prospeo, is the “revisionist” school, “The Patronage of Medievalism in Modern American Historiography,” *Medievalism in American Culture: Special Studies*, Bernard Rosenthal and Paul E. Szarmach, eds. (Binghamton, NY: SUNY Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1984), 1-15.

replaced with “English” and the land thenceforth would be called “England.” Verstegan unabashedly promotes the English as direct descendents of the Anglo-Saxons, linking the two cultures and literally fashioning an Anglo-Saxon history. To a marked extent, English antiquarians promoted the historical link to Alfred’s England and pitted the freedom-loving democratic Saxon heritage (of Teutonic, Germanic, or Gothic descent) against the aristocratic French-Norman claims to sovereignty.

National histories are active documents. As R.G. Collingwood has famously claimed, to know history is to know ourselves as humans (in whatever national setting), our history, and our possibilities. Historical knowledge, claimed Collingwood, is simply the self consciousness of a people that knows its own capacity for the creation of that history.⁵⁶ For early English settlers in North America, Britain, with all of its history, written, recorded, and then retrieved by English antiquarians, provides the first and, arguably, most important key. Along with certain British, Celtic, and Anglo-Saxon historical and mythical notions that figure into an Anglo-Saxon ideology, in the following pages, I will focus on the authors that I believe most influenced the rise and progression of American Saxonhood: namely, Tacitus, Gildas, Bede, Geoffrey of Monmouth, and Sir Thomas Malory. As most of these authors’ works were freely available in the British colonies almost from initial migration, the nation-building ideologies evident therein remain important for our understanding of later colonial American appropriation and perversion of the Anglo-Saxon myth for their own colonizing ends.

Importantly, the Anglo-Saxon state just described differs from the imagined one; as depicted in literature, it involves both lived *and* ideological history. Much of this ideology—and, as a consequence of it, much of England’s own identity—comes from England’s encounters with

⁵⁶ *The Idea of History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), 7.

Britain. As a physical outpost, the British Isles have accommodated numerous peoples, including the Anglo-Saxons, Celts, and Norse (Danes). Julius Caesar's Rome played a fundamental part in Britain's history, first by conquering the land, then in laying the foundation for various laws and customs. Early Anglo-Saxon tribes first settled in Britain as part of Rome's attempt to fortify it around the fourth century; called in by the Romans, they eventually scattered the remaining Britons and Celts to the outer British territories, such as Scotland and Wales. Although these tribes were from sundry regions, the bulk were either Saxons or Angles, and the term "Anglo-Saxon" was allegedly conjured up by King Alfred to separate these "new" Saxons or Angles from those that stayed in their homeland.⁵⁷ "Anglo-Saxon" united the *folc* into one *ethnie*, or *gens*. Following the arrival of Hengist and Horsa and their defeat of the Britons at Ebbsfield, Kent in 449 A.D., the "Anglo-Saxons," as a semi-united race, then settled in all of Britain in the fifth century and the name of the *ethnie* changed: they began calling themselves the "Englisc." This invading group, composed primarily of Angles and Saxons and probably some Picts, coalesced into a few kingdoms, and, before the seventh century was over, had accepted Christianity as their religion. Following the Germanic invasions in the fifth and sixth century, the influence of Rome gave way as the Anglo-Saxon peoples diffused widely throughout the region.

Out of the scholarly work done by the antiquarians, certain Anglo-Saxon mythical constructs gained currency—one such was the migration myth. Because of their reliance on lineage, powerful conquests, and forceful migrations, Anglo-Saxons have always been seen as

⁵⁷ Native Britons called them "Saxons," as did the Romans, but eventually "Angles" (or, those from East Anglia) and "Saxon" were used interchangeably. This generic group came to prefer the former term and eventually called themselves "Englisc" (P.H. Sawyer, *From Roman Britain to Norman England* [London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1979]), 2.

meso wanderers.⁵⁸ Historically, they have always moved to the west, from the forests of Germany to England to America. The Anglo-Saxon myth of origin, which is what Nicholas Howe has termed the “migration myth” of early Anglo-Saxon peoples, has migration as its central motif for ordering experience. That is, it provides a group with a link to its common, historical identity. The migration myth thus lends purpose to the culture. Howe offers the following as the central thesis of his work: “Through the memory of migration, Anglo-Saxon England found its myth of past and future [...] a map of the future [...] a representation of reality.” Substantially, Howe adds, “the myth of migration gave the English as a folc a common identity by teaching them that they were descended from those who had made the exodus of the mid fifth century”; that is, *everything* related to the Anglo-Saxon myth, Howe seems to argue, from Gildas and Alcuin and Bede to the Anglo-Saxons has as its central theme the migration myth of *Exodus*.⁵⁹ This myth may be thought of, Howe continues, as a “map of the imagination, as an ordering of experience into an evocative image by which the culture could sustain itself.”⁶⁰ In America, the migration myth would resurface: certain American writers sought to promote a common identity, linked through Britain to the Anglo-Saxons, in their justification of migratory settlements. Thus, the migrations of the Anglo-Saxons become a hallmark of the love of freedom championed by both groups, past and present. Ironically—especially for any investigation of Anglo-Saxon and American literature—early depictions of the Saxons hold this truth to be self evident.

⁵⁸ “Meso wanderers” may seem somewhat simplistic; yet, to avoid too detailed a foray into anthropological migration theory, I have chosen this term. For more on this migration theory, see Introduction.

⁵⁹ *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989); 179, 6-7. Scholar, theologian, and poet, Alcuin (c. 735-c. 805) wrote a range of material from hagiography to poetry. He was born in Northumbria, met Charlemagne in Rome in 780, and headed Charlemagne’s Palace School, a rich academic community filled with scholars from all parts of Europe.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 7.

While migration myths center on the *physical* land and do not exist simply as a racial issue, though racial connections are involved, any study of Anglo-Saxonism would be incomplete if it failed to mention Cornelius Tacitus's contributions to racial ideology. Tacitus, senator, consul, and governor, wrote his *Germania* in 98 AD. As Duane Reed Stuart notes in his groundbreaking 1916 edition of Tacitus, "*Germania* was essentially the creation of a *littérateur*."⁶¹ Tacitus evokes images of artistic and creative representation because as an ethnography, it bridges two worlds; his *Germania* stands representative as Germany's inception into the international consciousness. It serves as the literary root to which all who define German *Kultur* from its early Roman engagements must acknowledge. Admittedly, *Germania* is filled with some far-fetched notions and tales; however, much of the work consists of fact. Although its history and authenticity have a somewhat dubious past, *Germania* was an important text for English antiquarians as well as for early prominent Americans.⁶² Among other qualities, a salient feature of the *Germania* are the fundamental differences it posits between the Romans and the *Germani* (Germans); the most influential, in terms of Anglo-Saxon ideology, is Tacitus's description of the quasi-democratic nature of the *Germani*. He claims that unlike Romans, the *Germani* engage in politically-minded civic feasts to discuss matters of feuds, elections of leaders, and other civic and political issues; these matters were, as Tacitus suggests, settled the following day. Another compelling feature of the *Germani* is their love of freedom: Tacitus's *Germani* are ardent lovers of freedom, yet savage and impulsive; they won their own lands and work them; and they engage in democratic discourse amongst themselves. The *Germani*'s love of

⁶¹ *The Germania of Tacitus* (New York: Macmillan, 1916), xx.

⁶² The *Germania* was "rediscovered" twice—once in the 9th century and later in the 15th century. Oddly, not one ancient or medieval version of *Germania* exists: at present the earliest version is in the fifteenth-century codex, Codex Aesinas. Tacitus' work was, however, attested to in the Middle Ages by at least three medieval authors; see J.B. Rives, *Tacitus' Germania* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 65-70.

freedom makes them, according to Tacitus, a noble barbarian force against eastern rulers. Tacitus's Germani, more importantly, maintained a pure, unadulterated racial makeup, a purely eugenic idea that would be crucially important in later ideologies of British applications of Anglo-Saxonism and American Saxonhood: as Tacitus writes, "For my own part, I accept the view that the peoples of Germany have never contaminated themselves by intermarriage with foreigners but remain of pure blood, distinct and unlike any other nation."⁶³ For the American imagination, especially, Tacitus's notion of the "pure" and "unmixed race" of Germani, a breed of man who could forge his identity in the wilderness, would grow to become the pure Saxon lineage, the racially superior tribes of democratic and freedom-loving people from whom the British were descended. This was a Saxon model that spoke to early settlers of British North America.

As an ethnographical account of early Anglo-Saxons, Tacitus's work is replete with information. But how did the Saxons see themselves? What literature that remains from the earlier periods of the "English," should we choose to call the inhabitants of the British Isles from any period by that name, is scant. The titles, content, and critical reception of these works lie outside the scope of this particular project; however, it seems important to at least consider the ways in which early English *folc* (tribes culminating in a loose culture)—here, the Anglo-Saxons, as deduced by their writing topics, styles, and arrangement—saw *themselves* as a free and migratory community. Although there did exist Anglo-Saxon kings during the early periods of nation building in the British Isles, early Saxon literature was less concerned with kingship than it was with Christianity. For these early Christians, Biblical literature played an important part in their self understanding as an *ethnie*, in Smith's sense of the term—as a human group

⁶³ Tacitus: *Agricola and Germania*, J.B. Rives, trans. (Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1971), 104.

with “shared ancestry myths, histories and cultures, having an association with a specific territory and a sense of solidarity.”⁶⁴ The connection, or shared history, was Christian in nature; in fact, following the arrival of St. Augustine the missionary, the term “Christendom” became adapted to the race. Anglo-Saxon scribes copiously transcribed the Bible—especially the books important for their understanding of themselves as a migratory community, such as *Exodus*—and several translations into Anglo-Saxon exist. Further, the earliest writings to come out in or be related to Britain were largely ecclesiastical histories, notably those from Eusebius of Caesarea (c.263-c.339) and, later, the British Bishop St. Gildas (516-70) and the Venerable Bede (673-735).

The infusion of Christendom into the national character subsequently informed Anglo-Saxon laws. Old vernacular manuscripts contain fragments of early laws, charters, and even wills, dating from the seventh century. The earliest known Anglo-Saxon law codes were decreed first by King Æthelberht (reign c. 580-616), printed in Kent during the seventh century and preserved in three series in a twelfth-century manuscript, all evidently written down after some time in oral tradition.⁶⁵ Æthelberht’s laws represent not only the first documented Anglo-Saxon laws but also the oldest Anglo-Saxon writings. The second set of codes comes from a joint legislation—Hrothhere (reign c. 674-85) and Eadric (685). These two rulers, who, like Æthelberht before them, focused mainly on secular laws, most likely supplemented the previous

⁶⁴ *Ethnic Origins*, 320.

⁶⁵ My source here is the *Textus Roffensis* manuscript (Rochester, Cathedral Library, A. 3. 5; Sawyer, 1957). There is some question as to the manner of the laws, e.g. whether or not they were framed on Roman codes. Bede alludes to this idea, but it is the general consensus that Bede meant similar as in the actual writing of laws, not as to the pattern; see Patrick Wormald, ““inter cetera bona ... genti suai”: Law Making and peace Keeping in the Earliest English Kingdoms,” *Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo* (1995) 42: 963-93, and William A. Chaney, “Aethelberht’s Code and the King’s Number,” *American Journal of Legal History* (1962) 6: 161-77. Other conversations include the law codes being patterned after a ten-part biblical model, highly influenced by the missionaries; see D.R. Howlett, *British Books in Biblical Style* (Dublin: Four Courts, 1997).

codes. The third set, issued by King Withred (691-725), supplanted all existing law codes, adding doctrines on Christian practice, such as forbidding heathen practices and eating during the Sabbath. As these religio-cultural policies gained ground in Kent, others developed. Following the Kentish law codes, monks began to copy various West Saxon codes, which now exist in sparse fragments if at all. From the later ninth century on, Anglo-Saxon legislators became prolific, leading to the first national law codes put forth by Alfred the Great. It is entirely possible that Alfred, the first “national” king of what we now call England, distributed these law codes to various councilors of kings in neighboring areas.⁶⁶ Again, it remains important to note the Christian influence on the Anglo-Saxons. In later editions, or printings, the law codes of Alfred and of Wessex King Ina’s kingdoms were combined. Importantly, this combination, prefaced with a lengthy translation of Mosaic codes, sought to unite the Anglo-Saxons and Israelites and position the former as the new Chosen Race of God.⁶⁷ All subsequent codes reflect this symbolic unity, most likely due to the fact that later authors were continuing the symbolic pattern.

Prior to and during this period, the Isles of Britain that were so popularly contested in the Anglo-Saxon period provide the geographical territory for later incarnations of nationalism. Beginning with Gildas (who was British) and continuing through Bede (an Anglo-Saxon), then, a myth of an insular origin proved to be a point where *ab initio* a mythical origin could originate in Britain *and* continue through to the British New World. For both Gildas and Bede, Britain was

⁶⁶ This is the thesis of Simon Keynes, “Royal Government and the Written Word in late Anglo-Saxon England,” *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Rosimond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 226-57.

⁶⁷ This is exactly what Wormald has argued, claiming the editors divided the codes—under the influence of the kings or not—into 120 sections to reveal the unity of the two and to merge Anglo-Saxons in this new slot; see “*Lex Scripta and Verbum Regis: Legislation and German Kingship, from Euric to Cnut*,” in *Early Medieval Kingship*, P.H. Sawyer and I.N. Wood, eds. (Leeds: The School of History, 1977), 132.

an *insula*, a nexus point from which differing ideologies developed. For Gildas, the migration frame of reference was first linked to *Exodus*, thereby connecting the myth of migration to a common *folc*, a communal tribe located *within* Christianity—the ancient Israelites (Howe 38). As Howe has shown, Gildas explicitly referenced the Old and New Testaments as moving from the dark and obscure toward the light, so his exhortation to the people demanded a national mental shift. For Bede, as for Gildas, the drama of history plays out on an island stage acted out by those who cross the sea and even those who inhabit the same island. Bede illustrates the various *folc* that came to the island and left their mark—Romans, Picts, Scots, and Anglo-Saxons—yet, he argues, the British were unable to convert the newcomers to Christianity, which, inevitably, was the downfall of the Britons.

Gildas tended to capitalize on the sense of a collective past, a mythic origin, and national identity to argue his case; his *De Excidio* is essentially a plea for the Britons who have strayed from Christianity to look at the Anglo-Saxon invasions as a sign from God to change their ways and return to Christian ethics and morals. Britain had been a Roman colony since 43, when Claudius landed and subdued Celtic tribes. When Rome vacated following Alaric's sack, Romans gradually withdrew, but minor periods of struggle for control occurred as raids continued. During one of these sacks, around the middle of the sixth century, Gildas's tract appeared. Gildas viewed the past as guide to present action, using Biblical revelation of divine providence working itself out in the life of the Christian and the world, past and present. Gildas is fond of interjecting scripture into the text, and, further, he puts himself in the narrative, thus linking Word of God, historian, and heroic figure within the tract, arguing for a sort of parallel, wherein what he reads in the Testaments foreshadow each other, and calling to countrymen to look back upon the past to avoid a similar future.

Gildas served as model prophet for colonial American ecclesiastical chroniclers. His history recounts the British relationship with the Saxons thus: 1) He describes how the Saxons arrived, were employed at first by and then subsequently raided the Britons, 2) he details the mixed fortunes in the war, and 3) he describes the post-war period, wherein the Britons are under the devil's charge, a position held by the Saxons. As his main interest was saving his countrymen from the heathens, Gildas shows how they have become transformed into the very heathens of their conquerors:

For in processe of time by carefull diligence commeth the correction and amendment of Countries, and by carelesse negligence falleth the corruption and destruction of Nations. The last are the *Saxons* and *English*, called by him a people odious to God and man, to God, because they were Idolatrous Infidels, to man, because they murthered and oppressed the Christian *Britaines*, and although he enlargeth himselfe in the dispraise of the Nation, let no man neverthesse suppose that he uttereth this of any malice as stung with the dreadfull miseries with the which they vexed his Country.⁶⁸

Gildas notes that eventually “the Land was wholly as then drowned in iniquities”—that is, the people of the nation *and* their ecclesiastical “rulers” fell from grace:

not onely the temporall Princes, but also the Spirituall Rulers (whose lives should be a light unto the rest, and salt to preserve the soules of men from corruption) had at this time many of them so degenerated from all goodnes, as not only it

⁶⁸ *The epistle of Gildas, the most ancient British author who flourished in the yeere of our Lord, 546. And who by his great erudition, sanctitie, and wisdom, acquired the name of sapiens. Faithfully translated out of the originall Latine* (London: T. Cotes, 1638), 32-3.

provoked the justice of God to dispossesse them of their Country and give it to their deadly foes the Saxons.⁶⁹

A striking feature of Gildas's writing is that he often used coded metaphors for the Saxons—he often calls them *canis*, or “dogs,” but sometimes dubs them “lions” for their fearsome qualities—perhaps in fear of repercussions, since the text damned Saxons and openly called for revolt (54-5).⁷⁰ Gildas' ultimate aim, it seems, was to incite remaining military leaders to strive to promote “moral correction” in order to save what was left of the *patria*, to somehow remedy the damages made to the fatherland by the iniquitous invaders.⁷¹

Unlike Gildas, Bede was arguably the first historian to position the Anglo-Saxons within a positive nationalistic ideology.⁷² The popularity of Bede's *Historia* during its time and after arose from the fact that it detailed a successful conversion of a heathen people and, further, stood as testimony to the new culture that incorporated these tribes.⁷³ Given this, the term “Anglo-Saxon” gained national and religious currency through Bede's version of the past, retold in his history; it is in Bede that we find the first mention of the embattled British general Vortigern and the infamous Anglo-Saxon chieftains Hengist and Horsa.⁷⁴ Bede's mythical tale speaks volumes about his nationalist ideology. Fearing barbarian invasions following the withdrawal of Roman troops, Vortigern calls upon the Saxon brothers Hengist and Horsa for aid. They and their men

⁶⁹ Ibid., 17, 12-3.

⁷⁰ Nicholas J. Higham, *The English Conquest: Gildas and Britain in the Fifth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 54-5. Higham argues these were likely read by the conquering Saxons.

⁷¹ Ibid., 58.

⁷² Bede first studied under Benedict Biscop and Ceofrith and was an ordained deacon and a priest, spending the majority of his life at the Northumbrian monastery Wearmouth-Jarrow. Widely knowledgeable in diverse areas, Bede wrote scholarly material on language and religion. He is best known for his work as historian; see *A New Critical History of Old English Literature*, Stanley B. Greenfield and Daniel C. Calder, eds. (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 16-22.

⁷³ David Rollason, *Northumbria, 500–1100: Creation and Destruction of a Kingdom*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 10.

⁷⁴ Gildas mentions a general similar to Vortigern but does not specifically name him.

arrive in three keels, land on the island of Thanet, and agree to fight in return for food. Hengist, seeing how weak the Britons are, calls for reinforcements. At a banquet in Kent, Hengist offers his daughter to Vortigern in return for half the kingdom. Vortigern and the brothers eventually do battle at least four times, with the Saxons eventually overtaking the Britons. This was Gildas's cautionary tale. Following this scandalous beginning, bands of the four nations poured into Britain, and Bede famously coalesced the English groups, such as the Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and Picts, into one *gens Anglorum*—"Anglo-Saxons." Following their conversion, the Anglo-Saxons served as a figuration of the new Israel. By Alfred's time, the Anglo-Saxons had become national protagonists, battling against invading Vikings, fighting for their geographical *terra*, or homeland, and, with the installment of the Saxon witenagemot, representing the freedom and liberty of a democratic society. Bede traces the introduction and triumph of Christianity into this society.

Also unlike Gildas—ironically Bede's own source, who portrays the moral decay of his nation in the corruption of prominent kings and clergy—Bede gives more attention to prominent, positive models.⁷⁵ In this way, Bede's work remains fundamental for any investigation into Americans' use of Anglo-Saxon racial ideologies. The *Historia* is divided into five roughly equal books, covering Caesar's attempted invasion in 60 BCE up to 731 AD, the year Bede finished his work. Each book has a focus: the background to the early Augustinian mission; Pope Gregory the Great and the Augustinian mission, to the return of Paulinus from Northumbria; the growth of Northumbria under Irish influence; Archbishop Theodore and Cuthbert; and the present state of the English church. Reflecting the ecclesiastical nature of the historian himself, Bede's Saxons

⁷⁵ Vicky Gunn, *Bede's Historia: Genre, Rhetoric and the Construction of the Anglo-Saxon Church History* (Rochester: Boydell and Brewer, 2009), 102.

rose and fell in relation to Christianity and were eventually converted by Pope Gregory the Great. Bede explicitly and intentionally parallels the Israelites' journey with the coming of Augustine and the Saxons.⁷⁶ After the Anglo-Saxons had secured Britain, Bede describes how they received the gospel from both Celtic missionaries and the Roman Church (when Pope Gregory sent Augustine in 597). Eventually, the Synod of Whitby (ca. 664) firmly established Roman Catholic rites as rule. During this period, there is a marked rebirth in Christian social ideals, quite different from those in Gildas's time. Bede situates events specifically to reconstruct the way in which Germanus overcame the Saxons in a battle of faith, thus creating sharp distinctions between Saxons and Britons. All of this culminates in Bede's famous Chapter 22, where conversion and the spread of salvation prevails and links back to *Exodus*.

According to the narrative, the Saxons were chosen by God's providence to remedy the failure of the Britons, who were sinful in their refusal, or failure, to preach to the Saxons. Here Bede builds upon Gildas: though the Britons are not necessarily *ignoble* in Bede's version, it is the *Saxons* who become the new Israelites. Bede then depicts Gregory as one who understands and propagates the message of Christ, becoming in a sense the new Paul, responsible for England's salvation. As Hanning observes, "Bede applies the theology of history and its method to the main crisis of his nation's Christian past, and manages to convey artistically the important fact that this crisis has universal and political repercussions."⁷⁷ The British Isles furnish the site for scenes of multiple groups, geographically situated to receive various migrations that then become linked to salvation. It is important to note here that what later colonial Americans were

⁷⁶ Howe, 51.

⁷⁷ *Vision of History*, 32-3.

noting in Bede was the importance of eschatology in historical lineage, in both political and national structures.

Pagan and Christian ideas were thus fundamental to the Anglo-Saxons' idea of themselves. (Even the largely heroic myth of *Beowulf* portrays the Christian present with a beautifully tragic pre-Christian past.)⁷⁸ Bede's *History*, however, focuses less on the contrasting poles of the pagan Anglo-Saxon invaders and the erring Christian Britons than on the more saintly Christianized Anglo-Saxons and the repeatedly erring and relapsing Anglo-Saxons carrying forward this pattern. Bede faced a situational dilemma: pagans are the antagonists, and Anglo-Saxons are pagans, but, at the same time, the national founders. Bede sees the Northumbrian incident of conversion as a way to unite the Anglo-Saxons and Christianity in the historical sense.⁷⁹ For Bede, then, the conversion created a new historical cultural zone, a "golden age" in Anglo-Saxon history both literally and figuratively, as much of Northumbria became quite wealthy. In fact, following these incidents, Britons fell from grace, as Anglo-Saxons began studying at Irish colleges and necessarily relied less on them for Christian gifts. As with all nationalistic writing, Bede's history reflects an agenda (in part, that he was born in Northumbria and favored his home). As in Gildas, Bede's groups were tribal and impersonal; unlike Gildas, Bede saw the Saxons as the protagonists, not as the evil heathen invaders. The Saxons had

⁷⁸ By and large, scholarly consensus holds that the *scop* (the ancient bard, playing the role of both poet and historian), arguably the "voice" in poems such as *Beowulf*, sang the song orally, in an Homeric sense, until it was eventually transcribed somewhere in the 8th century, the sole surviving text being copied in the 10th century and preserved as British Library MS Cotton Vittelius axv. *Beowulf* was often nationalized in the interest of the translator. Scandinavian scholar Grimur Thorkelin's (1752-1829) take was that the poem was a Scyldingid, or "Epic Song of the Scyldings," which he puts in opposition to the *Aeneid*. (Actually, Thorkelin thought *Beowulf* was originally written in Danish, translated into Anglo-Saxon.)

⁷⁹ This period in Northumbria marked the conversion of Anglo-Saxon England following Gregory the Great's Letter of 601 to Mellitus. Essentially, Edwin, the king of Northumbria, was urged by his Christian wife Ethelberga, and by the bishop Paulinus, who had been instructing her, to convert. Edwin answered that he was both willing and bound to receive the new faith, and, according to Bede's version of the story, the Anglo-Saxon heathens become the "virgins" that Paulinus brings to Christ (just as he brought the man and wife); see *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, Bertram Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors, trans. and ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969) ch. 2, 9.

rightfully taken the land for their own purposes and for providence's sake—this was an attractive narrative for colonial Americans. The Saxons enabled, for Bede, a storied picture of salvation—one people, a *gens Anglorum* (and Bede's notion of *gens Anglorum* will arise in New World consciousness as the uniting of one people in “American”). For Bede, religion creates a unity that shapes the providential group to his own day. In a sense, Bede was attempting to present—or highlight *from* the past—an “imagined community,” in Anderson's sense of the term. He thus began a type of ideological mythmaking that later manifested in the form of the great Saxon national leader King Alfred and morphed yet again in Geoffrey of Monmouth's heroic accounts of Arthur and his knights in English history.

In Britain, and, later, in America, two strains of nation building mythology would develop in the cults of Kings Alfred and Arthur. Anglo-Saxons and Britons struggled for control of the land, often in merciless exchanges as those are documented in some historical King Arthur chronicles, but the latter group was finally either driven out or succumbed to the victors. During this time, as well, the Celtic peoples were forced westward, concentrating themselves in Wales, Ireland, and Scotland. In the ninth century, marauding bands of Vikings invaded much of Europe, and the isle of Britain came under siege. King Alfred saved Wessex, though much of the north and east came, at one time or another, under Scandinavian rule. Numbers of Scandinavian tribes passed through during this period, but the area was brought back under control by Alfred's successors, among them his son Edward and grandson Athelstan.

During Elizabeth's reign, Alfred seems to have trumped Arthur as the premier king model. There are two likely reasons for this. First, and probably most important, Alfred's history was better documented than Arthur's; second, the veracity of his greatness was lauded by many

of the great English antiquarians.⁸⁰ Martyrologist John Foxe thought Alfred so magnificent that he used him as an exemplar of what a king should be. Foxe, like other common lawyers seeking justification for Saxon lineage, turned to Alfred's age as the quintessential English archetype: "For Protestants, Alfred had the attraction of being a ruler of the English Golden Age, before the entry of Romish corruption."⁸¹ So great, in fact, was Alfred's legacy that he eventually became the archetype for the true heroic Saxon in England, and the burgeoning national historical myth of sixteenth-century England had King Alfred at its helm. The so-called "Father of English Prose" became known as "the Great" in the sixteenth century, a millennium after his reign, due in part to tenth-century English monk Asser's life and William of Malmesbury.⁸² Alfred's England was responsible for a high degree of literary nationalism. Through his laws and educational system aimed at establishing a definite and united culture in England, Alfred surpassed the aim of Bede's *gens Anglorum*: he sought to create a single new *gens*, not a composite, called the *Angelcynn*. As Sarah Foot observes, "the Alfredian 'nation' was ... defined in terms of its difference from the other (here clearly understood to be both the Christian Welsh and, more significantly, the pagan Dane)."⁸³ Alfred's interest in cultural improvements were far-reaching: "England, almost alone in the early Middle Ages, created a national prose literature of

⁸⁰ Alfred was born in 849, accessed as King of the West Saxons in 871, had numerous victories against the Vikings during the period of 871-78, and in the 890s wrote most of his corpus. Sources such as Bede, Asser, and William of Malmesbury provide evidence of Alfred's life. Works by the latter two, coupled with the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*—a document probably composed during his reign—are extremely obsequious in nature and serve as powerful propaganda for the king and England. In his introduction to Alfred, Denis Frantzen writes that both authors "should be congratulated for understanding the power of literature not only to teach, but also to arouse political loyalty"; see Allen J. Frantzen, *Alfred* (Boston: Twayne, 1986), 4.

⁸¹ MacDougall, 25.

⁸² Bishop of Sherborne Asser (d. 907?) was a Welsh monk and biographer of Alfred. One copy of his biography sat in the Cotton Library. His *Ælfredi Regis Res Gestæ* (Alfred's translation of Gregory's *Pastoral Care*) had been translated and published in England in 1574.

⁸³ "The Making of Angelcynn: English Identity before the Norman Conquest," *Old English Literature: Critical Essays*, R.M. Liuzza, ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 56.

astonishing scope and variety” due to Alfred.⁸⁴ Besieged by Viking attacks, Alfred fought off the marauders so that Wessex was the only place no Danes dominated. Coupling national leadership and prowess of war with intellectual achievements, Alfred was generally considered “the most effective ruler who had appeared in western Europe since the death of Charlemagne.”⁸⁵ Like Charlemagne, Alfred turned to other countries for ways of learning and teaching.⁸⁶ He rightly believed that England, having spent so much time and effort staving off attacks, had become intellectually barren. In effect, Alfred was creating an English *ethnie*. Nowhere is this seen more clearly than in his “Preface to Gregory’s *Pastoral Care*,” where he notes, “Swæ clæne hio wæs othfeallenu on Anglecynne ðæt swiðe feawa wæron behionan Humbre ðe hiora ðeninga cuðen understonden on Englisc oððe furðum an ærendgewrit of Lædene on Englisc arrecean.”⁸⁷

Following his massive educational reform and successful defense of the small Wessex band of English with whom he eventually fought off the Danes, Alfred was the first to proclaim himself “king of the Angles and Saxons” or “king of the Anglo-Saxons,” establishing an innovative royal style.⁸⁸ This notion, coupled with the propagandist histories—especially Bede’s, a political expression of the English people tied to Christian beliefs—put forth for the first time an historical vision of the quintessential English character in the figure of Alfred.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 38.

⁸⁵ F.M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 269.

⁸⁶ In actuality, Alfred was the grandson of Ecgbert of Wessex (802-39), a nobleman from Charlemagne’s court who first established Wessex as a dominant force in the ninth century.

⁸⁷ From Alfred’s *Preface to Pastoral Care*. Translation: “So completely had wisdom fallen off in England that there was not one man in all of the land of the Angles that could understand English or write in Latin. So very few on this side of the Humber who could understand their rituals in English, or indeed could translate a letter from Latin into English”; the manuscript is Hatton MS 20, Bodleian Library. Recently there is some debate as to Alfred’s claim for the decline in learning prior to and around the time of his reign. For example, there exists some evidence of liturgical activity, as well as written manuscripts and charters; see Jennifer Moorish, “Dated and Datable Manuscripts Copied in England during the Ninth Century: A Preliminary List,” *Mediaeval Studies* 50 (1988): 512-38. Regardless, Alfred took it upon himself to establish a more concrete and unified educational system, a marked change in the overall habits of learning and knowledge in the region.

⁸⁸ *Asser’s Life of King Alfred*, Simon Keynes & Michael Lapidge, ed. and trans. (London: Penguin, 1983); chs 1, 7, 9, 14, 38.

Ideologically, Alfred set out to reconnect the Christianized Anglo-Saxons, or “Englisc” as they were known following the successful defense against the Danes, with the ancient Hebrews in the written record: “Ða gemunde ic hu sio æ wæs ærest on Ebreiscgeðiode funden, ond eft, ða hie Creacas geliornodon, ða wendon hie hie on hiora agen geðiode ealle, ond eac ealle oðre bec.”⁸⁹ The link is clear: Alfred’s historical vision was, first and foremost, a plan to unite his people. Alfred wanted to make vernacular manuscripts available for a wide circulation so that he could promote a Christian learning that would be beneficial to his people and kingdom. In effect, the idea was that God would bestow beneficence onto his kingdom; it was an attempt to promote the English with a sense of past and Christian favor. Since the lassitude of previous generations had caused the English to fall from grace, it was Alfred’s mission to reconnect the lineage.⁹⁰

Alfred is probably best known for gathering law codes of surrounding areas and creating a stunning new “national code,” thus unifying, for the first time, English law. Alfred’s law codes were, he wrote, handed down to him by God Himself: “þis sindan ða domas þe se ælmihtega god self sprecende wæs to moyse 7 him behead to healdanne.”⁹¹ Alfred later conducts the reader *from* the Apostles *to* the present time in England, thus completing the analogous cycle of

⁸⁹ Translation: “Then I remembered how the law was first composed in the Hebrew language, and afterwards, when the Greeks learned it, they translated it all into their own language, and also all other books.”

⁹⁰ Following Alfred’s reign, Viking invasions weakened the kingdom; thus the Saxon learning started by Alfred eventually stuttered and finally, as far as written works, ceased. Camden, writing this period’s history in his *Britannia*, claims that he is appreciative of Saxon culture until this period, when, he writes, “between Thames and Trent there was scant one found which could understand Latin”; qtd. in Graham Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 210. Ironically enough, it seems Camden might be quoting Alfred here, who claimed the same absence of learning prior to his reign in “Preface to Gregory’s *Pastoral Care*.”

⁹¹ Translation: “These laws were give by God and He orders their fulfillment.” This extract is from Alfred’s legal code, Introduction par. 49. Milton H. Turk, from whom this information comes, has separated this section even further into what he terms the “Historical Introduction”; see *The Legal Codes of Alfred the Great* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1893), 31-3. There are six manuscripts presently containing Alfred’s legal codes. A brief publication history follows: Extracts from Alfred first appeared in *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*, published in 1566 in London by John Day; the first actual edition of the codes appeared two years later in 1588 by Lambarde, entitled *APAIONOMIA*, of which a second edition was imprinted in 1644; in 1610 and 1629, Marquard Freher and William L’Isle printed extracts of the codes, as did Spelman in 1638.

transmission—God has told Alfred, *via* the laws He handed to him, that his people are the new Chosen People. In this sense, then, Æthelberht, Ine, and other variant Saxon kings, culminating in Alfred, constituted what Smith terms a “dominant lateral *ethnie*.” In the formation of this type of *ethnie*, a precursor to the legislative state, the primary dominant agent (*viz.* the geographical headquarters for the power, or East Anglia, in Alfred’s case) sought to incorporate the outlying areas into the dominant culture. By unifying the nascent “nation” under a series of law codes—and, simultaneously, by distributing these to the outer regions of the territory—Alfred could essentially disseminate and, more importantly, regulate certain values, symbols, myths, and traditions (and laws). Alfred was not, then, only the “father of the English”; he was the shaper of the first bureaucratic model of a nation following Rome that would impact the history of civilization.⁹² Though not the earliest attempt to do so, Alfred’s legal writings represent a notable shift in the tenor of culture in ancient England. What Alfred attempted to do was gather the existing material and translate it into the vernacular, or what we now call “Old English,” for purposes of intellectual and cultural advancement and continuity.

All of this changed with the Norman Invasion. As is well known, in 1066, William of Normandy invaded England and defeated the English King Harold II at the Battle of Hastings, the last time invaders of any sort assumed control of the isles. William and the Normans changed the portrait of Britain immensely. What did the Norman Conquest mean for the English? Essentially, the old order was swept away almost overnight, the native aristocracy and old ways buried completely. Gone were the days of King Alfred and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. By the time of William’s *Domesday Book*, the great land survey commissioned by William in 1086,

⁹² Smith, *National Identity*, 54-5. Smith’s issue here is the state as it moves from being an aristocratic body to a legislative group; and while he does not examine the formation of the English “state” *per se*—his examination tends to focus more on the Norman society following the Conquest—this model appears to be very much in concert with my argument. For more support, see Hugh Seton-Watson, *Nations and States* (London: Methuen, 1977) esp. ch. 2.

there were only two English landlords-in-chief to the king, so a great number of lands were lost, and this often meant substituting new Normans for the old masters, those who spoke a different language and had different cultural values. Further, it meant new charges for the monasteries and new masters and loss of freedoms for serfs. Saxon histories did continue to exist, but records are sparse due to Norman oppression.

This was the period of the infamous “Norman Yoke” theory, an idea that would come to the fore in Englishman James Harrington’s *Oceana* (1656) and other later works. As Christopher Hill puts it, the idea behind the Norman Yoke was essentially this: “Before 1066 the Anglo-Saxon inhabitants of this country lived as free and equal citizens, governing themselves through representative institutions. The Norman Conquest deprived them of this liberty, and established the tyranny of an alien King and landlords.”⁹³ Actually, although the roots of feudalism were initially believed to have evolved from German family law, noted English historian Sir Henry Spelman (1562-1641) was the first to see the links between the Norman land tenure system in England and the new feudalism.⁹⁴ The English people would struggle to recover these rights up through the nineteenth century. It is true that William also introduced a legal system and civil liberties, and during this period and after, continental feudalism flourished. It might also even be

⁹³ *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century* (New York: St. Martins, 1997), 52. It is important to note here that in America, later, the Saxon-liberty cause would be taken up by a number of prominent authors and statesmen.

⁹⁴ Pocock, 50-6. Spelman’s goal was to “illustrate contemporary English civil and ecclesiastical law through a study of their Anglo-Saxon origins,” like Parker, Nowell, and Foxe and Lambarde; see Danielle Cunniff Plumer, “The Construction of Structure in the Earliest Editions of Old English Poetry,” in *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Timothy Graham (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2000), 248. He was the founder of scientific philology and a leading scholar of church history. Spelman collected manuscripts and succeeded Parker as the preeminent Anglo-Saxon scholar. Spelman produced the *Archæologus*—a glossary of Anglo-Saxon and Latin law terms in 1626. He also published the first part of books on councils, decrees, and laws, entitled the *Concilia*, with his son John Spelman (1594-1643), who inherited his collection, and also published an edition of the Old English Psalter in 1640, the first Old English text with collations; see Eleanor M. Adams, *Old English Scholarship in England from 1566-1800*. Yale Studies in English v. 55 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917), 47-51.

argued that at this time in his court rudiments of seventeenth-century English common law developed. In fact, in 1215, partly as a result of the Peasant's Revolt, the Magna Charta put forth basic liberal ideas to protect people from aristocratic rule. William established as well the idea of "due process," whereby no man could be punished without a proper trial. In the fourteenth century, the bare beginnings of a composite English "nation" again became evident. The central Norman state soon came into contention with the English Church, however, and a struggle for national and religious identity ensued; the dispute involved, among other things, notions of a common name as well as concerns of national origin. This would be a battle later waged by the English antiquarians.

Out of this period there also rose the glorification of the English past in the *Matière de Bretagne*, or English *romans*, a genre important for reestablishing cultural origins and norms.⁹⁵ Bede had written very little about the early Britons, who inhabited the island before the advent of the Anglo-Saxons. The main reason for this was that Bede *knew* little about them. Geoffrey of Monmouth, on the other hand, noticing that both Bede *and* Gildas had written little about the ancient Britons (the latter perhaps more surprisingly since he *was* British), attempted to correct

⁹⁵ In this work, I will be using *Matière d'Amérique* in direct relation to the Arthurian *Matière de Rome*, *Matière de France*, and *Matière de Bretagne*. Briefly, as Ad Putter and Jane Gilbert have observed, "'romance' is a family resemblance category: we should think of them as forming a complex network of relationships and similarities," not in strict definitional terms; qtd in *Middle English Literature: A Guide to Criticism*, Roger Dalrymple, ed. (Malden: Blackwell, 2004), 56. Northrop Frye has suggested that an archetype for romance is "a verbal imitation of ritual or symbolic human action"; *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romances* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), 55. The classic model of romance focuses more on the intensity of private emotion versus the male-oriented public world of national gain and military ambition. Typically, the material of romance involves adventure—a going and a returning—with fictitious or supernatural elements, usually involving knights, in prose or verse. It has been somewhat customary to speak of medieval romance under these headings: the Matter of Rome, the Matter of France, and the Matter of Britain. The Matter of Rome romances contain retellings of antiquity, such as *King Alisouder* and the *Sege of Troye*; the Matter of France romances concern Charlemagne, as in *Song of Roland* and the Outel Group; and the Matter of Britain romances, starting with Layamon's *Brut*, are the Arthurian romances (most include Chrétien here, although he is French); these also include the English romances. The expression of ideology remains important in romance; for example, in Geoffrey of Monmouth there exist "royal and national dramas characteristic of the century," and in French romances Chrétien de Troyes "defined the problems faced by individuals in that larger structure"; Stephen Knight, *Arthurian Literature and Society* (London: Macmillan, 1983), 38-9.

this in his *Historia Regum Britannia*, published in 1138. This arguable “history” of a heroic breed of Englishmen became the equivalent of a new English bestseller, overtaking even Bede’s as the leading source of information until the fourteenth century. Geoffrey’s heroic stories were immensely popular. Favoring Arthur and the Britons more than the Anglo-Saxon past, Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia* replaced Bede’s work as the primary history of England. It was Geoffrey’s romance of this history, in which he examined the Anglo-Saxons’ predecessors, the Celts, that connected the lineage from Rome to Britain.⁹⁶ *Historia* was a *romans* par excellence. Geoffrey popularized stories of King Arthur and his knights, Merlin, and the idea of Arthur as Britain’s savior. Indeed, Geoffrey focused more on history prior to the Anglo-Saxons, the rise of Arthur and his contestations with the Anglo-Saxons, his triumphs and demise, and British history following the invasions, so that it essentially pushed these notions to the fore of English public consciousness. With its romantically visionary treatment of a heroic Arthurian Britain, *Historia* became a bestseller, and Geoffrey’s work was soon taken as actual history.⁹⁷

Because these romantic ideals were part of a tradition of the *romans* tale from which colonial Americans borrowed, we must look closely at the literary manifestations of this history. As in the case of Alfred, stories of King Arthur had been popular in England from the close of the Middle Ages into Elizabeth’s reign. Unlike Alfred, however, Arthur’s origins are not

⁹⁶ This is not to say that Bede’s omission was intentional; he simply had no source material from which to draw concerning the early inhabitants of Britain. Geoffrey’s sources for this material are at once eclectic and vague, as Neil Wright has shown, *The Historia Regum Britannie of Geoffrey of Monmouth: II. The First Variant Version (A Critical Edition)*. Wright actually charges that the first variant history was written by a contemporary of Geoffrey’s, thus adding to the source confusion.

⁹⁷ The “history” of Geoffrey’s history has been called into question almost from the time it was published. Not surprisingly, these inquiries began in the north, where Bede printed his work. In the twelfth century, Alfred of Beverley was one early opponent of Geoffrey’s; William of Newburgh, canon of the Augustinian priory at Newburgh, was another. It was William who realized the political power of Geoffrey’s work—with Arthur bearing the figure of a national and spiritual model, “Celtic peoples could use [it] as a weapon against the Angevin dynasty”; see Antonia Gransden, *Legends, Traditions, and History in Medieval England* (London: Hamblen Press, 1992), 21.

specifically Anglo-Saxon and remain somewhat dubious.⁹⁸ It was not until the twelfth century in Geoffrey's *Historia*—a history built upon Bede but more secular in intention—that Arthur came to the fore in the *English* imagination. Following the path paved by earlier historians, Geoffrey provided a history of England through the kings. As Hanning notes, “Geoffrey’s contribution to the imaginative historiography of the early Middle Ages may be summed up as a removal from history of the idea of eschatological fulfillment, in both its national and personal manifestations.”⁹⁹ Geoffrey had two contemporary myths at his disposal—the Saxon and the Roman. In the former, the Saxons were a migrating group who marauded and migrated to a distant land, began a democratic government, and were soon converted by the Catholic missionaries, thus civilizing their savage freedom. The latter, however, holds that the descendants of Brutus and Rome, the British (who were converted long before the supposed conversion of the Saxons), were residents on the Isles, successfully governed and fought off the Saxon attacks until, as Gildas warned, they eventually succumbed. Most importantly, Geoffrey’s Arthur is clearly not the Celtic warrior Arthur; he represents more the ideals of medieval England, thus providing the first in a string of instances in which Arthur is used for ideological purposes.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ The earliest accounts of Arthur portray him as negative character. In the early Welsh *Life of St Cadog*, he is depicted as lusty and deceitful. Similarly, in Caradoc’s *Life of St Gildas*, Arthur’s conflicts with fellow Celts—Arthur, in fact, beheads Caw, the father of Gildas—and in Huail, Owein, and other British saints, Arthur is, too, portrayed as a villain. Gildas ignores him completely. Since Gildas lived about this time and knew of the Battle of Badon, for example, Knight concludes his omission serves as one of the ideological—the first, really—treatments of the Arthurian legend. However, in *The Age of Arthur* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1973), John Morris takes the stance that Gildas did indeed describe Arthur—he just happened not to mention him by name. Two early sources—*Annales Cambria* and Nennius’s history of Britain—use Arthur in a historical treatment. The former has Arthur carrying the cross for three days and tells of Arthur’s death with “Medrawd” (Mordred) while the latter glorifies Arthur in twelve listed battles. Though a plethora of studies on the subject exist, the argument over Arthur’s historicity has, to my knowledge, never been settled.

⁹⁹ *Vision of History*, 171.

¹⁰⁰ The first major story about Arthur was the Celtic *Culhwch ac Olwen*, written sometime around 1100. Welsh in origin, *Culhwch* tells the tale of Arthur as a first cousin coming to the aid of family, and Arthur depicts the first

In fact, Geoffrey's Arthur represents the beginnings of a split ideology in Britain and the beginnings of the myth's significant entrance into England's national ideology. In 1534, Henry VII hired Polydore Vergil to (re)write a history of England.¹⁰¹ Vergil's history, *Anglica Historia*, summarily denied the veracity of Geoffrey's book. Two years after this attack, John Leland wrote a pamphlet defending Geoffrey and his sources—including the mysterious "Welsh book" from which Geoffrey claimed to have retrieved many of his sources—partly to protect the sacredness of the English past and partly for nationalistic reasons.¹⁰² Henry, however, liked the idea that Arthur ruled more than Britain; thus, Arthur needed to be imperialistic as he ushered in a new reign. History and fiction collided. In a similar maneuver, Henry married Edward IV's daughter, who had Welsh lineage, not necessarily because he wanted to *be* the new Arthur but because he wanted a new Welsh incarnation (supposedly, Henry's grandfather had claimed to be from Cadwallar, the last king of Britain).¹⁰³ As such, Arthur symbolized a sort of British-Saxon dominance, even though he was Welsh.

instance of the way in which the Arthurian legend plays into socio-cultural (here, Welsh) history. The episode ties in symbolism from Welsh tribal codes, wherein the "triumph of the dominant family is the major ideological feature"; see Knight, 19. Similarly, in twelfth-century France, Chrétien de Troyes's Arthurian stories displayed socio-class conflicts.

¹⁰¹ In Malory's time (c.1405-71), Arthur Plantagenet, aptly named to carry the lineage from King Arthur, was born. In a stunning political move, Henry VII had married his half-sister, wishing to unify the division between the Houses of York and Lancaster. In 1485 Henry VII claimed to fulfill Merlin's prophecy by taking the throne; in 1486, the heir Arthur was born, building on this established pattern. When Arthur died at the young age of fifteen, Henry VIII became king, and the Arthurian idea was transferred. English antiquarian John Leland addressed Henry as Arthur revived, and the Arthur legacy continued into the Tudor dynasty. Henry went so far as to have Arthur's supposed "Round Table" decorated with Tudor emblems, and Elizabeth used a coat of armor bearing traces of both the history of Britain and of Arthur, the same as Henry VII had done earlier. Vergil (1470-1555), lamenting the paucity of actual histories, regarded contemporary historians, especially religious chroniclers, as "bald, uncouth, chaotic, and deceitful"; see Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England: c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan, 1982), 434. More than anything else, Vergil desired veracity from written history, claiming that writers should "never be so bold as to open any false thing, nor so remiss as not to utter any truth," *Anglica Historia*, 17 (lines 25-6).

¹⁰² James P. Carley, "Polydore Vergil and John Leland on King Arthur: The Battle of the Books," *King Arthur: A Casebook*, Edward Donald Kennedy, ed. (New York: Garland, 1996), 185-204.

¹⁰³ According to Geoffrey's account, Merlin predicted that a new king would come (the Plantagenets had earlier, in their reign, seen the "discovery" of Arthur and Guinevere's tombs at Glastonbury in 1190, so contrary to reports he might return, the Welsh king was declared dead and thus could not save his people). But, Leland and other English

Malory continued the *Matière de Bretagne*. Resurrecting Geoffrey's romantic Arthur for later generations, he imagined an even more fully developed *romans* for Britain's hero—one with political ramifications.¹⁰⁴ Printed in 1485, *Morte Darthur* represents ideologies of the changing economic and individual times, as well as the shift away from aristocratic rule. The power of the individual was growing, the market economy was changing due to land laws and dying feudalism, and religious sects, such as the Lollards, were making waves. Malory begins with gothic medievalism and typical formulaic treatment of chivalry in the early books and then moves to a more modern-seeming and climactic individual treatment in the final three chapters. Aside from its content, the style is different than in earlier histories. Stephen Knight calls Malory's *Morte* "the last statement of medieval chivalry" because "in literature and art there is a marked development and concern with the individual, in the 'dance of death' motif, especially, but also in the development of realism, a mode which bases itself on the validity of the individual sensual response."¹⁰⁵ Knight also points out the ideological forces that govern these historic literary appropriations: "The Arthurian legend, especially in its most sophisticated literary versions, is about power in the real world: the texts are potent ideological documents through which both the fears and the hopes of the dominant class are realized."¹⁰⁶ Unlike Alfred, then,

antiquarians, while not claiming for the actual veracity of an ancient book, held out for the idea of some support that might, according to Escobedo, shift the plane of historical knowledge to an immaterial one. The erudite Dee, on the same note, argues that historical evidence for Arthur and Brutus will someday be found, and he went to great lengths to stop the destruction of library collections by Catholics (going so far as to plead with Mary, Queen of Scots); Dee used examples of the past (Arthur) to motivate the present, tying English history in "a single, prophetic moment," yet risking it in the eschatology of a coming apocalypse; see Andrew Escobedo, *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 58-9.

¹⁰⁴ The Tudors, specifically the Welshman Henry VII, reigned at the time; before that, Edward IV was king and then, briefly, Edward V, who was killed by Richard III (who reigned for two years).

¹⁰⁵ *Arthurian Literature and Society* (London: Macmillan, 1983), 146-47.

¹⁰⁶ Fundamentally, Knight's work questions who and what these texts were written for and why. He remarks, "there is a dynamic political tension inherent in the essential Arthurian story that has enabled its potent recreation in a remarkable range of visions and periods"; xiv. Further, he argues, "A history of Arthurian literature which is socially

Arthur's role becomes twisted in conflicting ideologies: On the one hand, Malory suggests a chivalric past, but, on the other hand, darker and more sinister applications to nation building lurk. As Elizabeth Pochoda further observes, "there is a central paradox in *Morte* which arises from the fact that although Malory initially seems to have designed the Arthurian ideal along the lines of medieval political theory, by doing so he inevitably uncovered much of the Arthurian story which made it unsuitable as an historical ideal of life."¹⁰⁷ Specifically, Malory infuses the story of Arthur with certain political and nationalistic purposes. Pochoda continues, "With Malory, we confront a purposeful and conscious revival of Arthurian material which arises out of a cultural context very different from that of Geoffrey [...], a context specifically related to the contemporary aristocratic concern with reliving the ceremonies and traditions of the past."¹⁰⁸ Thus, Arthur becomes a link in the past of English nation building.

Malory's *Morte* marks the double role for sixteenth-century England's political elite—and, arguably, the first use of English myth for solely political and national purposes. There arose a symbolic expectation of Arthur's return, a "saving" of England, and a resurrection complete with imperialistic drives. Moreover, the symbolism was ideologically nostalgic: the "role" of Arthur, in a Levi-Straussian sense, showed an inevitable movement toward apocalypse, at which time Arthur was supposed to return and the next Golden Age of Britain would ensue.¹⁰⁹

The *Matière de Bretagne* had a continuing narrative. Arthur's soothsayer, Merlin, prophesized

and historically responsible can take its place as part of the striking—and increasingly available—history of the part literary culture has played in the defense of power within the state," xv.

¹⁰⁷ *Arthurian Propaganda Le Morte Darthur as an Historical Ideal of Life* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1971), xi.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 23.

¹⁰⁹ These ideas are generally accepted but are articulated well in Caroline D. Eckhardt's essay, "Prophecy and Nostalgia: Arthurian Symbolism at the Close of the English Middle Ages," in *The Arthurian Tradition*, Mary Flowers Braswell and John Bugge, eds. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1988), 109-26.

the restoration of a Celtic dynasty, when both Saxon and Norman rules would come to end.¹¹⁰

The main component of an Arthurian Golden Age, then, was comprised of these two ideas. But tales of Arthur began to seem fanciful; proof for his existence was scant. Following Henry VII, what the Elizabethans needed, it seemed, was more solid textual evidence—either Anglo-Saxon, early British, or otherwise—to support these fanciful claims of power. (In a similar way, what both Gildas and Bede showed were the ties between the dominant *ethnie* and the emergence of a national culture through promotion of the writings of that particular period, drawing from earlier Saxon stories and sources.) The Tudor use of Prince Madoc of Wales carried forward this rightful nationalism.

Madoc was not a new ideological strategy. Like Arthur, he was of Welsh origin, and also like Arthur, Madoc would influence the British New World enterprises undertaken by John Dee and others. The Celtic-English dichotomy somewhat dissolved when, in 1536, the Act of Union formalized the bond between England and Wales, increasing the physical land of the ever-growing English empire. At this time, too, religious upheavals arose. Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon sparked the Reformation, leading to the schism between the unity of Protestantism and the British Crown and the Catholic Church. Following this split and in Queen Elizabeth's reign, the Church of England, itself an ideological empire, grew quickly and steadily. Backed by the church, England's nationalistic ideas of expansion soon developed, and, with the

¹¹⁰ Merlin had predicted not the actual return of Arthur, but the *descendent* of the last Celt ruler, a Cadwalader, coming to power. However, since Arthur did not really die in the legend, per se, the "savior" could be either one—the incarnation returned *or* the descendent—an idea similar to that of Jesus saving the Christians. Henry IV, Edward IV, and Henry VII *all* made use of Merlin's prophecies: they also all took the throne by conquest. Froissart recounts the prophecy in 1361 that a new king—an heir to Lancaster—would arrive, and Henry IV was born in 1365. The Yorkists, later, argued Edward IV would restore rule to the Celtic line. Because of these political intricacies, Henry VII felt he *must* be in line somehow with Merlin's prophecies and the Arthurian legend. The point of all of these historical prophecies is clear: various writers manipulated history to their own ends, and the Arthur links depict the way these English rulers merged past and present into a near future.

English defeat of the Spanish Armada, notions of patriotism, nationality, and culture grew exponentially. London, the epitome of all things British, became the economic, cultural, and political center of the world; and, thus, in the 1530s when Henry VIII justified the break with the church upon Saxon grounds, Anglo-Saxonism properly entered English ideology. This was the beginning of the English Nation, a nation that would populate the British colonies in North America with its own emergent myths concerning geography, race, and ethnicity.

THE ENGLISH ANTIQUARIANS AND ANGLO-SAXON IDEOLOGY

In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Anglo-Saxon texts provided evidence of nationhood, nationality, and historical lineage. Essentially, a small number of men, driven at first by the desire to find support for Protestantism, began to look anew at ancient texts. Fathered by Laurence Nowell, John Leland, and John Bale, antiquarianism was born.¹¹¹ Others soon followed: Matthew Parker, John Foxe, William Camden, and Sir Robert Cotton are the primary English antiquarians of note. More than anyone else, Cotton has been credited as responsible for

¹¹¹ Unfortunately, I cannot do proper justice to the fascinating topic of seventeenth-century English antiquarianism. I will return to antiquarianism in another project. For more on early English antiquarianism, see especially Graham Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of The Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995); *Anglo-Saxon Scholarship: The First Three Centuries*, Carl T. Berkhout and Milton McGatch, eds. (Boston: D.S. Brewer, 1982); H.B. Walters, *The English Antiquaries of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries* (Primrose Hill: London, 1934); Eleanor M. Adams, *Old English Scholarship in England from 1566-1800*. Yale Studies in English v. 55 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917); and Angelika Lutz, "The Study of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in the Seventeenth Century and the Establishment of Old English Studies in Universities," *The Recovery of Old English*, Timothy Graham, ed., 1-82. Bale (1495-1563), along with John Leland (1503-52) and Matthew Parker (1504-75), was one of the primary English antiquarians, those whom commentators now call the "first generation." Both John Leland and Bale began medieval scholarship: they were the two main historians between the dissolution of the monasteries and Elizabeth's reign. May McKisack argues "it was the joint work of Leland and Bale which laid the foundation of medieval historical studies in sixteenth-century England"; see *Medieval History in the Tudor Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 16. Bale had a bulk of Anglo-Saxon material but no glossary from which to decipher it, so he created one, which was then printed by his friend William Lambarde in his book *Archaeionomia* (1568), a collection of Anglo-Saxon laws. Borrowing from Leland, Bale wrote a history of English authors, including William the Conqueror as author of Domesday Book and King John as the author of the Magna Charta. Like Robert Cotton, Bale had a huge library—with copies of Bede, Geoffrey, Malmesbury, and others—which was eventually sacked by the Catholics; Queen Elizabeth sent for his books, but some made their way into Parker's library; see McKisack, 17-20.

the collection and use of Old English manuscripts for political and ideological purposes. As Frantzen points out, “Within the larger rewriting of English church history undertaken by Bale and, later, Foxe, were attempts to recreate the evidence in a physical sense. One of the most striking features of the recovery of Anglo-Saxon texts in this period is their rewriting of the manuscripts.”¹¹² Importantly, Bale served as “the leading ideologue of post-Reformation British nationalism.”¹¹³ Bale’s nation was not that born in his century; it was that which arose in pre-Anglo-Saxon England: “Paradoxically, it [was] in the very irrecoverability of Britain’s ancient beauties that Bale locat[ed] the basis of a new British nation.”¹¹⁴ Unfortunately, some of the texts upon which Bale depended had been emended by scribes and other writers. But, men like Bale were decidedly crafty in their findings. While Parker thought the texts had been tampered with by previous readers for nationalistic reasons, he failed to admit that this was what he was doing himself. The English antiquarians knew what they wanted to do, politically; their job was to explain how Anglo-Saxon texts and the ideas within them related to their claims. Primarily in the beginning, the efforts of *all* Tudor antiquarians were based on England’s ancient textual heritage. Parker, Cotton, and Camden thus all played instrumental roles in the recovery of the English past. Parker, the renowned Archbishop of Canterbury, was the foremost collector of texts. He formed the Society of Antiquaries in 1572—later dissolved by James in 1606 in fear of the power of the Protestants and the antiquarian agendas—and was responsible for printing the first English texts by such authors as Gildas and Asser. Cotton was Camden’s pupil, who, upon joining Society of Antiquaries, became acquainted with all Camden’s literi and the other antiquarians. Cotton, in fact, would grow to amass the largest private library of old manuscripts

¹¹² *Desire for Origins*, 45.

¹¹³ Philip Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 51.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

in England, a library so great the government feared it; when Cotton lost favor in court after writing a diatribe against the court practices of Charles I, Charles had the library sealed in 1630.¹¹⁵

Both Parker and Cotton worked closely with John Foxe (1516-87), who lived with John Day, Elizabethan printer, for a time, and the latter found his fame as the publisher of Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*. Foxe, in fact, was instrumental in publishing Anglo-Saxon material, first printing a version of the *Anglo-Saxon Gospels* in 1571 with a preface and an English translation. Essentially, Foxe's *Gospels* "argued" that the Scripture should be put in the vulgar.¹¹⁶ Further, Foxe thought that Alfred was the greatest king, often using him as an exemplar of what a king should be; as MacDougall argues, "for Protestants, Alfred had the attraction of being a ruler of the English Golden Age, before the entry of Romish corruption."¹¹⁷ Moreover, since Arthur's existence was based primarily on "flimsy evidence"—it was, essentially, Geoffrey's history that provided most of the primary source information for Arthur, and its veracity was called into question almost from its inception into the public consciousness—what the English needed was a "true" historical ruler. Indeed, there were abundant materials on Alfred. What texts promoted, however, was Parker's or Camden's *interpretation* of Alfredian texts. While it is true that most of these representations appeared in the histories, some poems and dramas were written to include Alfred—Milton, for instance, thought he would be a good subject. Just as creative works saw a parallel in Alfred and contemporary rule, editors of laws, codes, and the like manipulated material to highlight what they deemed the better regime in the English Golden Age. The majority of scholars versed in ancient English constitutional laws thought Alfred's pre-Conquest

¹¹⁵ Cotton's grandson later regained control of the library and presented it to the country as a gift in 1700; the library contained many of the manuscripts still stored today at the British Museum, where they have been since 1731.

¹¹⁶ Adams, 31.

¹¹⁷ *Racial Myth*, 25.

state was more “English” and better than the Norman Yoke rule of the following kings. Alfred became mythic. As Simmons surmises, “Interest in Anglo-Saxon heritage thus became a means of social criticism and a strain in opposition to the celebratory remembrance of King Alfred, under whose leadership the Anglo-Saxon culture had reached its pinnacle.”¹¹⁸

Foxe took up the charge from Bale that there were true and false churches—that is, the Church of Rome had moved from the true English church. In doing so, Foxe imposed a national myth on ancient Christology—the Church of Rome’s incorporation of newer models of Christianity, seen clearly in the Norman subjugation of the ancient church and Saxon liberties—and argued for the ancient church as microcosm of the history of the world. Generations of later readers, both British *and* American, would come to see history through Foxe’s eyes; “Puritans alike loved the *Book of Martyrs*, memorized it, told their children stories from it,” and the illiterate “read” the narratives through the woodcuts.¹¹⁹ In *Acts and Monuments*, Foxe describes in detail the fate of the true church under the persecution of the Roman church. For Foxe, one still unsettled issue was the problem of discerning a “national church”; rejecting popery, he saw the establishment of the Elizabethan church as a true and saving ideal of national community.

Along with other more minor players, such as John Seldon and William Lambarde, to name but two, Cotton and Parker were largely responsible for bringing the textual history of England to the fore, where it exploded in arguments about national ideology before the texts were eventually relegated to universities.¹²⁰ Claims of a national character and language most

¹¹⁸ *Reversing the Conquest: History and Myth in Nineteenth-Century British Literature* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990), 34. Much of the preceding information comes from Simmons, 27-34.

¹¹⁹ Peter Gay, *A Loss of Mastery: Puritan Historians in Colonial America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), 15-17.

¹²⁰ There eventually was a great rise of study in Anglo-Saxon at both Cambridge and Oxford in the later seventeenth century, and both tried to lay claim on Anglo-Saxon heritage. Angelika Lutz argues that Parker and his antiquarians should have pushed Old English writings toward a wider audience, but, following his death, Cotton, Camden, and

fully emerged in the efforts of the renowned and widely-published Camden, who traced contemporary law and language to the ancient Saxons. The rise of the Saxons had begun. As MacDougall points out, “as an appeal to the Anglo-Saxon past had been useful to those anxious to upset the traditional religious establishment, so it was to prove to reformers seeking to alter constitutional arrangements.”¹²¹ Indeed, he goes on to claim, “the continuing labor of scholars in exploring and commenting on the English past was of critical importance in maintaining Anglo-Saxonism as a national myth which fired the imagination of a people with expanding imperial pretensions.”¹²² During the Protestant-Catholic contestations of the sixteenth century, support such as this became essentially important for England, especially as the modern notions of “nation” began flowering and questions of descent prevailed. In a sense, one might argue that the antiquarian movement was founded in part on nationalist machination, involving the problematic nexus of lineage, religion, and law. Protestantism became justified during this time as the king wanted separation from Rome. Early texts were then used as support for the Protestant movement. As Hill observes, “English Anglo-Saxon texts demonstrated insular peculiarities in English Christianity. This interest, coupled with the notion held by Protestants that monasteries

Spelman were ultimately responsible for the path to the universities. She claims the path of the institutionalizing of Anglo-Saxon during this period—from Canterbury and London (in the Parker era) to London and Winchester (in the late Elizabethan and early Stuart periods) to Cambridge and then to Oxford in the 1670s—can be traced by following the seven manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The study of the *Chronicle* serves to illuminate the larger shift and gradual institutionalization of Old English from the hands of antiquarians to universities and from region to region. Several aborted attempts by historians around Cotton to establish Old English as acceptable study outside universities, coupled with the tensions between the King and parliament in the Stuart period, led Camden and Spelman to conclude it had to be studied solely in universities (mostly because James sought to quash any progress in the study of Anglo-Saxon law codes, and the manuscripts would be safer housed in colleges); see Lutz, 1-82, esp. 71-4.

¹²¹ *Racial Myth*, 56.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 78-9. The new myth—English as Saxon stock—eclipsed the old, wherein the English thought they came from Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Celts, Vikings, during the Glorious Revolution of 1688; see Robert Young, *The Idea of English Ethnicity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008), 15-16.

were corrupt and wicked places, would be the driving force behind the creation of an entirely new form of historical inquiry. Out of this melee, the English antiquary grew.”¹²³

In the Renaissance, those such as Cotton who collected books were ostensibly saving them from charges of “tainting popery”; therefore, they were saving records of a kind of “free cataloguing,” whereby England had its *own* history, not merely one tied to the previous example of Rome. Antiquarians were, fundamentally, Protestant reformers who looked back before the Roman Catholic Church in search for a mandate for and justification of the Reformation. Foxe, especially, promoted the idea that the true British church had long been in conflict with the Roman Catholic Church. Foxe and the common lawyers wanted to go back to a time before this dominance, and, with Parker’s help, looked for documents attesting to this period. The argument ran thus: the English Church was first formed by the Britons and then maintained strongly with the Saxons, but it was compromised by Catholicism (in much the same way that Anglo-Saxon England came under the Norman Yoke). Thus, Foxe and Parker tied the church they were advocating to the ancient Saxon church, and they sought to provide material evidence for this linkage. So, antiquarians manipulated these old documents, and the views and writings on laws and religion therein, to establish and justify the way England *once* was and thus to determine the *true* English heritage. Needless to say, manuscript collecting and, later, printing became dangerous practices during this period. Later, in 1629, Cotton himself was framed on trumped-up forgery charges, imprisoned, and had his library closed down.

Another primary reason for using Anglo-Saxon texts during this period was, then, clearly political. The advance of printing grew along with the number of manuscripts and tracts on Anglo-Saxon documents. The official formation of the Stationer’s Company in London (1557)

¹²³ *Puritan and Revolution*, 57.

brought together lawmakers, scribes, and antiquarians.¹²⁴ With the rise of manuscript production came a surge in political debates occasioned in part by the dissemination of various types of manuscripts. Not surprisingly, given the rapid growth of an ideologically biased English antiquarian movement, these two—antiquarian scholars and political leaders—served each other well. That is, as the political propaganda by men like Burghley increased, men like Parker and Lambard made useful connections between the past and present through the study of records, treatises, and political records.¹²⁵ Parliamentarians like Sir Edward Coke, an important figure to later Americans, turned to Saxon precedents to supply a historical rationale for their opposition to intensifications in royal power. According to Coke, Saxons had “good laws,” were protected from rulership, and their political institutions grew; this was, he claimed, the golden age of good government.¹²⁶ Historically, the argument ran, the time following the Conquest had simply been a series of struggles to restore ancient political rights, beginning with the Magna Charta and culminating in the Stuarts’ triumph, which proved the English had had superior legal and

¹²⁴ H.R. Woudhuysen’s study of manuscript production during this period, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), examines this link. Prior to the mid-sixteenth century, law writers and scribes rarely crossed paths; however, with the formation of the London Company, scribes dabbled in works of law, personal business, and just about any copying job needing a skilled scribe. Importantly, many scribes had been or were set to become law clerks, working for people such as William Lambard, the antiquarian, or Lord Burghley. What these connections mean, Woudhuysen appears to be arguing, is that the genres easily bled into each other. Part of the problem, however, with manuscripts in the Elizabethan era was based on Protestant power politics and what Alan Haynes calls “The Elizabethan Secret Service.” Akin to present day CIA operations, this group, fronted by Cecil, Walsingham, and Robert Dudley, gained political knowledge from a variety of sources, typically using it to further the Protestant agenda. The right to search printing houses for sources resumed in 1576, and authors serving under the aegis of this group—one such was Camden—often had first knowledge of private libraries and frequently omitted certain details from contemporary accounts. For more on this, see Alan Haynes, *The Elizabethan Secret Services, 1570-1603* (Phoenix Mill: Alan Sutton, 1992).

¹²⁵ This is point one of Woudhuyen’s twofold thesis, the second being the growth of imaginative literature during this turmoil of manuscript activity. Although his main goal is to show the political import in the writings of Sidney, the first corollary remains important for my argument: The dizzying number of manuscript dealings and reformist political ideas emerged during the sixteenth century having the newest research on and ideas from Old English texts as a political foundation.

¹²⁶ Barczewski, 128. Coke (1552-1634), a common lawyer and jurist and a primary source for many later American arguments of Saxon lineage, published *Institutes of the Laws of England*. Along with Selden, he hoped to establish English law as tradition, preferring this over the Roman law widely used throughout the continent. Coke’s common law of England arguments especially influenced Jefferson and helped develop Virginia law.

political institutions from their beginnings. Tied to politics was nation building. Ultimately, as Gillian Brennan has pointed out, “in considering sixteenth-century patriotism one must be aware, not only that much of the information is the product of the Tudors’ effective propaganda machine, but also of the way in which successive generations have moulded personalities and events to suit their own circumstances.”¹²⁷

Besides Foxe, arguably two of the most important antiquarians with transnational influence were William Camden and Richard Verstegan. Camden introduced the Celtic Briton to the world and heralded his grace, while Verstegan championed the hardy Saxon, and these two archetypes would eventually make their way overseas to the British New World. Camden was arguably the greatest, most learned scholar of the late Tudor and early Stuart periods. Scholars still see Camden’s *Brittania* as the quintessential early work on the history of Britain; it is certainly one of the monumental works of antiquarian scholarship.¹²⁸ Camden’s place in the antiquarian circle was prominent because more than anyone else, he published antiquarian findings in interpretive works, designed to put forward the ideas of Parker and the findings of Cotton. Not only was Camden the greatest antiquary of his age, he was also a driving force of cultural and scholarly activity. Headmaster of Westminster School, he published a Greek grammar, a treatise on the history of English and Irish affairs during Elizabeth’s reign (*Annales*), and a monumental work on Britain, *The Britannia*. All were seen as heroic achievements.

¹²⁷ *Patriotism, Power, and Print: National Consciousness in Sixteenth-Century England* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2003), 13.

¹²⁸ The cartographer Abraham Ortelius greatly influenced Camden, urging him to put his notes on antiquity into print form. Along with Dee, Ortelius was perhaps the most renowned cartographer, publishing his extraordinary Atlas of the World, *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*, in 1570 and the equally impressive *Synonymia Geographia* in 1578, both of which brought him international fame. His newest venture, a map of the ancient world entitled *Parergon*, was to be accompanied by Camden’s text, at Camden’s behest. There was a link between antiquarians and cartography; geographical mapping evidently seemed analogous to tracing lineage. There was a continuing interest for writers, and readers, to link time and place, becoming increasingly more apparent as the century went on; see Jeremy Black, *Maps and History: Images of the Past* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

Camden was Clarenceux King of Arms when he published his *Annales*, at his old patron, Lord Burghley, William Cecil's request.¹²⁹ Camden's real purpose was to offer King James a dual history of the reigns of his real mother, Mary Stuart, and his surrogate mother, Elizabeth, that eulogized the former while presenting a mixed assessment of the latter.¹³⁰ Camden's contribution to the myth, therefore, was to establish the themes of Elizabeth's reign for later generations: the centrality of Mary Stuart's saga, the nefarious aspects of the Earl of Leicester, who manned the English land forces against Spain during the Armada, and the statesmanship of Lord Burghley.

The most important work, however, by Camden or perhaps *any* antiquarian from this time was his *Britannia*. At noted Dutch cartographer Abraham Ortelius's urging, Camden compiled his writings and published them as the *Britannia*, gaining international acclaim and providing the framework for historians and antiquarians throughout the following century. Camden's aim was to enhance England's standing above other nations by highlighting and tracing its glorious past, to discover "a more civilized Britannia."¹³¹ Camden's object was *not* to write a history of Roman Britain but to recover what was old in *British* history, observe it through a different lens, and make it new again—essentially, to glorify England and the lineage of English civilization.¹³² In fact, Ortelius urged Camden to do just that. Camden's dedication to his patron, Cecil, is clear. In it, he writes: "Ad hoc opus elimandum, id est, ad antiquissimam Britannorum, & Anglorum originem indagandam, & vetustas Britanniae urbes, quarum

¹²⁹ For more on the Camden-Cecil relationship, see Patrick Collinson, "William Camden and the Anti-Myth of Elizabeth: Setting the Mould?" *The Myth of Elizabeth*, Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman, eds. (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003), 88-92; see also Stephen Alford, *Burghley: William Cecil at the Court of Elizabeth I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 346-47.

¹³⁰ For more on this, see Collinson, who studies the impact of Camden's *Annales* on the Elizabethan myth.

¹³¹ F. J. Levy Powicke, "The Making of Camden's *Britannia*," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 26 (1964), 79.

¹³² For more on this argument, see Powicke, 70-98, Joseph M. Levine, *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern Historiography* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), and Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992), 114-17.

meminerunt Ptolemaeus, Antoninus, & alii, e tenebris eruendas, omne industriae meae curriculum, hos aliquot annos subcisivis horis, elaboratum est.”¹³³ The *Britannia* would be read by generations of Americans in the New World, providing them with a history and lineage from which they believed they descended.

Camden’s *Britannia* has three main parts: The first part recounts England’s history from Roman times to the Norman invasion, and parts two and three discuss the variant folk of the British Isles (and Ireland), naming cities and towns in the process. In addition to detailing its history, Camden was also trying to provide a *topography* of Britain, a project that up until the first publication of *Britannia* in 1607 (it went through three editions) had not been done. For his efforts, he succeeded, and *Britannia* stands alone as a model of the first printed ideological conception of the English as “nation.” Of course, topographies had been done prior to Camden’s work, most notably by Bale and Lambarde, but Camden infused his with a sense of national history and past, with the idea that British history was historically a series of conquerings and migrations that ended somewhat abruptly with William’s invasion.

The enormity of Camden’s accomplishment cannot be overstated: He literally revived, restored, and repositioned the ancient Britons in the Elizabethan world.¹³⁴ Camden, too, seemed to look more favorably on the Britons, describing their long regal beards, wearing of skins, bodies gloriously painted with war art, than he did on the Saxons, whom he portrayed as barbarous and savage invaders.¹³⁵ Not surprisingly, it would be Camden’s textual portrayal,

¹³³ Translation: “Toward the completion of this work, it has been my whole endeavor for several years to search out the most ancient British people and the origin of the English and to bring forward from the shadows the old British cities mentioned in Ptolemy, and other sources.”

¹³⁴ Parry, 31.

¹³⁵ Not surprisingly, however, when Camden fell in with the Anglo-Saxon crowd—Parker, Seldon, Lambarde, and others—his views changed slightly. Later editions of the *Britannia* were not as harsh toward the Saxons as the first; Parry, 42.

coupled most likely with John White's paintings of the natives in the New World, which would later serve as the first glimpses of the inhabitants of the New World for many would-be colonists and as primary evidence for Amerindians as relatives of the Celts. Camden's *niche* was etymology, and he undertook to find the origins of derivations of English names, towns, and places (for example, in the *Britannia*, he links "Salisbury" to the Saxons—no surprise considering James I had recently revived the title, giving it to Robert Cecil, son of Lord Burghley, Camden's patron). Topographies, British histories, and, in general, Anglo-Saxon studies soon became a popular gentleman's pursuit. In 1586, after the Society of Antiquarians was formed, Camden was invited to discuss his works with other antiquarians.¹³⁶

Verstegan, one of the lesser-known but more influential antiquarians, was likely influenced—as most every antiquarian working about this time was—by Camden's work. Verstegan, too, was widely read in the New World promotional material. He, however, was first and foremost concerned with origins. Verstegan was perhaps the pivotal figure in the transition of reigns from Elizabeth to James; a practicing Roman Catholic, his *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* was dedicated to James I. Though he was working from the side of the Catholic English—and he wasn't the only one, as Dee had converted to Catholicism as well—his *Restitution* provides one of the prime pieces of propaganda promoting Anglo-Saxon links to the England of his period. Verstegan literally creates a myth, going back as far as the Tower of

¹³⁶ We might say that, for all intents and purposes, Anglo-Saxon studies properly begins with The Society of Antiquaries. It was presumably started in 1572 by Parker and continued under Sir Robert Cotton as a group that met privately and raised the level of Anglo-Saxon study to that of classics until 1589, when it petitioned the queen for a public meeting place. The object of the Society was "the preservation of manuscripts and rare books relating to English history and antiquities, and the study of modern languages"; see Adams, 42. The three main participants were Cotton, Camden, and Spelman. The King disbanded the Society in 1605 for political reasons, primarily because of their investigations on constitutional and more political issues. Cotton's library was closed in 1629, and he was arrested, thus adding to the danger of using Anglo-Saxon studies for political reasons—which development must have frightened both Camden and Spelman, both of whom relied on Cotton's library; for more, see Lutz, 1-82, esp. 27.

Babel, that links the ancient Anglo-Saxons to the English, placing their origin in Germany and even going so far as to say these lands and the isles were connected. In his study of Verstegan, Richard Clement offers a tantalizing description of the power of this work as myth. Verstegan focused on origins: he connected England to the ancient Saxons, dismissing the Britons from this lineage. His argument, in fact, contends that the English should *not* look for British roots at all. Verstegan's major accomplishment, then, as Clement argues, was his depiction of the nobility of the Anglo-Saxons: "Here were roots of which a nation could be proud. What need of an Englishman to look to a mythic Arthur for inspiration when the results of Hengist and Horsa's conquest were manifest all around him? His language, his name, his country, and his lineage were all Anglo-Saxon."¹³⁷ Importantly, Verstegan firmly connects Anglo-Saxons and English by recounting the Christian conversion (borrowing, as he frequently did, from Bede), whereby in 800 AD King Egbert of the West Saxons decreed "Saxon" would be replaced with "English" and the land thenceforth would be called "England." Verstegan unabashedly promotes the English as direct descendents of the Anglo-Saxons and the Celts as descendants of the ancient Britons. Through examples of history, language, and other source material, he provides these connections. The real hero of Verstegan's work was the English language: even though the

¹³⁷ "Verstegan's Reinvention of Anglo-Saxon England," *Reinventing the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Constructions of the Medieval and Early Modern Period*, William F. Gentrup, ed. (Brepols: ACMRS, 1998), 33. Clement's work provides me with much of my material on Verstegan's history. He notes that the ten chapters of the *Restitution*, which detail German origins from Babel, Anglo-Saxons outside of Germany, Anglo-Saxon customs and lore, and their migrations and struggles to the time of the Norman invasion, are not typically studied by critics. What has seemed most important, since the earliest publication of the *Restitution*, is the glossary, which provides place names and definitions, an important part of linking lineage for early antiquarians. Most likely, then as now, Camden's work has overshadowed that of Verstegan, though Clement provides little reason why this should be the case. Verstegan's final chapter on the history of the English language (he again traces it back to Babel) does rank as one of the most studied. To be sure, important people figure in this study; Jefferson, to name one, Coke and perhaps even William Penn as well were well acquainted with it. Another in-depth study of Verstegan appears in Parry. As Parry notes, eminent historians and antiquarians, such as Richard White, who wrote his own *Historiarum Britanniae*, promptly endorsed Verstegan's work, even though his was a history of the Britons' lineage; support also came from Camden; 52-3, and 67.

Normans conquered the Saxons, the language remained. Importantly, *Restitutions* went through four printings in the seventeenth century. Camden, Verstegan, and the other antiquarians did indeed mythologize the past; the former two proved most important as their views of Anglo-Saxon history, once published, helped promote the Anglo-Saxon mythology. This, in part, was the Anglo-Saxon tradition inherited by early settlers in the New World.

JOHN DEE, WILLIAM CECIL, AND THE NEW WORLD “RECOVERY” PROJECT

The other part of this tradition belonged to John Dee and the myth of Madoc. Although France had been more active in exploring the North American territories than England was in the mid-sixteenth century, they had not put out the written effort—nowhere near the amount of tracts and promotional material—that England had. In fact, France made quite similar designs on the lands as had England: French nationalistic writers claimed their country was first in discovering America and wished to pursue that claim. Both France and England felt the need to succeed over Spain by somehow *preceding* it. England’s power was ever growing at this time, and it was outproducing all other countries in promotional material for the New World. The goal, then, was to be the first to explore and conquer. By the time of the English defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, England’s “map of the imagination” had expanded for political, social, and historical reasons. Brimming with national power, pride, and money, England needed a new point of migration to maintain its aura of superiority. The Renaissance English knew that Spain had been successful in exploring and settling America for nearly one hundred years before Elizabeth lifted the ban on colonization. By contrast, the English seemed somewhat slow in their efforts. Sparked by Humphrey Gilbert’s treatise publicizing Martin Frobisher’s search for the Anian Passage in 1576, English explorers sought the mystical “passage” they thought ran straight through North

America to the Orient. And with George Best's 1578 account of Martin Frobisher's three voyages, *A True Discourse*, directed at and dedicated to Christopher Hatton (chief in charge of Elizabeth's bodyguards), England began to promote a full-tilt national expansion to the west. Beste argued that "the finding of the passage to Cataya [was] a matter in oure age above all other notable," a truly heroic course for "the invincible mindes of our Englishe nation."¹³⁸ "Cataya" was Beste's term for lands in the New World, particularly a utopian island he believed to be there, which could be discovered via Gilbert's Anian Passage. Along with the mysterious magi Dee, both Hakluyts, Richard the elder and his son, and Sir Walter Raleigh, Francis Drake devised a plan to edge out Spanish competition by circumnavigating the globe and at the same time plundering Spanish vessels. For the most part, Drake succeeded, and Queen Elizabeth presented him with a royal coat of arms.¹³⁹ Following Drake's success and Frobisher's three voyages, English imperial interest increased.

Since Spain had been well-traveled in the New World even before the English, the bulk of the information on actual voyages available to Elizabethans and early Tudors was of Spanish origin. The elder Hakluyt and the Englishman Samuel Purchas, the foremost translators, collectors, and examiners of exploration material, compiled tomes of overseas navigation and travel materials that would remain the definitive volumes for years afterward. Purchas's *Pilgrimage* first came out in 1613, with the four-volume set completed in 1625. Later, because of the new regime—the historical changes that led to peace being secured between England and Spain with the Treaty of London in 1605 by James—Spanish voyage texts were also fair game. Purchas believed that English success in the New World spelled doom for Spanish claims, and he

¹³⁸ "The Epistle Dedicatory" to *A True Discourse of the Late Voyages of Discovery* (1578) in *Three Voyages*, 17-8.

¹³⁹ This account of Drake is based on John Cummins, *Francis Drake: The Lives of a Hero* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 64-7.

became quite the propagandist. Relying on Captain John Smith's and Thomas Hariot's narratives, Purchas was very careful not to ascribe any New World failures to the physical geography.¹⁴⁰ The major collection of the period was, however, Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* (1589), through which Hakluyt became the primary promoter. He also published *Virginia richly valued, By the description of the main land of Florida, her neighbor*, dedicating it to all future planters and explorers. A modern reader of this or any Elizabethan New World travel narrative hardly sees why or how adventurers would think it a fruitful adventure. Hakluyt, however, like Purchas, took great pains to manipulate the translations so that Virginia would appear more inviting than it was in reality—this was the *modus operandi* of all travel writing. In his study of travel narratives, Colin Steele notes that “the Elizabethan reader's image of the Iberian New World was ... one in which fantasy and reality vied for acceptance, for at this period of English history medieval myths were never far from the surface of human consciousness.”¹⁴¹ To spice things up a bit, both Purchas and Hakluyt also included captivity narratives in their compilations. Despite its growing status, the English nation during this period seemed more cut off than ever on their little island from the larger world, and the English looked back in time for a romantic vision of chivalry and conquest. The confidence evident in both the reports of writers and colonists of this era shows the fundamental belief that the origins and aims of England as a nation could be best realized by their conquest of a New World.

Hakluyt fervently believed in the Madoc myth, so much so that English minister David Powel's edition of Caradoc of Llancarvan's history of Wales, translated by one Humffrey Lloyd

¹⁴⁰ Colin Steele, *English Interpreters of the Iberian New World from Purchas to Stevens: A Bibliographical Study 1603–1726* (Oxford: Dolphin Book Co., 1975), 26.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 38.

from the original “Brytish language” into English in 1584, became his source.¹⁴² And it is important to note here that the Madoc myth was already well-traveled in the promotional material: Geoffrey’s history had listed Arthur’s and Malgo’s conquests overseas, and influenced by Dee’s readings of this and other Madoc material, Hakluyt repeated these claims in his equally propagandist *Principal Navigations*.¹⁴³ Briefly, the myth went as follows: Prince Madoc, born of a Welsh tribe sometime in the eleventh century, sailed for parts unknown in the Atlantic following a rift with a wealthy family. Madoc was the apparent forerunner of John Mandeville and Marco Polo, as Caradoc fervently claims Madoc witnessed many unusual things on his journey, especially upon landing somewhere, Lloyd’s contemporary cosmology concluded, in what we now know as the southern Florida region. Following what must have been a successful voyage and landing, Madoc made subsequent trips and landings on these new shores.¹⁴⁴ Given this evidence, then, Lloyd, Powel, other scholars of the period, and certainly Hakluyt concluded that the Britons were the first to land on the New World shores. This conclusion was buttressed by Lloyd’s thesis: he argues for early signs of Christianity, language, and lineage.¹⁴⁵ Lloyd’s novel tale, supported by others, provided Hakluyt (and others) with proof.

¹⁴² It was known as “Powel’s book” because Lloyd died shortly before its completion; Powel committed the book to press, convinced that the English needed to know about Welsh history. The volume was dedicated to Sir Philip Sidney, son-in-law of Walsingham, Hakluyt’s patron, who also wanted to “clear” the name of the Welsh from contemporary slanders; Caradoc of Llancarvan, *Historie of Cambria, now called Wales: A Part of the Most Famous Yland of Brytaine, Written in the Brytish Language Above Two Hundreth Yeares Past*, Humffrey Lloyd, trans. (London, 1584), sig. qvv.-qvi.

¹⁴³ In his diary, Dee writes, “I told Mr Daniel Rogers (Mr Hakluyt of the Middle temple being by) that King Arthur, and King Malgo both of them, did conquer Gelandium, lately called Friseland. Which he so noted presently in his written copy of *Monumethensis*: for he had no printed book thereof,” *Diaries of John Dee*, Edward Fenton, ed. (Oxfordshire: Day Books, 2000), 3.

¹⁴⁴ Caradoc, *Historie of Cambria*, 227-28.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 228-29. Actually, Lloyd uses source evidence for these assertions, claiming Cortés held his people’s origins were from a “distant land”; also, the language of the Aztecs had certain words, Lloyd argued, similar in root to British.

Another supporter, to an even greater and more insidious degree, of the Madoc myth was John Dee. Dee's name often evokes any number of tags—antiquarian, astrologer, magus, and numerologist. Beyond all of these things, however, one of the most understudied and unexpected aspects of Dee's career is his significant contribution to the historical foundation of the ideology of Elizabethan England.¹⁴⁶ That Dee played a part in Tudor history is often documented; that Dee played such an important role in Elizabeth's court goes largely unnoticed by many historians. He was an ardent antiquarian and collector; he copied, collected, annotated, and constructed documents from fragments of old manuscripts and coats of arms; he was in close contact with virtually every antiquarian and collector of the period; and he was a member of Camden's antiquarians, calling Camden "learned in pure philosophy and true history," his "one singular good friend."¹⁴⁷ In fact, Camden and Dee formed a lifelong relationship: Dee's son, appropriately named Arthur, was a student of Camden's. Dee had a close relationship with Camden because of this, as he did with Walsingham.¹⁴⁸ P. J. French, biographer of Dee, calls his library "Elizabethan England's Greatest."¹⁴⁹ Dee made his library freely available to a number of people, including Raleigh, Drake, Frobisher, and Hakluyt.¹⁵⁰ In short, John Dee served as perhaps the most influential lynchpin between antiquarian studies and actual practice—without him, the pages of old manuscripts were lifeless. Dee was extremely well-connected; he knew everyone from Walsingham to Sir Christopher Hatton, who was the Lord Chancellor of England and, according to speculation, the lover of Elizabeth. He was a natural scholar, giving his advice to Elizabeth on

¹⁴⁶ W.H. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995), 118.

¹⁴⁷ From a letter copied in Elias Ashmole's hand, Bodleian Manuscript "MS Ashmole 1788," fols. 70-6.

¹⁴⁸ There is much material on Dee's conversations with Walsingham, especially in his diaries.

¹⁴⁹ *John Dee: the World of an Elizabethan Magus* (New York: Routledge, 1972), 40.

¹⁵⁰ So influential was Dee, in fact, that his materials were used by prominent English historian Raphael Holinshed for his *Chronicles*; Sherman, 118-19.

various matters. He also knew Ortelius well and was friends with most of the explorers and compilers: he had met Christopher Columbus; he was intimate with Hakluyt, and he taught Frobisher how to navigate. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, he was a great believer in sea power and thought that Elizabeth's claims to the north had their foundations in King Arthur. In short, Dee was a critical lynchpin in Elizabethan exploration ideology.

In reviews of the promotion of Britain as an expansive and vibrant empire under Elizabeth, most historians rely on Dee's historical and imperialistic writings.¹⁵¹ Most, in fact, give him credit for first coining the term "British Empire" in his work *The Petty Naval Royal* (1577). Dee was involved with Walsingham, Burghley, and Leicester in what Alan Haynes, in his study of the Cecils, has called "The Elizabethan Secret Services."¹⁵² John Dee's nationalistic tendencies, as Gillian Brennan has already pointed out, were extremely imperialistic, and he would go to great lengths to tie England to a lineage that had in its national character power and the right to conquer others.¹⁵³ Dee traced the New World's land to Arthur, and this deterministic and ruthlessly patriotic vision ultimately caused Elizabeth to hesitate a bit when consulting him.¹⁵⁴ Most recently, Dee has been identified as a propagandist for the Protestant imperialist machine that fought for English interest in recovering a lost Arthurian Atlantic British Empire.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵¹ See David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) and "The Elizabethan Idea of Empire," in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 14 (2004): 269–77.

¹⁵² *Invisible Power: The Elizabethan Secret Services 1570-1603* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1992).

¹⁵³ *Patriotism, Power, and Print: National Consciousness in Tudor England* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2003), 16.

¹⁵⁴ Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1975), 85.

¹⁵⁵ Christopher Hodgkins, *Reforming Empire: Protestant Colonialism and Conscience in British Literature* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002), 10–32. Hodgkins seems misled by Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1975), 29–51, who interprets Dee's *Memorials* in the context of a Protestant nationalism she erroneously attributes to Foxe and Jewel, developing ideas found in Peter J. French; see *John Dee: The World of an Elizabethan Magus* (London: Routledge & Kegan, 1972), 180–99. Andrew Escobedo rather uneasily makes this awkward equivalence with Foxe, which explains his mere twelve pages on Dee in 250 pages about Protestant nationalism. See *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 20–2.

He wrote a great many tracts dealing with a British Recovery Project, England's formal right to the New World.¹⁵⁶ The rebirth of the British Empire required, for Dee, the recovery of lands lost, and Dee could provide, via ancient writings, the proofs needed to justify such a claim.

Elizabeth's reign would thus effect the rebirth of the lost empire.

Although his work is generally overshadowed by Parker's, Bale's, and Leland's, among other antiquaries, and his collection is not, as a rule, considered nearly as famous as Cotton's, Dee's importance in the Anglo-Saxon project of North America cannot be underestimated. Perhaps more than anyone else, he lit a spark in Elizabeth's court that set the North American project aflame. In his *Naval History of England*, G.J. Marcus asserts that, in the Age of Expansionism, Dee's influence "can ... scarcely be set too high."¹⁵⁷ Dee's vision for expansion was twofold. First, while he obviously forwarded a propagandist agenda, Dee's imperial vision rested on *interior* evidence from the manuscripts, where policies were informed by fact rather than doctrine. Second, although his vision was based on interior textual evidence, it was imbued with the Age of Exploration's New Science: he wanted to establish a "quasi-mystical, quasi-scientific, quasi-religious world order, under that British Protestant fraternity of chivalry."¹⁵⁸ His *General and rare memorials* (1577) on the recovery project brought Dee and Burghley together in October 1580. Cecil had a strong passion for history—he had even attempted to write one at some point—and, after reading Dee's work, he claimed that he would need more evidence of the

¹⁵⁶ These writings include *General and rare memorials pertayning to the perfect arte of navigation* (Bodleian Library Oxford, MS Ashmole 1789, fos. 61–115), and, with subsequent changes, as *General and rare memorials pertayning to the perfect arte of navigation : annexed to the paradoxall cumpas, in playne: now first published: 24 yeres, after the first invention thereof* (London, Sept. 1577), Pollard and Redgrave, Short title catalogue, 2nd ed., 6459; *Of famous and rich discoveries* (British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius C.VII, fos. 26–269); *Brytanici Imperii Limites*, (British Library, MS Add. 59681); and *Thallatokratia Brettaniki* (British Library, MS Harley 249, fos. 95–105).

¹⁵⁷ *A Naval History of England: Volume 1, The Formative Centuries* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1961), 52.

¹⁵⁸ Gwyn Williams, *Madoc: The Making of a Myth* (London: Methuen, 1979), 6.

recovery rights. Dee discussed matters with him in more detail over the next few days, and sold Cecil on the idea.

Dee was no stranger to Burghley. He had gone through Cecil for funding for his various missions in the years prior to 1580, traveling to the continent in the 1560s to collect books and material for his early works. He constantly wrote Cecil, assuring him that the knowledge he was gaining would be important for his later works on England.¹⁵⁹ Cecil appears to have stimulated more interest by continually funding Dee's travels and investigations. Out of his studies, Dee published *General and rare memorials*, a nationalistic tract on power and colonialization. Here, he concluded that Elizabeth should assume control of Europe via naval power, that the English navy was the only sure way to protect the Tudor right to power in the world. Further, Dee claimed that the stories of Arthur and other early Britons as well as past Englishmen assured the right of England over Spain for claim over *all* North American territories. His arguments were further bolstered by his "discovery" of Madoc. Dee consulted Elizabeth, Cecil, and Walsingham on this account.¹⁶⁰ Dee's anti-Spanish claims proved puissant at court, where anti-Spain sentiments ran high. Humphrey Gilbert's voyages seemed to provoke Dee even more toward acting upon his agenda, and he went to court at Windsor in November 1577 to speak with Cecil and Elizabeth and to "grant" Elizabeth her title to these foreign lands. This was, according to Dee, no chicanery; it was merely a follow-up on a claim previously made by Madoc. It was a *recovery*, not a *discovery*. The one true way to gain foothold in the Americas before the Spaniards was to claim rights by lineage—and Dee did just that.

¹⁵⁹ Nicholas H. Clulee, *John Dee's Natural. Philosophy: Between Science and Religion* (New York: Routledge, 1988), 124-5.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 185. Clulee reminds us that it is important to note here that all of North America, at this time, was known simply as "Florida."

Although Dee was, by his own acclaim, well-read in ancient texts—he even alleges in *Brytanici Imperii Limites* to have seen and read Geoffrey’s mysterious source multiple times—his favorite subjects were Brutus (and early Britannia), Edgar, Arthur, and Madoc (Sherman 91), and he seems to have used accounts of these figures all as support of Tudor expansionism. Fundamentally, he drew on these Celtic and Welsh ties to support expansionism in the same way that Thomas Jefferson and others would employ Anglo-Saxon material to buttress their political and civic agendas. Indeed, American Saxonhood was comprised of, from its earliest inception, an almost uncanny amalgamation of mythological ideologies created from various primary racial materials. Dee’s largely Celtic theories provide just one aspect of the American Saxonhood strain in the New World, and nowhere is this more clear than in his *Limites*, where in a short section Dee spells out the rightful heritage of North American lands to the British. The subtitle hints at what is to come: “A briefe Remebrance of Sondrye foreyne Regions, discovered, inhabited, and partlie Conquered by the Subjects of this *Brytish Monarchie*: And so your lawfull Tytle ... for the dewe Clayme, and just recovery of the same disclosed.” But Dee could not have succeeded so well in forwarding such a warped vision of Saxonhood, or at least not nearly as effectively, without the power of the great Cecil family behind him.

As is well known, the Cecil family holds an especially important place in English history. William Cecil, Lord Burghley, was the most important Elizabethan who never held a royal position. The role he played in Elizabeth’s court in all matters, foreign and domestic, should not—indeed, it *cannot*—be underestimated.¹⁶¹ It was Cecil and Walsingham who smoothly took care of the Throckmorton Plot, and because of his connection to Cecil’s “Cambridge Mafia,”

¹⁶¹ Space does not permit a more detailed account of William Cecil, Lord Burghley. Some of the best references follow: Stephen Alford, *Burghley: William Cecil at the Court of Elizabeth I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), David Loades, *The Cecils: Privilege and Power Behind the Throne* (Kew: National Archives, 2007), Michael A.R. Graves, *Burghley, Profiles in Power*, Keith Robbins, ed. (New York: Longman, 1998).

Parker most likely received the position of archbishop. After 1569, Cecil became, according to David Loades, “the Queen’s most trusted and confidential advisor.”¹⁶² Robert Cecil, William’s son, served both Elizabeth and James; during the latter’s reign, he viciously attacked Raleigh over Spanish trade laws. Robert Cecil was also a paying member of the Virginia Company. Later his son John was another powerful member of Elizabeth’s and James’s courts. Neither father nor son nor grandson was a courtier, a high ranking officer of the court, or played a leading part in entertainment; however, their impact was so great that in his biography of this Elizabethan family, David Loades claims outright that the England of Elizabeth and James should be called a “*regnum Cecilianum*.”¹⁶³ Of course, Cecil had many friends, including the infamous Camden and Walter Raleigh. Cotton acquired a great many of *his* manuscripts from Cecil. All were connected to the Saxon cause. Camden, in turn, was great friends with the geographer Richard Hakluyt since they traveled in identical social and intellectual circles. Cecil’s and Raleigh’s relationship was a strange one, eventually turning sour during the so-called “Main Plot,” aimed at replacing James with Arabella Stuart. Prior to this, however, Cecil supplied Raleigh with support for his voyages. It was at Dee’s house on the Thames that Gilbert and Walsingham—and Sir George Peckham, the Catholic leader—gathered together to discuss the Frobisher voyages and, most importantly, to claim the English title to the Americas via the myth of Madoc.¹⁶⁴

Madoc is a slippery figure. Nevertheless, he figures so prominently in Dee’s justification for North American lands that it seems prudent to attempt to capture the essence of his appeal. It is important to note that through time, there have been so many Madoc incarnations—versions of

¹⁶² Loades, 82-9.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 246.

¹⁶⁴ G.B. Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages* (1928) 2nd ed. (New York: Ungar, 1961), 49.

Madoc used by different people for various agendas—that scholars often refer to these as “Imperial Madoc,” “Frontier Madoc,” “Jacobean Madoc,” or even “Madoc the Sailor.”¹⁶⁵

Madoc’s story, obviously oral in the beginning, was first put into print in 1583 in a pamphlet promoting English settlement in North America. As Gwyn Williams has pointed out, this Madoc story was unmistakably a product of the times. The story served to buttress support, backed by Elizabethan noblemen and *most importantly* by Dee, during the later years of the sixteenth century, for rights to lands in North America.¹⁶⁶ Thus, in the dealings of Elizabethan circles, which include Walsingham and the great Cecils, the Welsh prince Madoc, ideological “brother” to Arthur, provided an edge to garner support for the Tudor reclamation of North American lands.

But, who was Madoc? And how important was this connection for North America? The story of Madoc ab Owain Gwynedd remains about as historically clear as the story of King Arthur. Bards had sung Madoc’s name for hundreds of years before he was first put into print. Evidently, there was once a handsome, seafaring prince, a son—legitimate or otherwise—of the illustrious Owain Gwynedd clan, who lived in the twelfth century. As in the case of Arthur, facts, dates, and deeds concerning Madoc are questionable and serve as fodder for imaginative scholars and layman alike since when he lived and what he did can only be gleaned from piecemeal verses and stories. The current belief is that Madoc ventured off toward the west in 1169 and discovered America in 1170.¹⁶⁷ As with the Arthur stories, however, the veracity of the subject

¹⁶⁵ Two of the most influential studies on Madoc and his mythic path through the ages, both of which inform my understanding of the myth for this study, are Williams, *Madoc* and Richard Deacon, *Madoc and the Discovery of America: Some New Light on an Old Controversy* (London: Cox & Wyman, 1966).

¹⁶⁶ Williams, *Madoc*, 34-6.

¹⁶⁷ This is a very brief treatment of Madoc; for the sake of brevity, I have omitted lineage, poetic, and historical issues. For more in-depth treatment of Madoc, see Williams and Deacon. As for the historical veracity of Madoc, Deacon provides ample evidence for and against the dates of his exploratory quest; see Deacon, 11-31.

matter is less important than variants of ideologies. George Peckham was the first Englishman to point out Madoc's quest in his *A True Report of the late Discoveries of the Newfound Landes* (1583), and this was later picked up in *Historie of Cambria* (1584) and Richard Hakluyt's *The Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589), though Caradoc printed the first written record of Madoc in his *Cambria* (a tract edited by Lloyd, good friend of Dee). Peckham reportedly got his material from an earlier edition of Caradoc, though none has ever been discovered. But one problem with this as a historical record lies with *its* translator, David Powell. Caradoc's book, it seems, was solely known through Powell; Powell "augmented and continued" it, as he writes, dedicating it to Sir Philip Sidney. Prince Madoc, then, arrives in Elizabethan England and comes to John Dee solely through the myopic lens of Powell.¹⁶⁸

The connections to Madoc, alleged Prince of Wales, seem a relatively obscure point until we remember that *all* the Tudors were descendents of the Celts. Henry Tudor's paternal side was Welsh. When Henry VIII achieved full authority over claims to England, the Kingdom of Ireland, and Wales, he finished a mission embarked on years before in the War of the Roses. Racially speaking, Henry VII's earlier victory in the War of the Roses was a victory for the Welsh everywhere in Europe, and many Celtic families flocked to England because of it. One of these families, headed by a young David Cecil, would grow to become the powerful Cecil clan of Elizabeth's reign. In fact, part of the bond Burghley and Elizabeth shared was this past; that is, in their Welsh pride, "they shared an instinctive sympathy of outlook deeper than the conscious convictions of the intellect, though there too they agreed."¹⁶⁹ Out of all this, then, patriotism for England and Wales commingled, forming a dangerous nexus of ideological conflation.

¹⁶⁸ Powell uses the terms "augment" and "continued" as proofs of fact checking; Deacon, 29.

¹⁶⁹ A. L. Rowse, *The England of Elizabeth* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950), 48.

Ultimately, as Dee saw it, the Madoc story could serve to bolster Elizabeth's claims to North America against Spanish claims, conveniently supporting *his* mission as well—the recovery of King Arthur's lands.

Many Welsh scholars were coming to Oxford in the 1570s and 1580s. One of these, the aforementioned Lloyd, friend of Dee and others in Dee's seemingly endless circle of associates, published a tract, *A Breviery of Britain* (1573), in which he claims that earlier historians were confused as to geographical territories. According to Lloyd, the Italian Polydore Vergel and the Englishman Bede got it all wrong: Brittany *was* Britain, and England and Wales were actually one. Lloyd never completed his translation of Caradoc, though he probably assisted Powell with his version. Powell, it seems, also looked to Philip Sidney, Dee, and, surprisingly, Humphrey Gilbert for information on the Madoc myth. We cannot underestimate Dee's influence regarding the Madoc claims: Dee was in constant contact with Raleigh, dining with him and Cecil and discussing plans for the recovery. He went so far as to assert that Brutus of Britain and King Arthur, as well as Madoc, had conquered lands in the Americas (and its Welsh-Indians, as they were thought to be, would resurface in the 1840s), and therefore their heir, Elizabeth I of England, had a prior claim to the land. In fact, Dee believed his own ancestor was in fact King Arthur, and he named his son (b. 1579) the same to carry on the lineage.¹⁷⁰ For his work in the cartography of the New World, Dee was promised 10,000 acres of land in the New World, covering largely territories in New England and what is now New York.¹⁷¹

¹⁷⁰ Fenton, 295.

¹⁷¹ Fenton 48-9, n. 14 and Clulee 187-88.

* * * * *

In early November, 1577, Sir Humphrey Gilbert and Dee combined forces to put into action a plan for recovery of the New “Old” World. Dee, of course, bent on his recovery mission, quite likely successfully persuaded Gilbert of the natural Tudor claim to New World lands via Arthur and Madoc. Gilbert was a natural choice of ally for Dee. An adventurer by nature, Gilbert’s participation in the New World plan began in the mid-1560s, when, fed up with the complacency of the Muscovy Company’s monopolies on exploration, he petitioned Queen Elizabeth with his tract, *A Discourse for a Discovery for a New Passage to Cataia*.¹⁷² According to the poet Gascoigne, who published the tract ten years later, Gilbert was simply a rash young man hoping for adventure. Gilbert’s “Cataia” was much like Beste’s “Cataya”; in truth, Gilbert took the baton from Beste, and he pushed the mythic vision to its limits: he thought “Cataia” was a veritable utopia. In *A Discourse*, Gilbert mines old documents and authors—from Plato, Aristotle, and Strabo to Ortelius and Peter Martyr—to buttress his utopian argument and even appends to the document a crude map.¹⁷³ A fascinating document, *A Discourse* was an admittedly crude source of information, replete with errors and false deductions. In substance, though, it became a powerful tool in that Frobisher and many later voyagers were highly influenced by Gilbert. Gilbert’s idea of the North West passage, a claim proved 340 years later by the HMS

¹⁷² Formed in the 1550s, a body of merchants called the Muscovy Company was the first joint-stock trading company, an organization that did in fact control and monopolize all trade and exploration during this period. It was established to carry on trade in new and unexplored lands and granted, by the Crown, monopoly of trade with Russia and all areas not frequented by Englishmen prior to 1553. The most famous, perhaps, was Henry Hudson. For more, see Kenneth R. Andrews. *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480-1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

¹⁷³ Strabo (64 B.C.-24 A.D.) was a Greek historian and geographer, mostly known for his *Geographica*, a work that has early maps of Europe and surrounding lands. Ortelius (1527-98), the Flemish cartographer, worked closely with Camden, among others of the Tudor circle. He was known for his detailed mapmaking skills. Peter Martyr (Pietro Martire d’Anghiera, 1457-1526), an Italian-born historian, wrote accounts of various Spanish explorations.

Enterprise mission led by Captain Richard Collinson and Commander Robert McClure, served to ignite hope of a mythic passage to utopia, and thus the dream of the New World was reinvigorated. As one biographer writes, Gilbert might not have given birth to the idea, but he “first crystallized the indefinite, and made of it a concrete proposition.”¹⁷⁴ In short, Gilbert’s dream became others’ myth; he was, in truth, the English father of the Madoc myth in America.

The oddly ironic part of the whole “Madoc plan” was that Gilbert, a veteran of the England-Ireland Wars, was nominally *against* the Irish. Known for his evil cruelty toward prisoners of war and native peoples, especially pronounced in the Irish Wars, Gilbert seems *prima facie* very much pro-Saxon and anti-Celt. So great was Gilbert’s Machiavellian instinct and reputation, in fact, that he was hand-selected by Elizabeth for England’s colonization operation in the New World. Gilbert, nephew of the Queen’s governess and one of her closest companions, naturally requested Elizabeth’s patronage for his plan. Gilbert’s plan was both devious and potentially iniquitous, given his knowledge of the populations of native peoples in the New World and his track record with the Irish. In his first attempts at this effort in 1578, Elizabeth was loath to front much money for the voyages, so Gilbert’s wealthy wife and others, including his partner and half-brother Raleigh, pledged collateral. According to the agreement, Gilbert would get ten percent of all lands discovered, and he would preside over the entire territory of the New World, as far as could be extended. Gilbert’s first attempt failed miserably; the mission was unexpectedly aborted within the week. By the time of his second voyage, Gilbert was again broke, and, in order to support himself financially, he had conferred with Dee for collateral. When he went down with the ten-ton *Squirrel*, Gilbert took with him any

¹⁷⁴ William Gilbert Gosling, *The Life of Sir Humphrey Gilbert: England’s First Empire Builder* (London: Constable, 1911), 65.

remaining rights and quasi-mythic utopian visions, but he left his mark by designating the New World as England's for the taking. When Edward Hayes published a lionization of Gilbert in his *Narrative of Sir Humphrey Gilbert's Last Expedition* in 1589, English rights to all territories seemed sealed.¹⁷⁵

Following Gilbert's death, Richard Hakluyt the younger presented Queen Elizabeth with an agenda and mission to the New World, and English interest in the New World reached its heights. English settlers could, Hakluyt argued, migrate, colonize, produce a profitable economy, and thus strengthen England to unprecedented heights of wealth and power. English promotional tracts for the New World were plentiful, descriptive, and equally positive, for their authors, Hakluyt and Purchas, served as the primary sources.¹⁷⁶ Quickly following a grant for the reinstatement of his deceased half-brother's patent in 1584 from the Queen, Raleigh, along with

¹⁷⁵ Hayes was the captain of the *Hind*, the sole surviving ship of Gilbert's convoy; the narrative was actually first published by Hakluyt. Interestingly, although the narrative heralds Gilbert as an almost mythic character, Hayes in part censures Gilbert's motives, claiming that the wreck of the *Squirrel* was an act of Providence. In short, he appears to argue that this type of colonial enterprise for monetary gain was against Christian morals and would never prosper.

¹⁷⁶ Richard Hakluyt, *Divers Voyages Touching the Discoverie of America, and the Ilands Adjacent vnto the Same . . .* (London: Thomas Woodcocke, 1582); Samuel Purchas, *Purchas His Pilgrimage, Or Relations of the World and the Religions Obserued in Al Ages and Places Discovered . . .*, 3rd ed. (London: William Stansby for Henry Fetherstone, 1617). For a complete overview of colonial promotional writing, especially for the early ventures, see David B. Quinn, *The Roanoke Voyages, 1584–1590; Documents to Illustrate the English Voyages to North America under the Patent Granted to Walter Raleigh in 1584 . . .* (London: Hakluyt Society, 1955); also relevant is David B. Quinn and Alison M. Quinn, eds., *The English New England Voyages, 1602–1608* (London: Hakluyt Society, 1983). For the impact and power of the Hakluyts' writings on New World promotional material, see especially Gesa Mackenthun, "Books for Empire: The Colonial Program of Richard Hakluyt," *Metaphors of Dispossession: American Beginnings and the Translation of Empire, 1492–1637* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997), 22–70 and Albert A. Cave, "Richard Hakluyt's Savages: The Influence of 16th Century Travel Narratives on English Indian Policy in North America," *International Social Science Review* 60:1 (1985), 3–24. The current trend in scholarship focuses on promotional works' arguments for colonization apart from the primary tracts, such as Andrew Fitzmaurice, "The Commercial Ideology of Colonization in Jacobean England: Robert Johnson, Giovanni Botero, and the Pursuit of Greatness," *William and Mary Quarterly* 64 (October 2007), 791–820; Armitage, *Ideological Origins*, 61–99. Peter Mancall's *Hakluyt's Promise: An Elizabethan's Obsession for an English America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007) discusses further implications of Hakluyt's promotions.

artist John White and Ralph Lane, led an expedition to Virginia in 1585—the fateful Roanoke experiment, from which neither Raleigh nor White would recover.¹⁷⁷

Both Thomas Hariot and John White had specific tasks on this expedition. Hariot, principal navigation instructor for Raleigh’s men, would jot down what he could as far as geography and vegetation, and White would make sketches of the flora and fauna for prospective adventurers. The plan seemed well-conceived. Eventually, in Hariot’s *A brief and true report of the new found land of Virginia* (1588), a brief guide for colonists, White’s artwork would serve as a model for the New World depictions of the native inhabitants, and, unfortunately, for Amerindians in ages to come. The party arrived back in England on Drake’s ship; on the return voyage in 1587, however, Raleigh’s settlers at Roanoke, the second major attempt at colonization, mysteriously vanished. For twenty years following, English colonization stalled. In fact, successful colonization would occur only after Elizabeth’s death, in James’s reign. In 1607, Jamestown was founded; in 1609, the Virginia Company began selling public stocks for its project, and this surge in activity was spurred partly by promotions and the aforementioned travel material.

Thus, with Protestantism well-established, England began to expand into the New World for two primary purposes—economic and religious freedom. America, the New World conquest, would be the recipient of John Dee’s ideological and highly Welsh claims concerning the New World, which would develop further in the southern coastal regions, most notably through the figure of Captain John Smith. A more northern and more “Saxon” branch of American Saxonhood would soon develop through William Bradford’s colony at Jamestown and come to

¹⁷⁷ For more on Roanoke, see especially Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Roanoke: The Abandoned Colony* (Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield, 1984), David B. Quinn, *Set Fair for Roanoke: Voyages and Colonies, 1584-1606* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), and essays in *The New World: The First Pictures of America*, Stefan Lorant, ed. (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1946).

full force in the Massachusetts region of Increase and Cotton Mather. In short, from the dark and hallowed chambers of Cecil's, Walsingham's, and Dee's meeting places to the fecund shores of the New World, a transformative nation building ideology had been transplanted, mutated, and was about to erupt: American Saxonhood.

CHAPTER TWO

JOHN SMITH AND THE VIRGINIA COMPANY: THE STRUGGLE FOR AN “AMERICAN” SAXONHOOD

On yonder rocky cape, which braves
The stormy challenge of the waves,
Midst tangled vine and dwarfish wood,
The hardy Anglo-Saxon stood,
Planting upon the topmost crag
The staff of England's battle-flag;
And, while from out its heavy fold
Saint George's crimson cross unrolled,
Midst roll of drum and trumpet blare,
And weapons brandishing in air,
He gave to that lone promontory
The sweetest name in all his story
-John Greenleaf Whittier

American Saxonhood properly begins in the New World with the Virginia Company of London and Captain John Smith. “The most common error in writing the history of the Virginia Company,” writes Frank Wesley Craven in his early yet still definitive history of the company, “has been a failure to understand the fundamental character of that corporation,” thus providing an economic framework for the venture.¹⁷⁸ “Whatever else it may have endured,” Craven continues, “it was primarily a business organization with large sums of capital invested by adventurers whose chief interest lay in the returns.” Ultimately, Craven argues, “The true *motif* of the company's history is economic rather than political.” This categorization is far too simple, however. Yes, the Virginia Company dealt in monetary investments for the sale and returns of lands not owned by it; naturally, company adventurers investing in overseas ventures expected a

¹⁷⁸ This and the following quotations are from *Virginia Company of London, 1606-24* (Williamsburg: Williamsburg 350th Anniversary Celebration Corp., 1957); all quotes from 24.

return and thus sought financial gain. However, the continued insistence of Richard Hakluyt on the maritime prowess and concerns of the English, bolstered by the burgeoning dynamism of Anglo-Saxonism promoted by other powerful Englishmen in Elizabeth's reign, such as Sir Edward Cecil, John Dee, and Sir Francis Walsingham, created an ideology of Saxon power and rightful English conquest that emphatically argued for English rights to Atlantic lands that ultimately persevered and then funneled its way into various splinter groups, whose concerns were, for one reason or another, ultimately equal and very nationalistic. The means were simply different.¹⁷⁹

The literary manifestations of an earlier model of Anglo-Saxon dominance and superiority, sparked by Dee's writings, was documented through the change of houses in the Crown by Richard Hakluyt. This continued in the narratives of Hakluyt's protégé, Samuel Purchas, who famously sought and collected various travelers logs and adventure stories for his *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas his Pilgrimes; Contayning a History of the World, in Sea Voyages and Lande Travells, by Englishmen and Others*, published in four volumes in 1625, Anglo-Saxonism was here transferred to the Jacobean gentry. A number of these were battling James's Scotch connections. Purchas's reformulation and redistribution of Anglo-Saxon ideas then transferred seamlessly to New World shores. Intending to capitalize on the monetary and

¹⁷⁹ Little is known about the company's origins and initial mission. It was formed by charter in 1606 by a small group of entrepreneurs who were able to get close to then-legendary Robert Cecil, later earl of Salisbury, who had his own private interest in the New World, and they gained rights to half of the northeastern shore of America. Of the eight founding adventurers and leaders, it should be noted that Hakluyt and Sir Thomas Smith, treasurer, were foremost on the list. Seven months following the company's formation, James I, in an effort both to add political weight to and to supervise the company, appointed a council of knighted men to the company, most of them closely connected with the court, some who even sat on Commons. James then granted to the treasurer and adventurers of the London Company of Virginia a sizable tract of land—800 miles at the widest, stretching from Atlantic to Pacific, and 100 miles out in both oceans (which grew to include the Bermuda Islands in 1612)—for the first colony in the New World on May 23, 1609; *Hening's Statutes at Large Being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia from the First Session of the Legislature, in the Year 1619* [to 1791], 13 vols. (Philadelphia: William Brown, 1823) 1:58-60.

ideological current, a number of rich and powerful Englishmen became the so-called “adventurers” of the Virginia Company, whose ranks comprised some of the most public-minded men in the country: there were some 1,200 knights, lords, and gentlemen taking part in the colonizing activities relating to the Virginia Company.¹⁸⁰ The most pivotal, public, and literary of these was Captain John Smith.

Smith’s entrance into the complicated sphere of Anglo-Saxon power and ideology still remains somewhat of a mystery. Following the debacle of Gilbert and Raleigh’s failed Roanoke experiment, the Gunpowder Plot, and James’s ascension, Cecil the younger (now working under James I as Lord Salisbury) was still trying to garner prospects for New World expansion, this time in southern Virginia. Smith, back from three years in Europe as a renegade soldier and adventurer, was signed on to sail on the *Susan Constant* for Virginia, and in May 1607, he and one hundred some other adventurers set up camp on James’s river in Virginia.¹⁸¹ Smith’s

¹⁸⁰ The “Names of Adventurers to Virginia” included Robert Cotton along with Henry Cary (who is listed as “captain”), future Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell, and, not surprisingly, Sir Thomas Walsingham, first cousin of Francis Walsingham, the powerful and prominent member of Elizabeth’s court. Also listed are the infamous Cecils—William and his sons, Robert and Thomas—along with other notables, such as the famous explorer John Josselyn, and William Strachey, an English lawyer whose connections in the theater were notorious and whose works are among the primary sources for the early history of the English colonization of North America. Money was power, and privilege was money; thus, many of the backers were gentry. Monetary gains proved to be the one sure way to drum up support for New World expansion. Also involved were Richard James (1582-1638), who authored commendatory verses for Smith and who later became Cotton’s librarian, and William Herbert, 3rd Earl of Pembroke (1580–1630).

¹⁸¹ Smith likely first came to be associated with New World plans via a loose relation with Raleigh, through whom he probably first met Bartholomew Gosnold who, taken with Smith’s attitude and resume, signed him on for the next voyage as able seaman extraordinaire, one capable of following orders and giving them, too. Gosnold had previously sailed to the New England area in 1602, taking the monopoly on voyage from Raleigh, remaining only a little over a month in the New World but establishing some crucial trade relations with the natives and carrying back, among other things, a load of sassafras. This incursion infuriated Raleigh, who wrote to Cecil demanding retribution and confiscation of Gosnold’s goods; Raleigh Trevelyan, *Sir Walter Raleigh* (London: Allen Lane, 2002), 348. Cecil denied him. Likely dissuaded by Raleigh’s age (he was nearing fifty) but excited by Gosnold’s prospects, Cecil instead placated Raleigh with the promise of profits from the Gosnold voyage but included him only indirectly in plans. Soon afterward, however, Raleigh fell into disfavor with James and was convicted and sent to the Tower, his patents all returning to the king. Encouraged by Hakluyt, Gosnold sought to return and establish a colony, and, with Smith—it is not certain just exactly *how* they met—decided on a plan to return, which they did, in 1607, to settle Jamestown. James and Salisbury, still working with the Hakluyts, hatched a plan for a new issuance

relationship to the development of American Saxonhood remains important for three very distinct reasons. First and most significantly, Smith creates the new form of strictly American romance of the New World style, a *romans* on the American soil, or the *Matière d'Amérique*. Borrowing from the medieval strain in English literature, Smith provides a key model of national style and narrative influence, which becomes, then, a model for later American writers to emulate. Second, from Smith we have as well the fullest and, eventually, detailed most popular written accounts of this early period in American history, in which are depicted the tension between the Virginia Company's mission and Smith's notions of individual liberty, problems of individual versus state crucial to, especially given its publication history, the nation building enterprise in the New World. In addition, details surrounding certain exclusions from Smith's story of the Pocahontas narrative reveal a heightened awareness of the need for a believable national mythos, which, as manipulated by the Virginia Company, could ease concerns over migration, prevent possible resistance to the New World project, and create, in turn, an international narrative noted for its peacekeeping claim.¹⁸²

My main focus in this chapter is the analysis of Smith's American Saxonhood romance of the New World. Like Geoffrey's adaptation of the Arthur tales, Smith's transference of the romance genre introduces to the New World the literary *Matière d'Amérique*, the primary *romans* of the matter of America. In Smith, we witness a purposeful revival of the Arthurian tradition, a new romance transferred to North American shores, consciously related to the

of a charter to southern Virginia, with Smith, Gosnold, and Captain Christopher Newport, who had sailed and raided with Drake in the Spanish wars, as partners.

¹⁸² The Pocahontas myth becomes a part of American "cultural capital," in the Bourdieuan sense, from Smith's time forward. Pierre Bourdieu, in his work, especially *Distinction*, puts forth an understanding of society based on the movement of "capital" through social spaces as it is accumulated or lost by individuals. In the Bourdieu's work, "cultural capital" consists of ideas and qualifications that confer to a certain people some respect to power; "The Forms of Capital," *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, John Richardson, ed. (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 248.

concerns of migration. However, the Anglo-Saxon and medieval romantic features in Smith's writings about the New World reveal the tensions between the individual and the larger power structure. Important to this latter point is the way in which the relationship between Smith's public documents and the Virginia Company's private interests functioned to construct the beginnings of American Saxonhood in early Virginia.¹⁸³ Thus, I offer an additional critique of Smith and the tensions that arise in matters of publishing and authorial intent and the place of the New World individual within the larger fabric of the English elite who promoted a dominant New World ideology; here, it connects directly to the Elizabethan appropriation and manipulation of Anglo-Saxonism in text and printing. Through analysis of Smith's work, a recurring theme exists, a disconnect between Smith's romance and the Virginia Company's aims. What emerges is a unique and purely American document—the archetypal romance of American Saxonhood. Smith provides the link from the *Matière de Bretagne* to the *Matière d'Amérique*, the latter of which remains the New World successor to the romance genre.¹⁸⁴

Similarly, Smith's role becomes entangled in conflicting ideologies. On the one hand, he hearkens back to a chivalric past for his structural model, but, on the other hand, this individual hero must engage with members of and operate within the emergent nation-building power structure. Ultimately, Smith's texts confront the symbolic struggle of the individual to find a

¹⁸³ Jennifer Robin Goodman has also observed that Smith exudes a basic romantic chivalry in his writings; "The Captain's Self-Portrait: John Smith as Chivalric Biographer," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 89:1 (1981): 27-38. Goodman argues that while his histories have been studied *ad nauseum*, Smith's romantic influence has been overlooked, and I would agree. However, we differ in this approach: Goodman offers a kind of scattered code of chivalry—"Smith's particular code of chivalry cannot be traced to a single source"—while I maintain that his writings are a blend of chivalrous, medieval, and Saxon material, the latter due more to the editors/readers; 37. Others have made a similar move. In *Malory's Morte Darthur* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), Larry D. Benson has argued that it be read as a "chivalric autobiography"; similarly, Goodman sees *The True Travels* as belonging explicitly to the chivalric genre, asserting, "A deeper acquaintance with chivalric culture makes Smith the man understandable"; *Chivalry and Exploration, 1298-1630* (Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1998), 193.

¹⁸⁴ See page 68, note 95.

place in a nation-building agenda concerned with creating a mission of peaceable conquest. Like the medieval tradition from whence he borrowed—especially in the most sophisticated literary social versions of the medieval romance tradition, such as Britain’s Geoffrey of Monmouth and the French Arthurian stories of Chrétien de Troyes—Smith’s work is about power in the real world. In the romances of Chrétien, individual exploits of knights problematized the growing social unease of the collective power elite. While knights often acted alone and in good faith, they also contributed directly to this disorder, thus eventually breaking the tension in the earlier books (in the Arthurian tradition, this is represented in the destruction of the round table).¹⁸⁵ Smith serves a similar double role, which becomes most evident in *True Relation*. The first is undeniably nationalistic and nostalgic: the narrative undertones of *True Relation* assuage any real concern over migration. While he adopts the medieval guise, Smith serves as the symbolic return, the “saving” of lands due to England, and a westward expansion successful and complete with imperialistic undertones. But the figure of Smith also serves as a carefully constructed and sophisticated trope of the *active man*. Most importantly, however, *Generall Historie* remains Smith’s paramount work relating to the nation building ideologies of American Saxonhood in early America for two very important reasons—its publication history and the authorial question in relation to the use of the Pocahontas story. In this carefully-crafted narrative, the power of the symbolic Anglo-Saxon *ides*, or “peaceweaver,” becomes an important tool for colonial settlement. Taken together, both *True Relation* and *Generall Historie* are literary texts through which we can read tensions in the ideological hopes and fears of New World colonization; through active and passive models, we become aware of the possibility of peace *and* conquering.

¹⁸⁵ See Knight, 112-17. See also the Introduction of this dissertation for a more thorough background of this material.

THE MATIÈRE D'AMÉRIQUE: JOHN SMITH AND THE HEROIC SAXON MODEL

In his study of the transnational problems of the New World, historian L.H. Roper has successfully positioned Smith within the framework of English machinations upon the New World, arguing for Smith's detailed knowledge of English machinations in colonization practices. Oddly enough, however, though Roper does take Smith to task for having "a clear knowledge of—and [being] a full participant in—the Jacobean socio-political game" that desired New World lands for political reasons, he seems not to grant any import to Smith's persona, claiming that "he played a relatively minor direct role in the expansion of English overseas interests."¹⁸⁶ I am arguing the opposite. I will grant that Smith did little to create a smoother assimilation for the English, failing to assuage the tensions between Indians and colonizers. And, admittedly, Smith's time in the New World was short—he stayed less than two years. However, Smith's mythic influence in the New World was monumental and largely self-styled: he wanted the fame but was unaware of or unimpressed by the deeper intricacies of the larger power struggle. As Roper argues, Smith did have full knowledge of *most* of the English designs on the New World; more importantly, however, he was inextricably linked to major propagandist players, such as Sir Robert Cotton and Purchas, various printers, and powerful members of the Virginia Company itself.¹⁸⁷ Simply put, Smith was not, despite his general perspicacity, fully aware of the degree of his involvement and, later, his expendability.

That Smith became deeply entrenched in England's drive for justification of New World development is a well-known fact. He contributed to what the Virginia Company envisioned as a favorable marketing source for the New World in himself, and he undoubtedly wanted self-

¹⁸⁶ *The English Empire in America, 1602-1658: Beyond Jamestown* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009), 68.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 53.

promotion; in turn, he profited in other significant ways in that he certainly did not have had the power to disseminate his persona into the national consciousness alone. Indeed, his writings, enabled by his involvement in the Company, bolstered the chivalric Smith image and helped to create a larger than life persona. Having read his material, other would-be travelers, including the New England Leyden Separatists, would come to consult him on all matters concerning the New World. With his broad knowledge of American plant, animal, and native life, his touted mapmaking skills, and his adventurous spirit and public persona, Smith was a *cognoscente du jour* of the New World. Later, his works, with added embellishments by Virginia Company members, Cotton among them, included for the very purpose of providing a sustainable argument for democratic English rule in the New World, continued this meteoric rise to public fame. Cotton was especially attracted to the strikingly medieval figure of Captain John Smith. In Smith, the antiquarian Cotton found the perfect medieval persona to portray in the charge against royal authority, especially James I; in Smith, Cotton could emphasize the revival of English liberties, freedoms, and a specifically natural and national originator of the dream of the British *coventus* as described by Tacitus, where hard and lusty freedom-loving men ruled together, and whose successful adventures with the Powhatans could provide a seamless transference to the British New World; and, in Smith, Cotton could work in tandem with the Virginia Company to promote the possibilities of New World migration and settlement.

Smith's first writing from the New World, *A True Relation*, opens up the possibilities for deeper exploration into the tensions between author, message, and textual history as it relates to New World American Saxonhood ideology. Begun as a letter that was ostensibly penned to a mysterious friend whose identity remains unknown even to this day, *True Relation* was rushed by Smith to Captain Nelson at Cape Henry at the last minute before Nelson's departure for

England in 1608. *True Relation* covers roughly the thirteen-month period of the Jamestown colony from December 1606 to Nelson's return to England in early 1608, but it was not, like the rest of Smith's writings, revised and included in Smith's history, *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles* (1624); following four printings in 1608, it went virtually unprinted until the nineteenth century. Because he was still in Virginia, we can be sure that Smith remained undoubtedly divorced from the printing process. What this means is that once aboard Nelson's ship, Smith had no further contact with the missal, which creates a thorny problem of textual transmission between Smith and the Virginia Company. Given this uncertain transatlantic path and sketchy publication history, *True Relation* nevertheless offers a way in for understanding the complex relationship between the Virginia Company and Smith.

True Relation tells of a successful reconnaissance mission to the New World. More than that, however, it is a condensed romance in the Arthurian tradition: the plot is strikingly similar. *True Relation* contains the narrative of an unwilling hero who is tested, the meeting and "defeat" of the enemy, and the providential view of a glorious future on the *terra*. In the short span of sixty pages, the pamphlet condenses this romantic material into a genre with which English readers would be familiar—the *romans*. These chivalric romances had certain stock traits. Fundamentally, the *romans* requires no love interest; the basic material is action, adventure, and, often, a heroic quest. Usually, an unwilling hero is thrown into an adventure situation, the hero meets a great challenge and succeeds; and this success usually benefits his country. *True Relation* contains all of these qualities.

True Relation is simply that: it is a relation of the New World knight *acting* in a fabulous adventure in the new *terra*. The narrative consists of an introduction of the new *terra*, a "test" for the hero, and the power shift, or the hero's new puissance that benefits the nation. Following a

very brief introduction, the narrative begins *in medias res* on April 26, 1609. The story proper, or plot, begins earlier, however, after the formation of the council on the ship, which Smith relates later in his *Generall Historie*:

[The night the box was opened] and the orders read, in which Bartholomew Gosnol, John Smith, Edward Wingfield, Christopher Newport, John Ratliff, John Martin, and George Kendall, were named to be the council, and to choose a president among them for a year, who with the council should govern. Matters of moment were to be examined by a jury, but determined by the major part of the council, in which the president had two voices.¹⁸⁸

Formed on board, the rudimentary government consisted of one president and six council members. Written in a terser hand with more stylized characters, *True Relation* omits these events and moves rapidly from the point of sounding the landing on April 22, 1607, to Newport's embarkment for England on June 22 of that same year. Following a successful landing on foreign soil, according to Smith, a great sickness fell on all chief members of the mission:

As at this time were most of our chieftest men either sicke or discontented, the rest being in such dispaire, as they would rather starve and rot with idleness, then be persuaded to do any thing for their owne reliefe without constraint: our victualles being now within eighteene dayes spent, and the Indians trade decreasing, *I was sent* to the mouth of the river to Kegquohtan an Indian Towne, to trade for Corne, and try the river for Fish.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁸ All citations are from *The Complete Works of Captain John Smith* (hereafter *CWJS*), 3 vols, Philip L. Barbour, ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986) 2:138.

¹⁸⁹ *CWJS* 1:35, emphasis added.

Thus, Smith enters as hero. He writes about his New World adventure as one who was unwillingly called for duty: “I was sent to the mouth of the river ... to trade for Corne, and try the river for fish.”¹⁹⁰ Agency was *given* him and he accepted. Following this initiation, he finally comes upon the Indians: “*I entertained* their kindnes, and in like scorne offered them like commodities ... *I liberally confronted* with free gifte such trifles as wel contented them ... *I anchored before the Town*, and the next day returned to trade ... *I encountred* with two Canowes of Indians.”¹⁹¹ As witnessed in the choice of verbs, the author stresses the character purposefully *acting* throughout the narrative; Smith becomes the savior for the small group. Once again, he returns to a healing John Martin, who decides to have the crew draw to see who will go: “Lotts were cast who should go in her, the chance was mine.” Once again, Smith is provided agency within the narrative to shape circumstances. This time, he embarks and makes three attempts at finding food and shelter, the third being successful. The narrative builds to a climactic point when Smith finally goes outward to face the unknown. He writes these words of explanation for his readers:

Though some wise men may condemn this too bould attempt of too much indiscretion, yet if they well consider the friendship of the Indians in conducting me, the desolateness of the country, the probabilitie of some lacke , and the malicious judges of my actions at home, as also to have some matters of worth to incourage our adventurers in england, might well have caused any honest minde to have done the like, as well for his own discharge as for the publike good.¹⁹²

Directly following this authorial insertion, Smith is struck by an arrow in the leg and captured.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 1:35, 37, 39; emphasis added.

¹⁹² Ibid., 1:45.

Thus, with plot settled, the actual story may begin—the meeting with the inhabitants. Although the interpretation of the capture remains the most remarkable part of *True Relation*, Smith was never in any danger. That same night, Smith relates, he enjoyed “quarter of Venison and some ten pound of bread.”¹⁹³ “What I left was reserved for me,” Smith continues, “and sent with me to my lodging.”¹⁹⁴ The rest of his “capture” mirrored this treatment. “Each morning 3 women presented me three great platters of fine bread, more venison then ten men could devour,” Smith recalls, continuing, “I had: my gowne, points and garters, my compass and my tablet they gave me again. Though 8 ordinarily guarded me, I wanted not what they could devise to content me.”¹⁹⁵ Ultimately, writes Smith, “our longer acquaintance increased our better affection.”¹⁹⁶ He becomes the trusted link between two worlds. In fact, writes Smith, “such acquaintance I had amongst the Indians, and such confidence they had in me, as neare the Fort they would not come till I came to them; every of them calling me by my name, would not sell any thing till I had first received their presents, and what they had that I liked, they deferred to my discretion: but after acquaintance, they usually came into the Fort at their pleasure.”¹⁹⁷ The “capture” is, literally, anti-heroic; since the hero does not face danger, the threat of the *actual* new land all but disappears. Further, Smith as acting *chevalier* wins over the enemy by his wits, thus gaining power without the fear of actual jeopardy.

By the end of the narrative, however, the actions of the hero are less innocuous. Smith has grown into a powerful and oppressive force: the newly-fashioned knight has become the conqueror. Smith recounts toward the end of the narrative about a “civilizing” incident that takes

¹⁹³ Ibid., 1:49.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 1:51.

place. When he believed one of the Indian guides had misled him, Smith recalls he severely remonstrated the guide: “But for his scoffing and abusing us, I gave him twentie lashes with a Rope; and his bowes and arrowes, bidding him shoote if he durst.”¹⁹⁸ Following this incident, the narrative intends to express a clean power shift. No longer needing Smith’s verbal or physical threats, the Indians easily acquiesced: “they seeing us begin to threaten to destroy them, as familiarly as before, without suspition or feare, came amongst us, to begge libertie for their men.”¹⁹⁹ The civilizing process had begun. Overtly, then, in *True Relation*, Smith as author narrates the success of the knight-errant, the New World *chevalier*, in his adventures overcoming the enemy on the new *terra*.

But *was* Smith the actual author? Because of the Virginia Company’s involvement in the enterprise, all options must be weighed. Certainly, representations of peaceable conquest would have provided the Virginia Company with ample fiduciary and public support. Thus, with the emergence of puissance in the Smith figure as *chevalier* in the New World narrative of *True Relation* also arises the subtle interplay of power tensions between the Virginia Company and Smith. *True Relation* illustrates this disconnect. The space between composition and publishing illuminates an imbalance of agendas. Since there does exist a gap of historical data between the finished “product,” or the polished version of *True Relation* that was completed in England, we must turn briefly to London printers and the problem of authorial intent. During the period in which *True Relation* was published, printers played a major role in all authors’ works; as has been noted in much scholarship on Elizabethan drama, publication of manuscripts was a

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 1:95.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid.

collaborative event during the early seventeenth century.²⁰⁰ We must remember, too, that as Smith's *True Relation* was being printed in 1608, Shakespeare's *King Lear* was beginning what would turn out to be a long and tedious history of corrupt folios and mysterious Stuart printing practices, leading scholars on the quest for the authorial quarto. Manuscripts were often chopped, rearranged, and otherwise altered without the author's knowledge.

Even Smith's *The True Travels, Adventures, and Observations of Captain John Smith in Europe, Asia, Affrica, and America, from Anno Domini 1593 to 1629* (1630), which started as a short exposé for Purchas, was edited, trimmed, and manipulated, once in Purchas's hands, largely by Purchas himself. Further, with the rise of manuscript production came the growth in political debates formulated in part through the dissemination of various types of manuscripts, and since this period was one of rapid growth in the English antiquarian movement, politics and antiquarianism collided. The earlier official formation of the Stationer's Company in London (1557) brought together lawmakers, scribes, and antiquarians.²⁰¹ As political propaganda in the form of Anglo-Saxonism increased, so did publishing. Powerful men like Cotton and Lord Burghley collaborated with antiquarians like Parker and Lambard to solidify connections to the past through records, treatises, and political tracts. Most of these figures worked together for similar ends. As historian Margaret J. Ezell has noted, our ideas of authorship during this period remain obscure in part because "our notions of what constitutes authorship and how we evaluate a text in this situation are [...] linked to venue and textual production."²⁰² Printers, too, added to the problem of authorship, as they had favorite patrons and certain agendas they liked to follow;

²⁰⁰ Especially helpful is Heather A. Hirschfeld study, *Joint Enterprises: Collaborative Drama and the Institutionalization of the English Renaissance Theater* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2004), 1-28.

²⁰¹ Woudhuysen's analysis of manuscripts further examines this link.

²⁰² *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 17, 20.

in most cases, power equaled production.²⁰³ Modern criticism has so long been obsessed with the author that we tend to forget at times to position the actual early American English writer in with the editor, scribe, copyist, collaborators, and patrons.

The issue of the Virginia Company's veracity and the complexity of the Elizabethan publishing industry highlights a tension in the transmission of these early texts: how much collaboration was involved, and how can we know?²⁰⁴ In the case of Smith, we can certainly begin with *True Relation*, a publication for which he was simply absent; *True Relation* was hastily printed in 1608 without Smith's permission, acknowledgement, or even his name attached to the work. Leading members of the Virginia Company received copies in England approximately six weeks after Smith handed off the manuscript to Nelson, and they then circulated it to a mysterious "I.H." who emended it for publication. Finally, it was printed with the name of "Thomas Watson" as author, a figure who later asked that his name be removed from the frontispiece; the name was then substituted with "a gentleman."²⁰⁵ As was fairly customary at the time, *True Relation* probably went through a brief and circumlocutory editing process and was expurgated before publication by the mysterious "I.H." The process highlights

²⁰³ Most printers were well known, since they were small in number; when Smith's writings were printed in 1615, the Court Stationers Company had only 22 printers. One related example is John Haviland. Although Haviland was initially Smith's printer, he appealed to Thomas Slater to publish Smith's *True Travels*. Interestingly, Haviland was Edward Griffin's successor in the Eliot's Court Printing House, serving from 1620-38, and he also published numerous antiquarian tracts, such as William L'Isle's *A Saxon Treatise concerning the Old and New Testament, now first published in print with English of our times*, a second edition of *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*. A significant figure in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, L'Isle was great friends with Cotton, borrowing freely from his library on numerous occasions. Many letters between the two exist, mostly dominated by discussions of various manuscripts. Many of these letters document specific manuscripts—some published and some privately owned—by various individuals, including Dee and Hakluyt; see Timothy Graham, "William L'Isle's letters to Sir Robert Cotton," *Early Medieval Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, Elaine Traherne and Susan Rosser, eds. (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), 353-80.

²⁰⁴ Jeffrey Masten provides an excellent overview of why this collaborative act remains important for, among other things, unpacking the ideological elements that helped shape these texts; "Pressing Subjects; Or, the Secret Lives of Shakespeare's Composers," *Language Machines: Technologies of Literary and Cultural Production*, Jeffrey Masten, Peter Stallybrass, and Nancy J. Vickers, eds. (New York: Routledge, 1997), 75-106.

²⁰⁵ *CWJS* 1:5-6.

the privileged printing practices within which Smith's work was inserted—and the power of elite English to alter and emend manuscripts for public reading. Barbour claims that I.H. had connections to the theatre given that he writes “so it is, that like to an unskillful actor, who having by misconstruction of his right Cue, over-slipte himselfe,” suggesting that he has merely “happened upon” the manuscript, thus divorcing himself from authorship.²⁰⁶ Thus far, he has been identified as John Healey.²⁰⁷ However, Joseph Hall, who published his *Mundus Alter et Idem* in 1605, is another option. Hall worked with Healey, the latter actually translating the *Mundus*.²⁰⁸ Hall's *Mundus* imagines an “Other World,” which, in fact, takes place names from North America; the world is quasi-utopian—Hall mentions only that it “has much variety, but little delight”—and the manuscript emphasizes the purpose of the creation of worlds: “They are good travelers, he says, who tell what they have seen in known lands, but he is a better who not only travels but is himself the maker of the lands he travels through.”²⁰⁹ Importantly, Hall portrays two sects in his utopia, a certain group of Virginia exiles and the English Brownists, both of whom arrive to set up government, and Hall himself had been square in the ideological promotional wars for the New World.²¹⁰ The larger point, however, is that *True Relation*, while known as Smith's work, was altered and rearranged to highlight the promise of settlement—and

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 1:98 n. 3.

²⁰⁷ The question of “I.H.” has been a tangential one in Smith scholarship, not gaining a great deal of attention. Charles Deane first claimed that the importance of I.H.'s identity was relatively inconsequential in his edited version, *A True Relation of Virginia, by Captain John Smith* (Boston, 1866). The first person to recognize Healey was Worthington Chauncey Ford; *Proceedings*, Massachusetts Historical Society (58): 1924-25, 245-47. Barbour appears to arrive at the same conclusion; see *Jamestown Voyages* I, 168n. and *Works of Smith* I, 98 n. 11.

²⁰⁸ Joseph Hall, *The discovery of a new world* (1609) Huntington Brown, ed. John Healey, trans. [London, 1609] (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937).

²⁰⁹ This insight is from Henry Morley's introductory sketch on Hall in *Ideal commonwealths: Plutarch's Lycurgus, More's Utopia, Bacon's New Atlantis, Campanella's City of the sun and a fragment of Hall's Mundus alter et idem* (London: Routledge, 1885), 268.

²¹⁰ In fact, many of the books were only identified in the presses by initials, thus rendering the tracing of manuscript circulation and copy during this period virtually impossible; H.R. Plomer, “The Eliot's Court Printing House, 1584-1674,” *The Library* 1921 s4-II (3):175-184.

Smith never had a say in the publication emendations. As Smith darkly portends in his foreboding caveat to the work, “[since the] Author being absent from the presse, it cannot be doubted but that some faults have escaped in the printing.”²¹¹ With close reading, the shadowy implications manifest themselves in the text proper, for *True Relation* ends on a suspiciously positive note, a characteristic quite absent from Smith’s *oeuvre*, the author claiming, “wee now remaining being in good health, all our men wel contented, free from mutinies, in love with one another ... in continuall peace with the Indians.”²¹²

Although *True Relation* marks the entrance of Smith’s heroic narrative persona into the New World, one which he would continue to develop throughout his literary career, authorial questions plague the meaning. Smith’s autobiography, *True Travels*, highlights these problems. Most notably, it improves upon the heroic knightly figure and inserts him into a more expansive narrative. In doing so, *True Travels* illuminates the involvement of authorial collaboration that links Smith to a larger manipulation of national narrative for ideological purposes, establishing Smith as an archetypal hero like the Welsh King Arthur or the Saxon King Alfred. This was not a random analogy. In fact, to add to the medieval mystique, *True Travels* was first printed in a tall, handsome, and decorative folio, accompanied by various medieval illustrations, including Smith’s own alleged coat of arms, which thus provided a certain *persona* for Smith as knight-errant—an important feature of medieval romances. Importantly, then, *True Relation* sets Smith up to stand as a new romancer of the New World.

Often deprecated for its patchwork quality, Smith’s writing style in *True Travels* contains a number of additional romance qualities, some borrowed but others completely refashioned and

²¹¹ *CWJS* 1:24.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 1:97.

new; his work remains clearly indebted to the medieval literature he had favored as a child, as well as the newly revived medieval romance literature of the period.²¹³ In fact, as Laura Doyle points out, in Smith we witness “a tapping of available genres (chronicle, anatomy, ethnography) and then a composition of those genres into a loosely coherent narrative.”²¹⁴ Doyle’s description reflects the breadth of medievalism in Smith’s work; his autobiographies, most notably *True Travels*, contain a few admixtures from both early French and English romances. A “medieval” borrowing offers to the author of history an earlier age wherein it is possible to exist with honor; thus, most medieval historical writers, from Eusebius to Augustine to Bede were purposeful re-creators of the past, trying actively to create a social world and unity rather than just to glorify a passive nostalgia over individual heroics.

As has been noted, a small portion of Smith’s *True Travels* first appeared in his friend Samuel Purchas’s *Hakluytus Postumus, or Purchas His Pilgrimes* in 1625. Purchas included about ten folio pages of Smith’s adventures, which he entitled “The Travels and Adventures of Captaine John Smith in divers parts of the world, begun about the yeere 1596,” which publication likely attracted a good number of English readers, including members of the Virginia Company and Cotton. Following the success of his stories in *Pilgrimes*, Smith later published these in book form in 1630; *The True Travels* was praised by William Strachey and generally

²¹³ As a boy, Smith tells us, he possessed a fantastic imagination and held a great love for chivalric romances. Following a period of seclusion in which he stayed alone in the forest, read romances, and heroically slept in his clothes in a small bower and re-fashioned himself, he emerged from the woods longing for adventure. For a complete biographical account of Smith, the standard biographies are Barbour, *The Three Worlds of Captain John Smith* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1964) and *Captain John Smith: His Life and Legend*, Bradford Smith, ed. (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1953). In the Elizabethan era, the rise of printing saw the rapid increase in readership of medieval romances, which became the equivalent of the pulp fiction, and both Spenser and Shakespeare had been famously influenced by them; see especially Phoebe Sheavyn’s pioneering study, *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969), 188-95 and Helen Cooper, “M is for Merlin: The Case of the Winchester Manuscript” in *Medieval Heritage: Essays in Honor of Tadahiro Ikegame*, M. Kanno et al. eds. (Tokyo: Yushodo Press, 1997), 93-107.

²¹⁴ *Freedom’s Empire: Race and the Rise of the Novel in Atlantic Modernity, 1640-1940* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008), 99.

hailed by later readers as an exceptional history of the true international adventurer. In point of fact, we can look upon *True Travels* as admixtures of a few medieval techniques, with borrowings from the *chanson de geste*, the Saxon heroic epic, and the medieval English romance—one never really favored over the other. *True Travels* presents a fuller view of the Smith introduced in Purchas as the dashing cavalier in all his glory, complete with dizzying chivalric adventures—headline-like tags such as *A desperate Sea-fight in the Straights* and *Smith gets thrown overboard* appear throughout the narrative—and feats of martial prowess. Besides providing a more detailed account of Smith’s sea fights, his adventures in Asia, and his battles and captivity with the Turks, Smith’s *Travels* also provides more autobiography concerning his early years.

Apart from setting Smith up as an errant knight in the New World, *True Travels* contains a number of other medieval features, all transposed onto the New World. The romance tradition has not simply provided a character for Smith—the powerful, even awe-inspiring explorer and self-described “captain”—it also seems to have offered a basic plot: A noble and fairly young man with no title or lands embarks upon adventures, ending up in the New World, where he will later attempt to fashion a heroic society in the face of oppressive rulers. The hero in stock romances often comes from beginnings that are shrouded in mystery. In Smith, too, a new feature arises in the stock romance—he is quintessentially English, or Anglo-Saxon, and, as an active national actor, he provides a more human presence in the ideological power struggle that plays out on a “virgin territory” or *terre de pesme aventure*.

Yet these romantic features of *True Travels* further add to the questions of the veracity of Smith’s work and why it was important for American nation-building during this time. Since his first publication, Smith’s truthfulness has been questioned. An important feature of his chivalric

narrative is the manner in which it is presented—the authorial voice. Although he proclaims toward the beginning of *True Travels* that “because I have ranged and lived amongst those llands, what my authours cannot tell me, I thinke it no great errour in helping them to tell it my selfe,” the narrative is replete with accounts by Smith that are largely romanticized, confused and mistaken, and, at times, borrowed from Purchas, his model, who seems to have plagiarized them himself.²¹⁵ Thus, when Smith writes in *True Travels* that he “cannot make a Monument for my self ... having had so many copartners with me,” he was not simply alluding to the “partnerships” of Purchas, with whom he first published his material, or Cotton, his later patron, but to the various texts from which he freely borrowed.²¹⁶ Smith likely had numerous sources from which to draw. For example, a Smith snippet appearing for the first time in Purchas’s *Pilgrimes* had an almost identical description of the Turks as that in William Biddulph’s *The Travels of Foure Englishmen* (1612). According to Smith biographer Barbour, even Smith’s dealings with the Turks might on some level be attributable to a text by Knolles entitled *Historie of the Turkes* (1136).²¹⁷ In fact, Purchas had a great deal of accumulated material either he or Smith could have used to augment Smith’s writings.

But there exists even more evidence to support the creation of Smith out of source material. As early as 1631, David Lloyd (1597-1663), a Welsh clergyman, wrote a satire of Smith in somewhat prosaic and bawdy verse entitled *The Legend of Captain Iones*. Lloyd’s *Legend* was immensely popular, going through five editions plus reprints just in Lloyd’s lifetime alone, with several editions following his death, as well as an expansion on the story.²¹⁸ Lloyd

²¹⁵ *CWJS* 3:235.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 3:141-42.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 3:168-69; see notes 5-6.

²¹⁸ Alden T. Vaughan, “John Smith Satirized: The Legend of Captaine Iones,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, 45:4 (1988), 714.

caricatures Smith in the character of “Rhisiart Siôn greulon,” or “Richard Jones, savage.” Like Smith, Jones saw adventures all over the world—in Asia, Europe, he battled Turks and fought in Ireland—and the *Legend* fits Smith’s career outline almost perfectly, so much so that Lloyd must have studied Smith’s autobiographical writings in some depth.²¹⁹ The similarities are indisputable: the frontispiece of Lloyd’s work is eerily similar to Smith’s, the title page of *Legend* reads nearly the same as Smith’s, and the adventures are strikingly alike. However, while the bulk of Smith’s material comes from around the world, Jones proves his mettle in America. Lloyd began these parodies in secret, and the first editions were printed as authored by anonymous; but as time passed and after Smith died, Lloyd could parody harder—and he did, often including even more outlandish feats in later editions. One of the later editions includes this epitaph: “Tread softly (mortalls) ore the bones of the worlds wonder Captaine Jones: Who told his glorious deeds to many, But never was believ’d of any.”²²⁰ Not surprisingly, *Legend* means to call out Smith’s veracity in his autobiographical writings. Printed before Smith’s death but published *after*—Smith died less than a month after Lloyd submitted *Legend* for print—the parody might have frightened Smith, or the Virginia Company, into an early printing of his later material. Lloyd likely thought it best to remain careful since Smith was so well connected; or, rather, because Smith had many influential friends who, for their own reasons, needed Smith’s veracity to remain intact.²²¹

Further, the connections in the front matter to various characters related to the New World project are clear, and Smith’s writings can easily be seen to serve as the locus wherein the earlier nationalistic charge from Dee—that the New World was the property of the British

²¹⁹ Ibid., 720.

²²⁰ Lloyd, *Legend of Jones* (London, 1659), 72.

²²¹ Vaughan points out the connections to the printings, 731. Lloyd seems to have waited until Smith’s death.

Monarchy, that there was ample fiduciary gain for both settlers and colonizers, and that New World gains would be beneficial to the state's power—plays out in print.²²² In his history of the enterprise set down in the first chapter of *Generall Historie*, Smith alludes to these claims. For example, he sides with the claim that the initial move was an act of recovery by recalling and recording Madoc's "discovery" of the New World, writing, "they [he and the crew] went [...] to take possession of it for the Queenes most excellent Majestie."²²³ Additionally, when, in the preface, Smith claims that his "Plaine history humbly sheweth the truth; that our most royall King James hath place and opportunitye to inlarge *his ancient Dominions* without wronging any," Dee's influence is clear.²²⁴ The authorial voice claims to be knowledgeable of working within the larger structure in the national process of rightful recovery. Smith believes he is doing the right thing, and he demonstrates the need for historical continuity and nourishes the notion that not only is this conquest right, it is natural.

The problems of authorial intent become most clear in *Generall Historie*. In contradistinction to the foremost promotional writers and the chroniclers of New England, Smith presents us with a historical vision that finds its lineage in the romances of the medieval English period. As much a historian as a yeoman in his literary ethic, Smith as an individual also illustrates a purely providential human causation in the New World as a parallel between national and individual progress. As he asserts at the opening of the *Generall Historie*, "I am no Compiler by hearsay, but have beene a real Actor."²²⁵ In Smith's Virginia strain of American Saxonhood, the salvation of human progress in the New World is in no way linked to Christian *exempla* as found in his earlier models, the national-ecclesiastic histories of Britain; and unlike the divine

²²² Barbour, *Three Worlds*, 336-9.

²²³ *CWJS* 2:63.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 2:43, my emphasis.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, 2:41.

providence in later New England writings, the ideological beliefs in Smith are largely secular and heroic. He does allude to a Christian God deity but invests it with the same power as Fortune; illustrating his man-of-action philosophy, Smith writes, “all you expect from thence must be by labour.”²²⁶ He both exalts the heroic and allows for human causation. History here is shaped by human forces, however, not eschatological. There is no *deus ex machina* or Christian force acting to intervene; the secular actions of Smith alone move the narrative forward. Like Geoffrey of Monmouth did for British history, Smith removes eschatology from his “history”; thus, while God plays a small role in the unfolding of events, it is *man* that is the actor, the mover, and, most importantly, the creator. The religious is not completely eradicated, but the implication is that God is a *watcher* more than an active participant. In the conclusion of the *Generall Historie* he writes, in retaliation to “some Fortune-tellers” who charge “they would rather believe in God than their calculations,” of his self-reliance: “I undertook when nothing was known but that there was a vast land.”²²⁷ Smith’s posturing becomes itself an archetype for what Theodore L. Gross calls the American literary hero, “the exceptional man who seeks to realize an ideal,” a figure who demonstrates “certain common characteristics in line with heroes of other times and countries.”²²⁸ This idea is extremely common in the medieval romance genre, especially in Arthurian ideology, where there exists an explicit notion that ordinary knights can fight their own way to some honor and that competitive assertiveness is the supreme model. In early romances of England, there is a move from the partition of an estate to primogeniture, the practice that one could marry into wealth rather than be born into it, providing the possibility of wish fulfillment or, at least, the promise that men might attain land and wealth through alliance.

²²⁶ Ibid., 2:330.

²²⁷ Ibid., 2:464.

²²⁸ *The Heroic Ideal in American Literature* (New York: Free Press, 1971), viii.

Smith subverts this idea in the New World, and the ideology in the *Matière d'Amérique* rests squarely on “man at the center”; Virginia—and, his dream suggested, New England—could be a place where inherited nobility would dissolve and where the future would be parity among classes, equal status for every man as long as one comported oneself in a naturally noble manner.

Generall Historie further provides a striking and more fully developed example of the *Matière d'Amérique*. It is here that Smith's *chevalier* enters American history proper. Purchas, who wrote one of the dedicatory epistles, wrote this about Smith:

[I] all so wel
Hath taught Smith scoure my rustie out-worne Muse,
And so coniu'r'd her in Virginian Cell,
That things vnlearned long by want of vse,
Shee fresh areeds me read, without abuse
By fabling. Arthurs great Acts little made
By greater lies she saith ...
Smiths Forge mends all, makes chaines for Savage Nation,
Frees, feeds the rest; the rest reade in his Bookes Relation.²²⁹

Subtly, Purchas's epistle illustrates two very important ideas that figure in the rest of *Generall Historie*—a link to the power of an Arthurian figure and a new geographical conquest. Smith picks up historically where Purchas left off, with a true tale so fantastic that it rivals King Arthur's exploits, and Smith, like Arthur, “mends,” subordinates the enemy, and “frees” and “feeds” the new community. A remarkable commentary, especially given Purchas's stature as historian in England at the time, this small epistle sets the romantic tone. How Smith chooses to order his New World experiences remains fundamentally important for the *Generall Historie* as American romance. It is a geography of adventure. He spends little time detailing the day-to-day

²²⁹ *CWJS* 2:47.

activities of Jamestown life; instead, Smith focuses largely upon Indian battles, explorations, and other more glorious events.

Generall Historie relates all of Smith's dealings with the Virginia Company, Powhatan and his people, or other Englishmen, through the chivalric actor, an action-driven hero whose medieval escapades often create the very trouble from which he must extricate himself. The narrative also, as has been mentioned, whether in Smith's hand or someone else's, presents the reader with a quick synopsis of all previous Elizabethan ideologies concerning the New World—the narrator recounts the stories of Madoc, Frobisher, Gilbert, and Raleigh, all of which echo Dee's fantastic claims that the land, belonging already to England, required a formal, recovery action, which Smith and company immediately provided. Smith also documents the history of the Roanoke expedition, condensing versions found in Hakluyt's *Principle Navigations*. Importantly, he provides Raleigh's supposed relation of "The great courtesie of a Woman" to the travelers, a beatific vision of mythic homecoming. In this fantastic anecdote, a native woman, the wife of Granganmeo, runs to greet and help the sailors in the water, orders her fellow tribesman to carry them from their boats to the shore, and dries the sailors' clothes, feeds them, and entertains them. This powerful woman then had the bows and arrows of entering tribesmen broken in two when she saw the fear in the Englishmen's eyes. Following this account, Smith traces the remainder of the English expeditions until 1606, when he begins his narrative proper as well as his tenure on New World shores.

Book One of *Generall Historie* situates the reader within the context of rediscovery—but it does so with a subtle hint of ethos. While he opens the book with chivalric visions of past heroes—"For the stories of Arthur, Malgo, or Brandon, that say a thousand yeares agoe they

were in the North America”—he immediately distances himself, writing, “I know them not.”²³⁰ Smith chooses to begin, as he does in paragraph two, with Madoc: “The Chronicle of Wales report, that Madock, sonne to Owen Guineth, Prince of Wales ... arrived in this new Land in the yeare 1170.”²³¹ Thus can he tie the current history to Madoc and Hakluyt, and begin to create a new beginning from this older extended lineage—*not* via the more “fanciful” notions of Arthur. Smith introduces—or *reintroduces*—the various explorations, beginning with Madoc, through Gilbert, Raleigh, and Drake. He describes, in brief, the inhabitants, curiously remarking on a matriarchal system of religious belief: “For mankinde they say a Woman was made first, which by the working of one of the gods conceieved and brought forth children; so they had their beginning.”²³² Following this brief detour, Smith returns to the explorations and concludes Book One with George Waymouth’s 1605 voyage.

So much of the introduction concerns itself with situating the New World project as rightful conquest that Smith’s proper entrance into the *Historie* comes only in Book Two, where he, in a technique clearly borrowed from Bede in his descriptions of England in *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, outlines the geography, vegetation, and flora and fauna of Virginia for his readers. Smith’s ethnography, however, leaves something to be desired. He concludes of the natives only that they are “inconstant ... craftie ... very ingenious ... all savage[s],” covetous of gold, beads, and “such like trash,” and, generally, “their far greater number is of women and children”; so, Smith claims that although he “lost seaven or eight men,” he “yet subjected the salvages to our desired obedience.”²³³ This ethnographic section then leads into the history proper. In the Third Book, Smith qualifies why progress in the New World has

²³⁰ Ibid., 2:61.

²³¹ Ibid., 2:61-2.

²³² Ibid., 2:78.

²³³ Ibid., 2:114-5, 129.

been so slow up to that point. Here we see the tension that exists between accounts of divine intervention and Smith's historiographical practice that favors a carefully constructed account of an impersonal world wherein man stands at the center and where past notions of national history do not detain the reader; the secular adventures of the individual offer the promise of a new creation of that history. For example, Smith takes credit for winning over the natives, especially in the famous Pocahontas scene, when, should we believe the narrative, his life is saved, yet, following literary fashion, he gives the credit to God: "But almightie God (by his divine providence) had mollified the hearts of those sterne Barbarians with compassion."²³⁴ Soon after, however, the silver-tongued Smith convinces the colonists, who were beginning to blame him for their misfortunes and ready to quit the project, that he will save them, saying he "quickly tooke such order with such Lawyers, that he layed them by the heeles."²³⁵ Having saved the day, Smith then recounts how the Indians, led by Pocahontas, bring provisions, thus saving the lives of the weary colonists.

SMITH AND POCAHONTAS: THE NEW WORLD *IDES*

As seen in Smith's crude attempt to trace the cosmology of Indians, the power of women remains important in *Generall Historie*. Along with Squanto, Pocahontas, who in 1613 was captured, converted to Christianity and then married Englishman John Rolfe, is the most prominent mythic "heroine" of Indian captivity lore. Although limited scholarly work has been done in the context of Native American captivity as an ideological force in British colonial

²³⁴ Ibid., 2:152.

²³⁵ Ibid.

nation building, I have found Pauline Turner Strong's work especially informative.²³⁶ In her study, Strong argues that Pocahontas, "who represents salvation, communion, and colonial legitimacy," became a legendary figure primarily because she was a tragic hero.²³⁷ Strong I think rightly observes that Pocahontas was a captive long before she was deemed "savior" of and convert to the English and the symbolic nature of her capture seen as a transnational tragedy. Historically, she has been called the Joan of Arc of America for good reason: the Pocahontas story exhibits the twofold nature of the romance in America, one free but manipulated agent and one liberated from the tyranny of social forces.²³⁸ Smith's "myth" of capture, Pocahontas's mysterious placation of Powhatan, and her subsequent, implicit role reversal and marriage to John Rolfe all center on the tidy unification of a nation building plot. One social means for English writers to advance notions of peace in early English nation-building activity is the romance myth, which bears great structural similarity to its similar peace-keeping tactics of medieval England. (The birth of the *romans* was a period noted for its civil disorder for various

²³⁶ *Captive Selves, Captivating Others: The Politics and Poetics of Colonial American Captivity Narratives* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1999). Strong's study comes from a fairly brief but ever-growing lineage of captivity studies. Roy Harvey Pearce's early work in captivity in the late 1940s and 1950s, groundbreaking as it was, provides a sound foundation, though it lacks any discussion of ideology; Pearce wrote numerous articles on the subject, as well as *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1953, rev. 1964). His last work, however, was his most satisfying in that he blends literary studies with a history of ideas approach; "From the History of Ideas to Ethnohistory," *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 2 (1974), 86-92. Richard Slotkin's *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860* (Wesleyan University Press, 1973) provides perhaps the best-known work in this area, situating Indian captivity in the context of American nation-building; but Slotkin's work contains many broad generalizations. More ethnographically-sensitive captivity work may be found in *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642-1836*, Richard VanDerBeets, ed. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1973). Taking a more feminist position, scholars such as Annette Kolodny focus more on the female voice of the captive woman; Kolodny's first chapter in *The Land Before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers, 1630-1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984) provides for more of a voice. More recently, Michelle Burnham's work provides for a greater balance between the ideologies of the captors and captives; *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1997).

²³⁷ Strong, 19.

²³⁸ Ann Uhry Abrams, in "The Pocahontas Paradox: Southern Pride, Yankee Voyeurism, Ethnic Identity, or Feminine Heroics," a paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Studies Association, Miami, Fla., October 1988.

reasons, including relaxing of feudal ties, growing pressures within the legal system and economy, and the rise and growth of social mobility.) In the Pocahontas tale there exists a manipulated *mythos*, a reversed medieval romance with Smith at its center, which seeks to reinforce the legitimacy of American Saxonhood conquest through literary re-representation of a “divine gesta,” to borrow from Mircea Éliade, whereby an eternal repetition may be played out in such a way as to celebrate the union of England and America in the metaphorical re-reversing of the myth through the “marriage” of Indian to English.²³⁹

The historical events of the capture center essentially on a few adventurers, two of whom had very important ties to the Virginia Company’s promotion of nation-building Saxonhood—Samuel Argall and Sir Thomas Dale. The basic outline of the kidnapping follows. In 1613, on someone’s order—no solid evidence exists as to whose—Argall was charged with capturing Pocahontas allegedly to end the adventurer’s “war” with the Powhatans. A young linguist in the colony named Henry Spelman, having “acquired” some Indian friends during his two years in the forests, assisted Argall. Publicly, Spelman had been deemed “lost” or even sold, as some reports ran, one of which was Smith’s, which accounted for his whereabouts in the forest those years; in reality, however, he had been planted and was working undercover for the Virginia Company.²⁴⁰ Following the capture, Argall notified the chief that Pocahontas was being held hostage in order that he might set the captive colonists free, return some stolen munitions, and, in general, cease warring on the colonists. The story goes that months followed without an answer, and, finally, Powahatan succumbed and delivered the goods. But it was too late. The English, by this time, had become fed up, and, mysteriously, Pocahontas was a changed woman, having

²³⁹ *The Sacred and the Profane: the Nature of Religion* (Orlando: Harcourt, 1957), 96.

²⁴⁰ This method was nothing new: Smith planted his own undercover “spy” to learn the language in 1608, leaving the boy Samuel Collier in the care of Warraskoyak chieftain Tackonekintaco; Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 207-8.

fallen in love with the English and especially tobacconist Rolfe. In addition to kidnapping Pocahontas, Argall apparently “saved” young Spelman in 1610.

Argall and Dale remain important for their ties to the Old World mythology of Elizabethan England, especially to the Cecils and to King James, and their participation continues the spark of American Saxonhood first conceived by Dee and Lord Burghley. Argall, whose fame in the history of early America comes from being the actual captor, was a noted thief, an extortionist, a “shameless” and “treacherous” man who was, at times, “despotic” and “fraudulent.”²⁴¹ In 1609, when reports of the Hobbesian anarchy in Jamestown reached the Virginia Company, they had James draw up a second charter, for which Argall was recommended. When De La Warr assumed command of Jamestown, Argall, along with Ralph Hamor, was given a “special appointment” as an officer in the new government. He became

²⁴¹ J.S. Bassett, “The Relation between the Virginia Planters and the London Merchants,” *American Historical Association Report* (1901), 554; William Wirt Henry, “The First Legislative Assembly in America,” *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 2 (1893), 155. Argall came from a line of well-connected people. His two-year stint in Virginia has been deemed by historians as nearly ruinous to the colony and was filled with acts of bribery, intimidation, and thievery. Argall was, it would seem, what we might now call a “soldier of fortune,” a mercenary. He was born into a well-to-do family, and he was related by marriage to Thomas Smith, treasurer of the Virginia Company and active leader in the Company from its inception. Much of the early American scholarship on Jamestown ignores Argall’s ancestry, which is important to his connections to the English mission. His grandfather Thomas, a successful bureaucrat, lived on the grounds of the Archbishop at Canterbury and served highly important administrative positions of church and state. As his will, dated August 19, 1583, shows, his father Laurence Argall was on quite friendly terms with Sir Francis Walsingham, among other Elizabethan gentry. In fact, Walsingham was very well-acquainted with the Argall clan; Rowland worked under both Walsingham and Burghley as operations officer in Ireland, with the former even mediating a personal land issue for Rowland. The Argall family had a distant link to Sir Humphrey Gilbert. Though this might seem trivial on the surface, it was not; as Alsop notes, “the blood tie between the two families might not in itself be significant if it were not easily demonstrable that the Argalls [and other involved families] were all prominent Kentish gentry who formed close relationships from the middle of the sixteenth century”; James D. Alsop, “Sir Samuel Argall’s Family, 1560-1620,” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 90:4 (1982), 483. Subscribers of the company included prominent descendents of the Argalls’ friends and connections, such as Walsingham; further, there were numerous relatives of the Argalls who were shareholders in the Virginia venture. Most importantly, however, was Samuel’s first cousin, Sir John Scott, council member on the Virginia Company and brother of Thomas Smith, treasurer, to whom Argall was thereby related. As a side note, Richard (son of Thomas) Argall’s widow married one Laurence Washington, from whom George Washington is descended.

governor from 1617-18, presiding over the colony with Thomas Dale.²⁴² Dale, who enjoyed some renown during Elizabeth's reign, serving first in the Netherlands under Robert Dudley, first Earl of Leicester, and later in Ireland in the military, was a sometimes patronee of Robert Cecil. Dale acknowledged that it was *Cecil* who bade him go to Virginia: he writes, "Cecil [was] pleased to imbark me for the plantation in Virginia."²⁴³ As Dale's biographer Darrett B. Rutman has observed, "scant as the record is concerning Dale's background [...] the friends were powerful indeed."²⁴⁴ In late 1609 and early 1610, plans had started to secure Dale's release in order that he might join the Virginia project; De La Warr, in fact, had already named him in early 1610 "marshall of the colony" months before he left.²⁴⁵ Dale sailed in March of that year.

Both of these figures represent the link between Old World money and power. They exemplified the prestige and wanton nationalism of the Cecils and John Dee, whose Welsh ideas—mostly involving property "rights" to North America via the tenuous link to Madoc's supposed discovery—promoted conquest and development for capital's sake. As such, they

²⁴² Interestingly, John Rolfe favored Argall's position (thus implicating himself, it seems) writing to Sandys in 1620, when charges were still lingering, "I assure you that you shall find many dishonest and faithless men to Captain Argall, who have received much kindness at his hands and to his face will contradict, and be ashamed of much, which in his absence they have intimated him." Rolfe worked in concert with Argall: "[I] cannot chose but to revele unto you the sorrow I conceyve, to heare of the many accusacons heaped upon Captaine Argall, with whom my reputacon hath bene unjustly joynted"; Rolfe to Sandys, January 1620, in *The Ferrar Papers*, "Records of the Virginia Company," vol. 3, Bernard Blackstone, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), 247.

²⁴³ Dale to Sir Dudley Carleton, October 18, 1617, in Alexander Brown, *The Genesis of the United States*, 2 vols. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1890) 2: 870. Following the well-known debacle of Essex at Elizabeth's hands, however, he began to lose favor at court, and, petitioning Cecil for help, Dale attempted to quash charges against him, which then resulted in a warrant for his arrest. Following this, however, Dale somehow rose again, this time to captain, and gained command of an English army in Dutch service. Partly because he was so well-liked by important people, Dale interested the Virginia Company as a leader in New World operations; thus, he entered into its service.

²⁴⁴ "The Historian and the Marshal: A Note on the Background of Sir Thomas Dale," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 68:3 (1960), 291. Dale's brother-in-law was the infamous William Throckmorton. Prior to 1612, Dale, along with Edward Cecil (Burghley's grandson), Gates, and Strachey created a "law" to form and colonize (no trace is left). In 1612, Dale, taking around 300 settlers from Jamestown, created Henricus, named after the Prince of Wales. By this time, Cecil had been promoted to general of the fleet by Buckingham, and he worked with Samuel Argall in an expedition to Cadiz against Spain.

²⁴⁵ This was despite the fact that he was again in garrison with the army and still on the payroll of the States-General; *The Records of the Virginia Company of London*, 4:126.

symbolize precisely the type of nation building impulse against which Smith was reacting. Dale and Argall provided the link to John Dee. In fact, after he had been in England some years, Smith would reflect on the events in Virginia given what he learned from the Indians, reflections which became the basis for the *Generall Historie*. Smith writes that he despised Argall and all he stood for, partly because following Smith's departure, De la Warr and his new regime, including Argall and Dale, along with William Strachey, secretary and lieutenant governor of Virginia, began a series of cover-ups beginning in 1610 to bolster the Virginia Company's position in the public eye and ostensibly to breath "new life" into the colony by Gates and suppress waves of negativity brought forward from Smith's tenure as president of Jamestown. Strachey figures in importantly here because the production and transmission of his *True repertory of the wreck and redemption of Sir Thomas Gates, July 15, 1610* (published later by Purchas), a response to Smith's writings, was taken to the Virginia Company by Gates himself. The *Historie* remains interesting, however, especially where the Virginia Company is concerned, since Strachey's narrative contains information regarding Pocahontas that Smith's did not, namely that she was married to a tribesman prior to her fabricated "relationship" with Rolfe, and, more importantly, details of her perceived sexual appeal—he calls Pocahontas a "well-featured but wanton yonge girle."²⁴⁶ Not surprisingly, then, Smith's version of events was preferred reading for the general public; Strachey's steamier chronicle was quashed by the Virginia Company, lying dormant until 1849, when it—and nineteenth-century interest in the mythos of the Smith-Pocahontas story—was reborn.²⁴⁷

²⁴⁶ William Strachey, *Historie of Travell into Virginia Britannia* (1612), Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund Hakluyt, eds. (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1953), 72.

²⁴⁷ As S.G. Culliford, Strachey's biographer notes, "Strachey's failure to achieve publication is not surprising [because] not only had he been preceded by John Smith, but the final chapters of the work could never gain approval of the Virginia Company"; 162. Fearing that Strachey's version was not ideologically sound enough, the Virginia

The question of *which* account to use for New World promotion lingered in the minds of Virginia Company adventurers. As Mark Netzloff has shown, the internal problems of the colony during the advancements of charters—especially the period of change from the first to second charter that brought in Argall and Dale—was a period fraught with internal strife and manifold, and often murky, notions of liberty. It was of this period about which both Smith and Strachey wrote, and, to be fair, in Strachey’s writings, he attempts historical truthfulness. Always, however, his publications were repressed; instead, public sources, documents, and ideas were “borrowed” from the Virginia Company “official” version of events, *A True Declaration of the Estate of the Colonie in Virginia* (1610). As the company concluded,

Wee have thought it necessary, for the full satisfaction of all, to make it publikely knowne, that, by diligent examination, wee have assuredly found, those Letters and Rumours to have been false and malicious; procured by practice, and suborned to evill purposes: And contrarily disavowed by the testimony, upon Oath, of the chiefe Inhabitants of all the Colony.²⁴⁸

Thus, while both Strachey and Smith portrayed similar events in the New World, it was the latter’s that was favored by the Virginia Company of London, gaining English and, later, international, acclaim.

Company opted to leave Smith’s as the public record: Culliford claims, “at a time when public enthusiasm for colonization waned [Strachey’s work] could never gain the approval of the Virginia Company”; *William Strachey, 1572-1621* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1965), 162. *The historie of travaile* was finally published in 1849. Strachey was also an eye-witness reporter of the 1609 shipwreck on the uninhabited island of Bermuda of the colonial ship *Sea Venture*, which was caught in a hurricane while sailing to Virginia, the same wreck that would provide Shakespeare with material for *The Tempest*; this account was also squelched by members of the Virginia Company until 1625 on account of the bad publicity it would bring.

²⁴⁸ *A Declaration of the State of the Colonie and Affaires in Virginia With the Names of Adventurors, and Summes adventured in that Action By his Majesties Counseil for Virginia* (London, 1620), 3.

It is important to remember that Smith was writing during the period immediately following the Indian massacre of 1622. By that time, the Virginia colony was developing well and had a population of around 4,000 colonists; the tobacco growing was becoming lucrative, and Richmond opened up as tobacco farmers and new colonists moved upriver. This left the original Virginians' colony somewhat open and vulnerable, but there had been no attack in eight years, and the English had become complacent. The peace did not last. According to reports, an Indian chief the English called Jack of the Feather killed a white man, and he was subsequently killed in return. In retaliation, Pamunky Indians killed 347 people near Berkeley Plantation along the Chesapeake Bay, around ten percent of the total population of Virginia. In *New England Trials*, Smith argues in favor of strategic reason, claiming that "they did not kill the English because they were Christians, but for their weapons and commodities." But the English were frightened. Up to this point, New World migration had slowly crept into the national consciousness via plays such as *The Tempest* and *Eastward Ho!* While the drama for earlier English historians, such as Bede and Gildas, played out in a shift of power on the *same* island, in this case, the drama of New World history played out on an island stage populated by those who crossed the sea and those who inhabited the island. Following the Indian attack of 1622, the English became particularly alarmed, and questions concerning New World ventures took center stage. In London, furor arose as some began to argue that the English had no right to the New World lands and no ethical cause to injure Indians. The Virginia Company panicked. To quell these fears, Smith wrote, "But must this be an argument for an English man, or discourage any either in Virginia or New England? No: for I have tried them both."²⁴⁹ In Smith, the Virginia

²⁴⁹ *CWJS* 1:432.

Company found the link to New World conquest as a peaceable mission, and in the newly-fabricated Pocahontas narrative, its most powerful tool for national-building mythology.

The story itself provides the most important, and most famous, romantic episode in the colonial American romance genre. Most important for marking the transference of the *Matière de Bretagne* to the *Matière d'Amérique*, the incident is the most well-known because it was the work of a master manipulating of a powerful Anglo-Saxon literary technique: the story of the *ides*. In his dedication to Lady Francis in the 1624 printing of the *Generall Historie*, Smith positions the Pocahontas rescue among his other romantic exploits with women: he claims the Turkish Lady Tragabigzanda, “when I was a slave to the Turkes, did all she could to secure me”; Lady Callamatta, of the Tartars, “supplied my necessities”; and, “that blessed Pokahontas, the Great Kings daughter of Virginia, oft saved my life.”²⁵⁰ Purchas, who had published this part as one of the excerpts in his *Pilgrimes*, mentions almost in passing that Smith had been captured—he writes that Smith “had fallen into the hands of the Virginians,” in one of two mentions of this episode.²⁵¹ Truthfully, Smith spent the better part of two months in captivity before Powhatan apparently decided to have him executed. Curiously, in *True Relation*, there exists no account of the story—Pocahontas *is* mentioned, but only once, and there is no reference to her saving Smith. Thus, the fullest account of the episode comes from the *Generall Historie*:

Having feasted him [Smith] after their best barbarous manner they could, a long consultation was held, but the conclusion was, two great stones were brought before Powhatan: then as many as could laid hands on him, dragged him to them, and thereon laid his head, and being ready with their clubs to beat out his brains,

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 2:41-2.

²⁵¹ Ibid., 3:314.

Pocahontas, the king's dearest daughter, when no entreaty could prevail, got his head in her arms, and laid her own upon his to save his from death: whereat the emperor was contented he should live to make him hatchets, and her bells, beads, and copper; for they thought him as well of all occupations as themselves. For the king himself will make his own robes, shoes, bows, arrows, pots; plant, hunt, or do anything so well as the rest.²⁵²

Here, in a reversal of medieval romance roles, adventurer Smith is saved by the teenage Pocahontas, who, cradling his head in her arms, stops the magnanimous chieftain from going through with the execution. Perry Miller calls this "one of the most charming demonstrations [of] native spontaneity."²⁵³

However, the omission from *True Relation* adds to the gap between authorial intent and publishing purpose. As Henry Adams famously argued in his early study of Smith, since *True Relation* makes no mention of various exaggerations found in the 1624 edition of the *Generall Historie*, we must be wary of any truthfulness in the story. I am inclined to agree. Although the supposed savagery of the natives is depicted in both accounts, the *Generall Historie* adds other numerous descriptors not present in *True Relation*. For instance, Smith's capture comes after he, facing 200 bloodthirsty savages and using one tied to his own arm as a buckler, was finally taken prisoner, whereafter "many strange triumphes and conjurations they made among him."²⁵⁴ In *True Relation*, no mention of such danger exists. As was previously noted, Smith's "captivity" is amicable, for, following his capture, he is treated well and even informs Powhatan he must leave as soon as it occurs. And all of the Indians' actions in *True Relation* are extremely cordial and

²⁵² Ibid., 2:150-51.

²⁵³ *Nature's Nation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 5.

²⁵⁴ *CWJS* 2:146.

humane; there is none of the peril of the *Generall Historie* account, where death always hangs over Smith's head. Additionally, in *True Relation*, Smith says of Powhatan, "Hee kindly welcomed me with such good wordes, and great Platters of sundrie Victuals, assuring mee his friendship, and my libertie," and of his captors in general, "So fat they fed mee, that I much doubted they intended to have sacrificed mee."²⁵⁵ Powhatan, claims Smith, sent him gifts and wanted to meet Smith's father, and Powhatan's tribe would creep near the fort at night, "every of them calling me by my name, would not sell any thing till I had first received their presents."²⁵⁶ Such is Smith's account of his imprisonment; only once does he mention Pocahontas—on Smith's company's return with two Indian hostages and "with such trifles as contented her."²⁵⁷

What is even more strange than Smith's later addition of Pocahontas's rescue of him is that in that revised account, following Powhatan's decimation of a number of Englishmen, including John Ratcliffe, in a 1609 botched trade attempt, Smith tells us Pocahontas also "rescued" the young Spelman (odd, indeed, considering that Spelman, in his account, claims Smith *sold* him to the Powhatans): "Pokahontas the Kings daughter saued a boy called Henry Spilman, that liued many yeeres after, by her meanes, amongst the Patawomekes."²⁵⁸ "Aided in his escape by Pocahontas," the account runs, "Spelman took refuge among the somewhat autonomous Potomacs, ignoring Powhatan's orders to return."²⁵⁹ In point of fact, Spelman's inclusion *at all* remains a bit of a mystery. As a scholar and antiquarian, his uncle's weight in the

²⁵⁵ Ibid., 1:150.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., 1:151.

²⁵⁷ Ibid., 1:95.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 2:232. Henry Spelman's story is strange. Due to primogeniture issues, young Spelman was disinherited by Sir Henry the elder, presumably his uncle and a famed antiquarian, forced into servitude, eventually signing up for the Virginia venture. Spelman became fluent in native languages and published a tract, *A Relation of Virginea*, an account that serves primarily as an ethnography: he records various habits, dress, and customs and pastimes of the natives, revealing little about himself.

²⁵⁹ Qtd. in Strong, 63.

English world was great; there was practically no one above him in matters of historical English law, even Robert Cotton. Cotton would have certainly been interested in Spelman, as he often worked with him and John Selden in matters of English Common Law.²⁶⁰ In fact, when young Spelman returned to London, he met with Cotton and provided Purchas with material for his *Pilgrimes*, but for reasons unknown, his uncle Henry was eager to ship him back to the New World. In a 1612 letter, the elder Spelman wrote: “Argall has requested Henry as an aide or companion”; and in a letter to his brother, John Spelman, Henry, who appears somewhat put off by John’s silence about young Henry’s whereabouts, desires to know when Henry will sail again: “Mr Hackluyte can provide the information,” writes Spelman, “or else [John] should approach Lord de la Ware himselfe.”²⁶¹ Spelman did return, however, on Argall’s ship, in whose charge he was returned by his uncle—he had previously worked under Argall and, before him, De La Warr—and was promoted to captain, serving from that time until his death in the 1623 massacre, essentially acting as a go-between for the French (Spelman was also fluent in French) and the Indians.

What seems both intriguing and odd is that a later print edition of the work described Spelman thus: “Henry Spelman was the *third son* of Sir Henry Spelman, the antiquary.”²⁶² There are two possible reasons for this clerical error: Either Spelman the younger’s lineage was not

²⁶⁰ All three, it will be remembered, argued that the Normans imposed a yoke of feudalism on the free and democratic Saxons; Selden composed part of the second charter for the Virginia Company. The elder Spelman’s chief historical interest was the Church of England and finding antiquarian records to that end. Spelman’s *Concilia* is a veritable trove of information documenting the history of English Church practices and procedures, beginning with the Britons, who, Spelman claims, were Christianized soon after Jesus’ crucifixion, through the coming of Augustine’s mission in 597 to 1066. Importantly, Spelman’s corpus took on a rather pro Anglo-Saxon view—he held that the Normans imposed on the true church. Spelman also published an Anglo-Saxon glossary and became involved in drawing up patents for the Council of England, himself being a member, starting in 1620; Catherine Drinker Bowen, “Historians Courageous,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 101: 3 (1957), 249-254.

²⁶¹ *Spelman Correspondence*, Survey Report, no. 345, British Museum, Ms. 34599, f. 29.

²⁶² *Travels and Works of Captain John Smith VI: President of Virginia, and Admiral of New England 1580-1631*, By John Smith, A. G. Bradley, ed. (Kessinger Publishing, 2006), ci; emphasis added.

clearly known, or this was a surreptitious attempt to connect him to the famed antiquarian; I find the latter more satisfactory. Smith's omission of Spelman, however, creates multiple problems. Following Adams's inquiry and claims it seems easy to agree that there is something strangely fantastic, not to mention strikingly constructed, about Spelman; as Adams rightly points out, these problems, coupled with the fact that Wingfield's *Discourse of Virginia* (1607) also contains absolutely no record of either Pocahontas incident, thus weakening any argument for Smith's "rescue," should be cause for skepticism. I side with Helen Rountree, who has argued that the rescue story might ring true if Smith needed saving, which, she claims, was not the case.²⁶³ Clearly, given the dire straits of Virginia at the time, members of the Company of London thought a need existed for some sort of providence tale; working undercover, Spelman provided the opportunity for the translation of a transnational tragedy that would publically unite two cultures.

For, as we have seen, the Virginia Company needed justification—quickly. The company's great regard for the political instability of concerns arising from migration that manifested itself as the *adventus Americanum*, the providential migration to the New World, demanded immediate attention, especially given public negativity in plays such as *Eastward Ho!*, Jonson's *pièce rosée* which almost celebrated the "lost colony" of Roanoke and alluded to the integration of whites and Indians. The Virginia Company needed to shift the focus away from the dangers of the New World and its native inhabitants: young Spelman's being saved by and living peaceably among the Indians was one way. The impressive story of the marriage of Pocahontas was quite another. And it was even more powerful. The notion of producing peace by

²⁶³ As has been mentioned, this is evident in the first account. Rountree quickly dismisses Smith's story, offering no alternate version, and further claims that Smith even "may have manufactured the peril from which Pocahontas supposedly saved him"; *Pocahontas's People: The Powhatan Indians of Virginia through Four Centuries* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990), 38.

symbolically focusing upon Indians was nothing new. Since a variety of accounts from the New World were hardly encouraging, often emphasizing disease, pestilence, and Indian attacks, a literary attempt to confront and counteract this and the other negative publicity produced by earlier settlements, such as the Roanoke and Popham colony debacles, had been for years necessary. As early as 1612, the company produced an extensive series of travel literature in order to promote possibilities of success to potential financial backers and adventurers. Often authored in concert with the Council, a number of promotional tracts focused on creating an image of peace through extensive and deceitful propaganda.²⁶⁴ The company's idea was to transform the threat of the "barbarous" Indian in the public consciousness to one of possible peaceful assimilation, a marrying of cultures: "The image of the submissive, attractive, and marriageable aboriginal transformed the stereotype of the 'savage' native, which had the desirable effect of spurring interest and investment in the colony by defusing a major obstacle to settlement."²⁶⁵

As it turned out, the Pocahontas story in Smith's *Generall Historie* provided the Virginia Company with the promise of much more positive propaganda than had originally been imagined. Set in a darkly transitional period of nation building, the implicit marriage of cultures and the conjoining of white and Indian served as a link between the old ways and the new—and *Old World* and New. This matrimonial depiction, started in the New World with a Saxon *chevalier* as narrator, creates an entirely providential national narrative. Implicit, too, are the multiple discourses that surround and define these events as they would be represented to later

²⁶⁴ "A Justification for Planting Virginia," the Virginia Company's own publication, highlights its own awareness of the propagandist mission: "It was proposed that some forme of writing in way of Justification of our plantation might be conceived, and pass [. . .] into many hands"; *Records of the Virginia Company*, Susan M. Kingsbury, ed. (Washington D.C.: Government Printing House, 1938) 3:1.

²⁶⁵ David Stymest, "'Strange Wives': Pocahontas in Early Modern Colonial Advertisement," *Mosaic* 35 (2002), 110.

readers: these heirlooms would become part of the mythological heritage bequeathed to later generations out of a largely national and manipulative discursive practice. Thus, the claims to any “truth” are historically negligible. In fact, the Virginia Company’s use of New World discourse, in the Foucauldian sense, and their manipulation of this mythos for the production and control of *all* signifying practices regarding New World cultural narratives produced a false veneer, an image of the possibilities of success, precisely through the language of this mythic marriage material. As Foucault states, “discourses” are “tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations”; these “forced relations” are relations of power, including social institutions or groups who intend to govern social control.²⁶⁶ The Virginia Company had every intention of positioning Smith, a New World *chevalier*, and England, by association, into the rightful heritage of Arthur and Madoc; the Other was simply different. King Arthur evolved into the New World cavalier, Captain John Smith the Knight, which ennoblement made to acknowledge the growing concern of unknown danger, served also to constitute more fully new structures of the order. A success of the New World *romans* could establish ideological control for England and the Virginia Company. The *romans* served as the primary discourse of colonization. As Stuart Hall puts it, “it is discourse, not the subjects who speak it, which produces knowledge. Subjects may produce particular texts, but they are operating within the limits of the episteme, the discursive formation, the regime of truth, of a particular period and culture.” The Virginia Company thus manipulated the narrative to evoke the expressions of a collective memory of the community, that in England and America. The collective memory, in

²⁶⁶ *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1 (Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1981), 101.

turn, would be very much influenced by any emerging national myths, especially in a land where there *were* no historical stories for the English.²⁶⁷

Thus, the prominent attention paid to a powerful female figure in the symbolic Pocahontas story made famous by Smith is crucial to American nation building. Recently, David Stymeist has elaborated on the noteworthy cultural symbolism in the Pocahontas narrative:

The promotion of Anglo-Indian intermarriage in Colonial travel literature became a substitute for actual hybridization in the English colonization of the New World and concealed the reality of open hostility. The figure of Pocahontas represented an icon of miscegenation that masked the cultural and genetic endogamy in early modern English colonial enterprises.²⁶⁸

Thus, the fantasy of intermarriage becomes a significant part of the official advertisement for the settling of Virginia in the period between 1605 and 1622. In the fictive account of her provided by Smith and quite likely amended later by certain collaborators, readers might embrace a sort of New World “morality” that fused the spiritual, social, and historical worlds of migration. Recall, for example, the true Pocahontas as the newly Christianized “Rebecca” was whisked away to England in a ceremonial tour with husband Rolfe in 1616.²⁶⁹ To add further to the ceremonious

²⁶⁷ As Bernard Lewis states about collective myth, the most powerful entail “a conflict, a clash between the group, usually exemplified in representative figure, which is to say, the heroes of the narrative, and external forces” may be human or supernatural. Any especially heroic romance or epic tale remains the most powerful, such as those found in Homeric epics and the like; *History: Remembered, Recovered, Invented* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 43.

²⁶⁸ Stymeist, 112.

²⁶⁹ One Thomas Spelman, the younger brother of Henry, sailed on *George* on the return trip to London with Pocahontas, along with the young Henry Spelman, who was in the employ of Argall at the time. Though the Rolfe enjoyed fame in England, by the time of “Rebecca’s” arrival, Indians in England were not a new trend—Martin Frobisher had carried one to England in 1576, perhaps the fifth in forty years. There were other Native American converts on this voyage, but little information about them exists. For more, see *Records of the Virginia Company* 1: 485, 496. What seems important to note is Rebecca’s royal treatment: compared to two other indigenous women who converted and traveled to England, she was given twenty times the monetary help. The literature on this topic

symbolism of the marriage, several other Powhatans accompanying Rolfe and his bride were Christianized by none other than Reverend Purchas and one of Dale's men (acting as interpreter); two of the women traveling with Pocahontas were duly renamed "Elizabeth" and "Mary."²⁷⁰ The drama was very much a Company affair. Since all finances were paid by the Virginia Company for this trip, all of the details were worked out by certain Adventurers—at the head of the list was De La Warr. Appropriately enough, the group stayed in London at the aptly named "Belle Sauvage Inn"; Pocahontas, with James I and Queen Anne, watched Ben Jonson's masque "The Vision of Delight" in what Stymeist calls "the crowning moment of this visit to England; the royal approval of Anglo-Indian intermarriage consecrated the Virginia Company's use of Pocahontas as sexual advertisement and proof of their missionary success."²⁷¹ The important depiction of peace, a *myth* of unification read through Anglo-Saxon ideologies, proved far more important than the actual peace, and the later Pocahontas visit to England was, for all intents and purposes, "more for show than substance"—just as well, since peace did not prevail, and no extreme Anglicanization resulted.²⁷²

To better understand these events and the power behind the creation of the mythos through which New World development of American Saxonhood occurred, I must briefly return to Smith's dedication in *True Travels*, for this seemingly innocuous nod provides a key into a larger, darker, and more sinister realm of national self-fashioning and nation building. Smith dedicates the volume to "William, Earle of Pembroke" and "Sir Robert Cotton, that most learned Treasurer of Antiquitie, having by perusall of my Generall Historie, and others, found that I had

is, in general, somewhat lacking. The best resource to date is Alden T. Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters: American Indians in Britain, 1500-1776* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

²⁷⁰ Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters*, 92-3.

²⁷¹ Stymeist, 115.

²⁷² Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters*, 235.

likewise undergone diverse other as hard hazards in the other parts of the world, requested me to fix the whole course of my passages in a booke by it selfe, whose noble desire I could not but in part satisfie.”²⁷³ Pembroke was a powerful man, possibly the richest man in England at the time, and was extremely influential in matters of Virginia, being both an adventurer in the Virginia Company and a board member on The Council for New England. Naturally, both Pembroke and Cotton were prominent figures in the Virginia Company; in fact, they both were brought in with Selden who was recruited in 1619 to strengthen the colonization effort. The Company wanted to bolster their mission by creating and codifying a system of laws under the new charter to defend against any resistance that might weaken its overall structure.²⁷⁴ Smith was in a strange position. Naturally desiring fame, he sought publication for his book; however, he was still operating within the greater power structure of the Virginia Company, and the ensuing interplay between the two drives creates a strange contrapuntal mix of individual and social struggle for some kind of truth.

In his persuasive but not exhaustive study of the Pocahontas story, J. A. Leo Lemay vehemently dismisses all claims of Smith’s falsehood. Taking up a more romantic vision of Smith, Lemay argues, “Cotton would not have asked Smith to write the *True Travels* if he thought Smith was lying.”²⁷⁵ Compelling as this rationale seems, I disagree, for the very reason that Cotton and others might have lied as well; if so, then Lemay’s entire argument collapses.

²⁷³ *CWJS* 3:141.

²⁷⁴ David Sandler Berkowitz, *John Selden’s Formative Years: Politics and Society in Early Seventeenth-Century England* (Washington: Folger Books, 1988), 55.

²⁷⁵ *Did Pocahontas Save Captain John Smith?* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1992), 56. Lemay’s conclusions may be succinctly summed up thus: “There are eight unmistakable references in Smith’s writings to Pocahontas’s saving his life [...] if we had only one of these accounts, we would nevertheless have excellent evidence that Pocahontas saved his life [...]”; ergo, all eight of these “proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that Pocahontas rescued him”; 98. Arguing this way, the claim is essentially a *non sequitur*, or, at the very least, Lemay commits a fallacy of circular reasoning. Simply because Smith mentions it eight times, how do we know he is telling the truth? In other words, it really doesn’t matter how many times Smith writes it, the question of veracity still exists.

Further, *how* the story was manipulated negates any question of veracity. Lemay seems oddly naïve in this respect, claiming, “if [Smith] had lied, they would have learned about it”—“it” being the rescue and “they” being Cotton and other men involved in the eventual transmission of the story.²⁷⁶ Again, the claim appears to beg the question, since if *they* knew *and were a part of it*, it might very well be true. Yes, they probably would have learned about it, since Cotton was an erudite scholar. For the most part, too, members of the Virginia Company of London were well-educated men. In fact, these were some of the most well-connected men in all of Stuart England, so we can be certain that they would have known about it—if they were not *part* of it.

Cotton, for one, was very much tied to the idea of English liberty and desired to see its full rise again out of the ashes of James’s reign in the New World. A means of defense against the growing superstructure might be produced in an elaborately created *mythos*, one that involved John Smith, whose chivalric character had drawn Cotton in since he had first read Smith’s writings in Purchas. The antiquarian that he was, Cotton could link an heroic figure to the New World project, assist in creating an ideological mythos for the public. Indeed, there was no man in England more qualified. And Cotton could link this all in a way that complied with the “Christian” mission of the adventurers.²⁷⁷ One important fact that Cotton would have known about Christian Anglo-Saxon verse is that while the domineering tendency favors male heroics, it frequently accommodates occasional but influential female figures in cultural situations. Cotton would also no doubt be familiar with the notion that, differing greatly from the more subdued

²⁷⁶ Ibid., 100.

²⁷⁷ The main end, according to the Virginia Company’s polished manifesto, was first “to preach the Gospel, to recover out of the Armes of the Divil, a number of poore and miserable soules, wrapt up unto death in, almost invincible ignorance”; Thomas West, third Baron De La Warr, Sir Thomas Smith, Sir Walter Cope, and Master Waterson, *A True and Sincere Declaration of the Purpose and Ends of the Plantation Begun in Virginia ...* (London, 1610), in Alexander Brown, *The Genesis of the United States: a narrative of the movement in England*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1890) 2:339-40.

heroines of later medieval romances, these often Christian female depictions played out in Anglo-Saxon verse at times to intervene in the course of human events with profound influence (as such, for example, the Virgin is very often exalted in Old English poetry).²⁷⁸ So, too, naturally, is the male Germanic hero an almost god-like character; unflinching in the face of certain doom, the Germanic hero pushes onward.

Having acquired the early Anglo-Saxon texts such as *Beowulf*, *Judith*, and *The Wife's Lament*, all of which portray strong female depictions, Cotton would surely see the obvious portrayals: even if we take into account the idea of translation issues and scholarship, *Beowulf* is clearly a warrior prince and *Judith* is the fabled biblical woman savior.²⁷⁹ Thus, more convincingly and equally plausible—perhaps more so, given the plethora of texts, historical and otherwise, in Cotton's possession, and his medieval imagination—is the powerful and symbolic figure of the Anglo-Saxon *ides*, the aristocratic woman or peace-keeping queen, as she was sometimes known. In her compelling look at the Anglo-Saxon *ides*, Jane Chance examines its function in various Anglo-Saxon written material and lore, both Anglo-Saxon and Germanic

²⁷⁸ That Cotton was a great collector of manuscripts has already been established; that he was so importantly connected to a wide number of texts needs further clarification. Of Cotton's manuscripts, the Nowell Codex is probably the most famous. Named after Laurence Nowell, the alleged first owner, the text contains both *Beowulf* and *Judith*, the two texts in question. These works in the Nowell Manuscript differ from works in the Junius (Caedmon) Manuscript; the latter contain virtually all Old Testament narratives, such as *Genesis* and *Exodus*, while the former contains, among others, these more fanciful, romantic texts.

²⁷⁹ The issue of translation is tricky, but there is ample and clear evidence to support the idea that Cotton would have had a fundamental, if not rudimentary, command of Anglo-Saxon vocabulary, at least enough to get the story behind *Beowulf*; *Judith*, being a biblical text, would have been much easier. *Beowulf* is called to the new land (new, at least, for him) to slay the dragon that has infested King Hrothgar's kingdom; in the Anglo-Saxon *Judith*, the heroine saves the town, and the role of the biblical figure is "of the church triumphant over the demonic forces behind paganism"; Richard J. Schrader, *God's Handiwork: Images of Women in Early Germanic Literature* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1983), 41. Here, the Anglo-Saxon poet condenses the story of *Judith* down to essentially two main protagonists—Judith and Holofernes, Nebuchadnezzar's general—and Judith, now Christianized, prays to the Holy Trinity for strength: "Ic ðe, frymða god ond frofre gæst, / bearn alwaldan, biddan wylle/ miltse þinre me þearfendre,/ ðrynesse ðrym" (translation: "I pray to you, the Lord of Creation, Heaven's Son and Spirit of Hope, for mercy, Mighty Majesty, in my need"; 83-6). This "new" Anglo-Saxonized *Judith* is a bit different than her Hebraic counterpart in that emphasis appears to be on her strong intellect and virginal qualities, and the heroic codes translate, in this case, to the feminine and into a religious context.

texts and, later, in Tacitus's *Germania*, where the female *ides* serves as the "peaceweaver," or *freoðuwebbe*, or the one who keeps the peace (*friðusibb*). Close-mouthed, loyal, loving, and wise, her chief role was to keep the peace between two tribes through marriage and children.²⁸⁰ Historically, Queen Emma served as the prototype of the *ides* figure. A Norman by birth, Emma married the Scandinavian King Æthelred the Unready, which was a political match: she became a symbol of friendship between cultures. Later, following the Danish conquest of England and Æthelred's death, Emma married Cnut the Great. The Queen of England married to her conqueror was a powerful symbol of nationhood. Emma as the historical peaceweaver united nations in defeat and conquest, thus providing a providential symbol of both unity and continuity.²⁸¹

In its literary setting, the Anglo-Saxon *ides* similarly serves two worlds. Because she is married outside of her tribe, the exogamous role of the *ides* represents a very real, historical concern: she can be viewed as a peaceweaver/keeper or, as is often the case, a "foreign captive."²⁸² It is vital that she be "held" symbolically, for, in either case, her symbolic presence marks the centripetal force upon which the narrative turns. A good example of the early Anglo-Saxon *ides* in Old English literature may be found in the figure of Danish Queen Hildeburh in the Anglo-Saxon epic *Beowulf*. Married to a Finn, Hildeburh's son becomes a Frisian warrior battling the Danes, of which her brother is a part. The Dane Hengest and Hnæf, Finn's brothers-in-law, battle and she loses all relational connections: Finn dies, so Hildeburh loses her son, brother, and husband. Thus, like the Norman Queen Emma, she weaves the peace pledge but then becomes ironically caught within it: "she is the central focus of the alliance that results in

²⁸⁰ *Woman as Hero in Old English Literature* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986), 1-11.

²⁸¹ Pauline Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith: Queenship and Women's Power in Eleventh-Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), 177-78.

²⁸² Janet T. Buck argues this point; "Pre-Feudal Women," *Journal of Rutgers University Library* 34 (1971), 48.

the death of all those men to whom she is most closely related.”²⁸³ Ultimately having failed as peaceweaver for the two groups, then, she is torn between both worlds, and, though her marriage was intended to weave peace, it has failed. The marriage dissolves in violence between the two tribes, and Hildeburh is sent back in disgrace.

In the colonial American version, Pocahontas as *ides* served to *prevent* this type of dissolution, if even only fictitiously. Smith, or possibly an editor or collaborator, cleverly alludes to this saving grace of the *ides* mythology: “God made Pocahontas the Kings daughter the meanes to deliver me: and thereby taught me to know their trecheries to preserve the rest.”²⁸⁴ Depicted as a Native American who later “marries” Englishman Rolfe, this mythological tool would easily pacify the members of the Virginia Company, other adventurers, and, in general, shape English opinion of the enterprise. Pocahontas’s exogamy served the same function as the Anglo-Saxon *ides*; the marriage was “a political maneuver for furthering the alliance between hostile groups” and publically promoting this alliance.²⁸⁵ In short, the Saxon *mythos* of the *ides*, reinvigorated through the figure of Smith as the heroic Saxon, could unite the nation building *ethnie*. What is most striking about the Pocahontas story is that it represents a tension in the *mythos* of American Saxonhood that was developing in and around this time, a double-consciousness of or disconnect among the actions and character of a “John Smith” *author* and Pocahontas *subject*, the *ides* that will “marry” the two cultures, uniting both.

This British New World adaptation of the Anglo-Saxon *ides* narrative also defines Smith’s and the Virginia Company’s rocky relationship as well as the tensions that exist between

²⁸³ Patricia Clare Ingham, “From Kinship to Kingship: Mourning, Gender, and Anglo-Saxon Community,” *Grief and Gender: 700–1700*, Jennifer C. Vaught and Lynne Dickson Bruckner, eds. (New York: Palgrave, 2003), 24.

²⁸⁴ *CWJS* 1:432.

²⁸⁵ Janemarie Luecke, “‘Wulf and Eadwacer’: Hints for Reading from Beowulf and Anthropology,” *The Old English Elegies: New Essays in Criticism and Research*, Martin Green, ed. (London: Rutherford, 1983), 195.

the individual and the larger socially conscious structure. But Smith seemed to have remained conflicted about his allegiances, and, consequently, his “additions” to the mythic creation seem stilted and awkward. Nevertheless, in the “improved” description of events in the *Generall Historie*, he underscores how right ethics and Saxon values can deliver the English from the hands of the *divel* in the New World. And in a letter to Queen Anne which Smith was supposed to have written in 1616, he explains that Pocahontas’s marriage could be used in favor of justification for conquest: “Seeing this Kingdome [of England] may rightly have a Kingdome [America] by her means.”²⁸⁶ (Oddly, however, the “little booke” Smith claims to have presented to the Queen has been largely called into question: neither is there record of Smith having sent a book to the Queen, nor were his works published by 1616 [except for the brief Purchas portion mentioned above].)²⁸⁷ Thus, the example of Smith serves a dual function in early American nation building; while he develops a chivalric *mythos* in his corpus by exemplifying the New World acting man, or heroic individual, his historical accounts that shape the New World also reposition the darker ideology carried forward from Elizabeth’s reign to disrupt the historical construct of the narratives. That is, the pattern of “lawful recovery” of lands thought to belong to Madoc first, thus England forever, continues in the Virginia Company’s language. After all, in the publicly made reports printed, the company argued for the “appearance and assurance of Private commodity to the particular undertakers, by recovering and possessing to themselves a fruitfall land, whence they may furnish and provide this Kingdome, which all such necessities.”²⁸⁸ The tensions we see in the relationship between Smith and the Virginia Company

²⁸⁶ *CWJS* 2:260.

²⁸⁷ See Brown, *Genesis* 2:784.

²⁸⁸ Thomas West, third Baron De La Warr, Sir Thomas Smith, Sir Walter Cope, and Master Waterson, *A True and Sincere Declaration of the Purpose and Ends of the Plantation Begun in Virginia* ... (London, 1610), in Brown, *Genesis* 1:339-40.

essentially represent as well a larger contest for originary notions of New World myth between emerging economic and political factions and the chivalric values and characteristics of what will come to be seen as the American individual. Taken at face value, Smith's writings represent the possibilities of the individual in the New World; in their alteration from private authorship to collaborative emendation, however, Smith's work illustrates this developing freedom and liberty twisted and manipulated by the greater powers of the Virginia Company of London and other members of the English elite. Within Smith's writings, the Virginia Company could couch certain implicit symbolism and depict for the reading public in England a vision of rightful migration and conquest to ensure future control of lands gained; simultaneously, the English figure of Smith was a public way to link and justify the growing nation-building ideology of American Saxonhood.

* * * * *

In 1618, two years before Bradford and company set out for New England shores, Sir Walter Raleigh was on his way back to the Tower, accused again of high treason. For his part, Smith had unsuccessfully attempted to return to the New World. His attention, however, drifted from Virginia; Smith's *A Description of New England* (1616) told of the trip to the coast of Maine and his interests in the New England coastal region. As the Separatist Pilgrims were looking to North America for evacuative purposes, Smith and Sir Fernando Gorges were organizing an expedition to New England, in charge of a small group of settlers. Smith never made it. Although he continually sought support for a new colony in America—most notably from Sir Francis Bacon in his 1618 letter to the same—in later life Smith remained in England, never to return to the

New World with which he was so enamored. Earlier, in 1612, a third charter had been granted, making the colony even less dependent upon the Crown. Then treasurer Edwin Sandys, who, historically, has been seen as an over-zealous colonizer and liberal, sought to continue Raleigh's and Gilbert's idea of a "new" England. With Sandys at the fore of the movement, a new form of government patterned after the Magna Charta was to arrive on De La Warr's return trip in April 1618. De La Warr perished in the crossing, but the papers arrived via George Yeardley, who was elected governor in 1618. The papers became known as the "Virginia Magna Charta" and became the very cornerstone for liberty and freedom in the colony. Everyone under the previous Dale government was absolved, legal matters were tidied up, and the New World Magna Charta government seemed to breathe new life into the colony.

Despite these developments, the Indian Massacre of 1622 changed the tenor of the colony immensely. When Edward Waterhouse published his *A Declaration of the state of the Colony and Affaires in Virginia. With a Relation of the barbarous Massacre in the time of peace and League, treacherously executed upon the English by the Infidels* (1622) following the massacre, the fate of Native Americans was sealed; contorted into a destructive and threatening force, American Saxonhood had arrived. Back in England even the Reverend John Donne—who had earlier vied for a position on the Virginia Company but had lost out to Strachey—recognized signs of the emerging American Saxonhood coming out of the New World in his depiction of the incident. Following Waterhouse, Donne gave a sermon to the Virginia Company shortly following the massacre, mostly espousing retaliation. Here, he views Indians as "natural men," or the primary ancestors of the English, set far back in the evolutionary scale. Recalling West's earlier dark metaphor of spreading the Christian gospel and emphasizing "law of nations" as a

foundation for inhabiting other lands, Donne alludes to the Saxon conquest.²⁸⁹ The Saxons, however, differed in tone and scope to the Romans, Donne argues, in that while the latter involved grand sweeps of national conquering, the former's impulse for conquest was made up of a number of disconnected efforts by sundry groups, culminating in an initially pagan civilization. For Donne, paradise might be regained as quickly as Christ could be integrated into the New World as the New World natives were seen both as Edenic dwellers and Satanic worshippers, and there was sufficient fear, then, which would later play out in New England, of the English falling to barbarous rule in Virginia.²⁹⁰

Smith's view on the massacre was less interested in the religious and symbolic than Donne's, and thus more mundane and characteristically practical than Waterhouse's. The Indian attacks left so pronounced a change in attitude and marked the beginning of the end of the relationship between Smith and the Virginia Company. There was still some romantic achievement to be gained from all of this. According to Smith, matters were human, not divine, and thus the *cause* of the massacre was lack of "marshall discipline," or a standing army, as well as the carelessness of the planters; the remedy was simply "to send Souldiers and all sorts of labourers," or a fine and noble army of Saxon-type Englishmen.²⁹¹ In other words, the

²⁸⁹ See David Armitage, "Making the Empire British: Scotland in the Atlantic World 1542-1707," *Past and Present*, 155, and Noel Malcolm, "Hobbes, Sandys, and, the Virginia Company," *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 24.

²⁹⁰ For example, Alexander Whitaker, minister in Henrico and coauthor of the Virginia Company's own document for New World promotion (see n. 39), writes of the "lawlessness" of the native Americans and the temptation for the English: "Some of our Adventurers in London have been the most miserable, covetous men [...] all which God hateth even from his very soule"; *Good Newes From Virginia* (London, 1613) D2, 9, 11. So what, Whitaker wonders, will keep the colonists from falling into barbarity? A similar caveat was issued by Francis Bacon. For his part, Donne believed that perhaps this would provide a new lease on life for these people. I owe a debt to the following for some of my information on Donne and the New World: Harold Cooper, "John Donne and Virginia in 1610," *Modern Language Notes* 57 (1942), 661-663; Paul W. Harland, "Donne and Virginia: The Ideology of Conquest," *John Donne Journal* 18 (1999), 127-52; and Stanley Johnson, "John Donne and the Virginia Company," *ELH* 14:2 (1947): 127-38.

²⁹¹ *CWJS* 2:327-28.

catastrophe was the fault of the Virginia Company. Ever the martial hero in the *Matière d'Amérique*, Smith desired a part in the retaliation; as he wrote in his *Advertisements*, “The Warres in Europe, Asia, and Affrica, taught me how to subdue the wilde Salvages in Virginia and New England, in America.”²⁹² Smith held that he could ostensibly “convert” at least half of the neighboring Indians to the American side. Of the massacre, he writes,

Thus you have heard the particulars of this massacre, which in those respects some will say be good for the Plantation, because now we have just cause to destroy them by all meanes possible ... now we may take their owne plaine fields and habitations ... [there will be more game] if we beat the Salvages out of the Countrey ... it is more easie to civilize them by conquest then faire meanes; for the one may be made at once, but their civilizing will require a long time and much industry.²⁹³

In essence, Smith’s take on the attack was a subtle charge against the entire Virginia Company government: It happened because of weak governmental structure, which relied upon a foundation that subsumed the individual, thus failing to deal effectively with the natives individually. In Smith’s eyes, the superstructure had failed. Like Waterhouse and Donne, Smith endorses quick conquest, claiming the Spanish dealt with the natives effectively by doing the same, and he offers aid in the form of manpower. “If you please I may be transported with a hundred Souldiers and thirty Sailors by next Michaelmas, with victual, munition, and such necessary provision,” he writes, that “by Gods assistance, we would endeavor to inforce the Salvages to leave their Country, or bring them in that feare and subjection that every man should

²⁹² Ibid., 3:269.

²⁹³ Ibid., 2:298.

follow their bussinesse securely” (at the time, colonists spent a good deal of time watching and waiting for another attack).²⁹⁴ As he was for the New England enterprise, however, Smith was turned down for the job. In fact, the Virginia Company was so busy creating an importation office for tobacco distribution that it did not have the time or funds for a proper garrison, let alone felt gratitude toward Smith any more for his chivalric quests. Smith’s time in the New World had clearly come to an end.²⁹⁵ Lamenting what appeared to be a failed attempt to develop fully the *Matière d’Amérique*, he somewhat sadly offers this view: “it seemes God is angry to see Virginia made a stage where nothing but murder and indiscretion contends for victory.”²⁹⁶ One final question, it seems, stayed with Smith until he died: *Why* did the colony fail?

For his part, Smith, simply fell out of public favor; his star having faded, Smith was of no further use to the company and the English. In 1626, when Charles took the throne following the death of James I, Puritans felt the need to move westward to the New World, and they did so with Sandys’s and the Virginia Company’s help. Smith was interested, desiring to return; he thought both Virginia and New England could “comfort” each other, writing that “the two colonies should be planted, as they now be, for the better strengthening each other against all occurrences [and] increase and continue that mutuall love betwixt them for ever.”²⁹⁷ Although John Winthrop and others discussed possibilities with Smith, they opted out from choosing him as martial leader, and the Leyden Pilgrims decided instead to hire the staid Miles Standish. In the New England project, a more ecclesiastic strain of American Saxonhood would develop, and the break from England would be cleaner than it was in Virginia; in Britain would there no longer be a force in New World Saxonhood. Back in England, at the final convening for dissolution of the

²⁹⁴ Ibid., 2:306.

²⁹⁵ Barbour, *Three Worlds*; 308.

²⁹⁶ *CWJS* 2:314.

²⁹⁷ Ibid., 3:274-75.

Virginia Company of London, one lone voice, that of the infamous Captain John Smith, paradoxically remained silent at the end.²⁹⁸ Present as he was, he was no longer an acting member in New World negotiations: Smith's voice, the first mouthpiece for American Saxonhood in the New World, had, strangely enough, been silenced.

²⁹⁸ Brown, *Genesis* 1:554.

CHAPTER THREE

BRADFORD, WINTHROP, AND MATHER: THE EMERGENCE OF NEW ENGLAND SAXONHOOD

*“And so they came, but not to rest.
The Anglo-Saxons never rest”
-John F. Simmons*

In the summer of 1620, a handful of Separatists, having fled the England of Elizabeth and James I to Holland, began to decide on a proper course of migration to the New World. The Plymouth Company, the Virginia Company of London’s sister company in New World undertakings, was one option for the group. Unlike its more southern counterpart, all Plymouth Company claims were assigned to the northern part of the New World coast; but growth of operations had been slow. The company’s previous attempt at settlement in Kennebec, Maine, proved unsuccessful.²⁹⁹ Thus, the northern territory was virtually unchartered by the English, which, coupled with the fact that there was no strong individual leader in the band of Leyden exiles that had been taking refuge in Scrooby since 1608 who could, like Captain John Smith, forcibly head a new settlement, complicated matters for the Plymouth Company-Leyden Puritans’ operation. Even Smith, whose allegiance later switched to Plymouth from the Virginia Company, avoided such a connection at that time, providing the Puritans with only brief

²⁹⁹ This was the failed Popham Colony, which dealt a near-fatal blow to the Plymouth Company in the spring of 1607. Sparked by Ferdinand Gorges and led by George Popham, brother of the illustrious barrister John, who served as governor, the Popham Colony was Jamestown’s failed sister experiment—the illustrious Sir Raleigh Gilbert, Sir Humphrey Gilbert’s son, was deputy, serving as a naval admiral as well. With the death of the two principal members of the group—John Popham and John Gilbert, Raleigh’s brother—encroaching disease and the severity of the elements, the disheartened settlers, led by Henry Popham, fled back to England in shame. Ironically, John Smith’s success in Virginia helped to renew interest in the Plymouth Company.

consultation and maps for northern New England. That Smith wanted to go there is without question. The Leyden members hadn't enough money to pay him, however, and desiring as little attention as possible, they probably shied away from Smith because of the negative publicity his name carried.

Instead, the Pilgrims thought to go straightaway to the parent company with their plans. They knew, however, that a course for Virginia brought with it very real and natural dangers; of this Smith had at least warned them. And they were not a "hardy" folk; while in Scrooby, the Pilgrims had been merely eking out a living as artisans. William Bradford was a weaver, William Brewster made his living as a tutor and printer, and, in England, Robert Cushman worked as a loomer. In other words, as members of the artisan class, the Pilgrims knew little of geographic survival. Further, the danger of religious intolerance, the very peril from which they were fleeing, made the voyage plan that much more risky, as the other English group, comprised largely of the Virginia adventurers, might not welcome them. With mounting group dissension, they nevertheless needed a plan. Thus, they agreed to settle on a plan to associate themselves loosely with the Virginia Company's southern patent, which gesture at the time seemed safe and uncontroversial.

The group borrowed capital from the Virginia Company and enlisted the help of Sir Edwin Sandys, then secretary of the Virginia Company, who somehow and quite mysteriously promised to make the whole event possible.³⁰⁰ In fact, for reasons unknown to anyone but himself, Sandys personally asked James to issue them a permit to sail to and form a colony in the

³⁰⁰ J.H. Parry, *The Age of Reconnaissance: Discovery, Exploration and Settlement, 1450-1650* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 216-18. Sandys, instrumental in both Virginia and New England, helped spread the word about New England to wealthy investors.

New World, embarking for a course in the southernmost section of the company's jurisdiction.³⁰¹

Sandys' appeal was successful. Later, he arranged a clandestine meeting with James, wherein the exiles claimed that they would "spread the gospel" and "extend his dominions" in the New World, to which James, it appears, readily assented. Curious, he asked what profit might arise from those regions to which the Pilgrims were sailing and from their planned endeavors.

"Fishing," one of the Leyden members quickly replied, to which James shot back, laughing, "So God hae my soul; 'tis an honest trade. T'was the Apostle's calling." They were then speedily directed to the funds, with the agreement that if they behaved "peaceably," all would be well.³⁰²

The offer being accepted, however, the group had other plans; since the long arm of James did not extend into the New World, the Leyden group's "mission" there would evolve into something entirely different from an innocuous fishing venture, especially given the fact that they beached nowhere near the patent's specified destination point.

Can we assume that these Pilgrims purposely strayed off course in light of the diminishing national interest of the English so far away and James' apathy about their plans?

This question has been debated by scholars for the last few decades.³⁰³ In perhaps the only place

³⁰¹ Sandys's motives have always been a bit of a conundrum, as has Sandys himself, especially with regard to his participation in the New England venture. He apparently recruited the famed antiquarian and jurist John Selden to work on the governmental structure of the New World venture in New England; Berkowitz, 68-74. Further, that he was a good friend with William Brewster, the elder, fourth signer of the *Mayflower Compact*, is no mystery. Although Sandys maintained some affiliation with other overseas enterprises—he was, in fact, a leading member of the East India Company as well as a founder of the Bermuda Company—he paid particular attention to the largest of them, the Virginia Company, tirelessly working more than any other merchant for at least six years; further, he was an active participant in both Virginia's and New England's settlement. Sandys attempted a certain agenda with the Leyden exiles he could not achieve with Virginia, and he saw in the group a new chance to broaden the English geographic presence. Importantly, then, it was Sandys who desired first for Virginia then Plymouth to "erect a free popular State" with the "clause that the people there shall have no government putt upon them but by their own consents"; qtd in Alexander Brown, *English Politics in Early Virginia History* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1901), 209.

³⁰² This anecdote is taken from Samuel Rawson Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*, 10 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1883) 4:155-56.

³⁰³ Daniel Plooijs' claim that the Scrooby group never even intended to remain in Holland permanently, viewing it as a wayside stop on the journey to the New World, is now considered to be a statement of truth. Both Plooijs' *The*

in *Of Plymouth Plantation*, Bradford's retelling of these events, that states exactly where the *Mayflower* was bound, Bradford writes, "after *some deliberation* amongst themselves and with the master of the ship, they tacked about and resolved to ... find some place about Hudson's River for their habitation."³⁰⁴ Selma R. Williams argues convincingly that this passage emphasizes a purposeful deception on the part of the immigrants, that the "deliberation" was merely a later narrative ploy on Bradford's part, and that the Pilgrims intentionally chose the specific area between Virginia and New England that was still partly controlled by the Dutch, a fact of which Bradford had been well aware.³⁰⁵ This last move would have been extremely shrewd. By the time Bradford's company sailed, the first Dutch had settled in Fort Nassau, on Castle Island on the Hudson River, a pluralistic settlement full of a striking number of non-Dutch nationalities, including English, who fled their various countries for religious freedom. The group was naturally attractive to the Leyden exiles, who themselves wanted distance; through this lens, the *Mayflower's* landing spot becomes considerably less serendipitous. Importantly, the largest difference between Virginia and New England lies in the role of religion in each region's development of American Saxonhood. While the former held religion as less of an ideological force in their manifestation of Saxonized nation building, the latter Puritan group profoundly

Pilgrim Fathers from a Dutch Point of View (New York: The New York University Press, 1932) and Henry Martyn Dexter and Morton Dexter's *The England and Holland of the Pilgrims* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1906) are the leading works of Pilgrims/Separatists in Holland, although that topic has been somewhat resurrected in recent scholarship, notably Jeremy D. Bangs's *Pilgrims in the Netherlands—Recent Research Papers Presented at a Symposium held by The Leiden Pilgrim Documents Center and The Sir Thomas Browne Institute* (Leiden: Leiden Pilgrim Documents Center, 1998). Bangs' study contains further references to new discoveries and scholars in the field. In reality, the group had *de facto* autonomy from the crown; flagging interest in Northern America and the group's willful noncompliance secured that. Brewster and Bradford could subtly wrest control of Plymouth away from England, especially given the chaotic religious climate in which England was immersed at the time, because James simply did not concern himself as much with the Leyden group as his other affairs.

³⁰⁴ All citations are from *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1647* (hereafter *OPP*), Samuel Eliot Morison, ed. (New York: Knopf, 1952); 60, emphasis added.

³⁰⁵ *Kings, Commoners and Colonists: Puritan Politics in Old New England, 1603-1660* (New York: Atheneum, 1974), 89.

emphasized religion as part and parcel of their connection to a migrating cultural identity.

Envisioning themselves as the new Israelites, the early Puritans connected back to Anglo-Saxon notions of Christendom for historical narrative.

Christendom remained an important part of the constructed memory of the newly-formed Anglo-Saxon tribes' *ethnie*, which grew to ideas of English nationhood in the ninth and tenth centuries. According to Bede, the land was devoid of Christianity prior to the arrival of the missionary Augustine of Canterbury; thus, Bede saw the English as the new Chosen People. The Anglo-Saxon notion of Christendom formally entered the English vocabulary during the ninth century, or the time of King Alfred, a troubled time for Saxons. While not new, the term has no Greek or Latin parallel. "Christendome" was used by Alfred himself in 893 in his translation of Paulus Orosius's *Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII*.³⁰⁶ In this work, as Stephen J. Harris points out, "Anglo-Saxon ethnogenesis—that is, the coming into being of an Anglo-Saxon *ethnie*—is expressed within the context not of a nation nor Christianity, but of Christendom."³⁰⁷ Alfred's translation of this history provided the final support for nationhood. Coupled with Bede, the translation of Orosius's *History* served to unify the Alfredian vision of the Saxon state: an ethno-religious marker, Alfred's manipulation of "Christendom" symbolized the revaluation of the collective identity through language, politics, and history and separation from Rome.

Similarly, I argue, New England authors refashioned this Anglo-Saxon notion. For the Puritans, Christendom linked *historically*, not simply geographically. Thus was Cotton Mather able to prophesize about the expansion of Christendom to the east: "The day is at hand when the Turkish Empire, instead of being any longer a Wo to Christendome, shall it self become a Part of

³⁰⁶ Judith Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), 8-9.

³⁰⁷ "The Alfredian 'World History' and Anglo-Saxon Identity," *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 100:4 (2001), 483.

Christendome.”³⁰⁸ The connection of Christendom to the myth of American Saxonhood was just as powerful as the myth that they were the new Israel; in fact, it was even more so. The Saxon embracing of Christianity had unified a nation. Although the ways in which a deeper Saxon ideology was developed remain somewhat obscured by their religious arguments, the three seventeenth-century New England chroniclers I discuss—Bradford, Winthrop, and Mather—reframe Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical arguments for their creation of a regional *ethnie*. These three colonial New Englanders purposefully situated their culture within this framework to support and justify the new migrant model, firmly planting *New* England into the Christian Saxon lineage of the *Old* English.³⁰⁹ Like Alfred’s innovation of the past for the future of the Saxon state, these New England chroniclers revamped an existing model. The enculturation of Saxon identity, coupled with the notion of the promise of a migration myth carried forward from the Anglo-Saxons, validates the quest for liberty in the colonial period and beyond. New England becomes a temporal place that would provide the foundation for English immigrants’ development of American Saxonhood patterned after the Anglo-Saxon vision of the true Christian Church of England. This pattern takes as its literary model representations of the Saxon migrants and the

³⁰⁸ *Things for a Distress’d People to Think upon* (Boston: B. Green & J. Allen, 1696), 34-5.

³⁰⁹ Most scholars now agree, as David D. Hall claims, that Puritanism was a movement that “wore several different faces at any point in time”; “On Common Ground: The Coherence of American Puritan Studies,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 44:2 (1987), 195. Beginning with Perry Miller’s groundbreaking work in which he introduces the “Augustinian strain” of piety, several scholarly treatments have explored connections to English nation-building narratives in the British New World. George M. Madsen discussed Miller’s omission of the important notions of Christology and the lack of Christian doctrine; “Perry Miller’s Rehabilitation of the Puritans: A Critique,” *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 39:0101 (1970): 91-105. Michael McGiffert’s “Grace and Works the Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism,” *Harvard Theological Review*, 75:4 (1982), traces the Elizabethan move to transfer the covenant to the New World. More recently, Mark A. Peterson characterizes Puritanism as a “dynamic ... complex and sometimes contradictory set of impulses” that adapted its inherited English beliefs about nation with the increase in New World commerce; *The Price of Redemption: The Spiritual Economy of Puritan New England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 6. Building upon Fischer’s sociological treatment of New England (*Albion’s Seed*), both Peterson’s and Conforti’s studies (*Imagining New England*) seek to link an “Englishness” to New England regional identity; they explore an imagined identity as it is *borrowed* from England—in terms of names, lineages, and racial stock. I argue similarly, but this chapter intends to explore the Saxon influence in greater detail.

various national battles for Briton. When migrations occurred on the British Isles, Bede serves as the model chronicler. He establishes in his history that the story of each tribe involves the oceanic journey to the *insula alia*; these national accounts reveal an archetypal pattern of the migration across the sea and settlement on an island.

I am arguing the same for New England's appropriation of Anglo-Saxon identity. This Christendom becomes reformulated in New England. Thus, it is my overarching claim in this chapter that the most important aspect of New England's development of the nation building ideology of American Saxonhood couples this reinterpretation of English "Christendom" with the idea of purposeful social crossing, the combination of which becomes a newly-created nation-building device to link the two historically separated cultures.³¹⁰ The Saxons, following their conversion, assumed a powerful new identity: blessed by Providence, they entered into Christendom the chosen people. Similarly, New England adjusts American Saxonhood to align with its religious claims for a providential settlement. Keeping Old England in socio-historical *memory* while increasing separation *physically*, New England creates a new imagined and intensely geographic space, which becomes the dominant, imaginative myth used to create national unity.

In New England, the victor's narrative, which culminates in the writings of Bradford, and Winthrop, recreates the Anglo-Saxon migration myth, carries it forward, and animates the myth to provide a reason, context, and propitious future projection for the New England immigrant community. American Saxonhood pushes into New England in this manner. As I argue later in

³¹⁰ Of these claims, almost no scholarship exists; past interpretations have generally included interpretations of New England viewed through both Judeo-Christian and Greco-Roman lenses. It remains important to note, however, that "Anglo-Saxonism" as a term or idea was virtually non-existent. My claims here are that this tradition marked the point in colonial America where ecclesiastical chroniclers began to *develop* these ideas without express knowledge of this conscious creation.

this chapter, we find this ideology in its fullest bloom in Cotton Mather, who explored the initial connections first set forth by the insular notions of community in Bradford and Winthrop and developed them into the New England model, an archetype that would remain in place for the next 200 some years. In what follows, I will first highlight the way in which Bradford's migration initiated a Saxon response and resurrected the myth of migration out of the Anglo-Saxon Christian lineage. Following this, I explore the way in which Winthrop's membership in what he believed was the "true" Church of England shaped his vision for a unique New England *ethnie* via this resurrected notion of Christendom. Finally, I end with a more sustained analysis of Mather's *magnum opus*, the *Magnalia Christi Americana*, which illustrates a high point of New England American Saxonhood as it enters the eighteenth century. *Magnalia* provides American Saxonhood's *raison d'être*. Mather argues for a geographically-centered Christendom, a sustained narrative containing both the grand sweep of Bede's *Historia* and the prophetic vision of Gildas.

BRADFORD AND WINTHROP: THE "RETURN" OF THE SAXONS

"Englishness" has traditionally maintained a certain tie to religion as part of its spiritual and cultural identity, and recent interest in ideas of Christianity as part of a nation-building ideology has attracted new interpretations. Stephen J. Harris, for instance, has put forth the theory of the strength of "Christendom" in early English identity.³¹¹ If we view Christendom as a "religio-ethnic order of identity altogether distinct from Christianity," as Harris does, we can in this context better understand that "in combination with a reinterpreted Bede, Christendom offered Alfred and his circle both an imperial vision and an ethnic identity, a combination of blood and

³¹¹ "The Alfredian 'World History,'" *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 100:4 (2001), 483.

faith that extends beyond the Anglo-Saxon Church into the very marrow of Anglo-Saxon identity.”³¹² Ultimately, then, one important and fundamental feature of New England’s development of American Saxonhood, in fact, is a purposeful lack of proximity. In contrast to the Virginia colony project, New England immigrants intentionally broke all *physical* ties to England, while at the same time remaining ideologically linked to its lineage; as the corporeal distancing increased, the need for greater continuity emerged. Thus, early New England authors looked to Gildas’s claims for unification and Bede’s vision of history for this direction.

In this way, New England migration presents a pronounced notion of return that deserves special attention because the ancestral link to England satisfied, for early New Englanders, an ontic thirst, a lifeline to the ancient English notions of church and liberty that could provide a primordial root for their sense of communal being. Like Alfred’s use of the past for future nation building, first-generation New Englanders had an opportunity to develop a new ideology appropriate to place, a myth wherein geography and religion united. There could exist a *new* Christendom. As Bradford asserts in *Of Plymouth*, the Pilgrims were “well weaned from the delicate milk of our mother country,” so that “when they came ashore they would use their own liberty ... none had power to command them.”³¹³ This purposeful geographic distancing on the part of the Puritans was of planned importance: it symbolized the specific migrational act meant to connect the immigrants’ lineage while at the same time distancing themselves from any requisite physical manipulation. More importantly, however, migrating Puritans thought this task could be completed only by connecting *back* to the true English, or Saxon, Church; they wanted the geographic space to recreate an intangible communal ideology in the New World—here,

³¹² Ibid.

³¹³ *OPP*, 33, 75.

Benedict Anderson's notion of an "imagined community" looms large—one that would maintain control by hearkening back to a connected spiritual past and would also seek to control its destiny with the promise of geographic right. As Bernard Bailyn has argued, Cotton Mather's New England would indeed become such a powerful and autonomous force around the close of the seventeenth century: "Puritanism, in its various forms, fulfilled itself ... unconstrained by a parent church or by any external social or institutional authority."³¹⁴ At the same time, colonial American chroniclers, such as Mather, reached back to some glorified and ancient past, wherein early Anglo-Saxon freedom enabled the genuine, democratic liberty of the true church. These ideological roots function as the origins of the New English manifestation of American Saxonhood.

Even as men like Bradford and Winthrop were migrating to New England, they believed that they were involved in a kind of return to original Christendom; positioned within eschatological time, the ancient Saxon myth of religious freedoms guided the migration, which held the promise of transforming them into a replica of the static original. This transmission of ideas came from Old World books, largely comprised of popular volumes; apart from Greco-Roman classics, these included the standard English Bible, martyrologist John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*, or *Book of Martyrs*, and works by the early English historians Gildas and Bede. All of these works were quite popular in England during the period and carried over into multiple editions with each successive migration. In fact, the colonists initially brought with them a wide range of books—and did so on each subsequent crossing—and they had vast quantities of books

³¹⁴ *The Peopling of British North America: An Introduction* (New York: Knopf, 1986), 123.

shipped from Old England at a constant rate.³¹⁵ There was never a time when they lacked English writings. Greek and Roman classics did not, however, participate in the culture of Christendom that the early English Saxons had. Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* made clear that connection. Arguably the most influential book in early New England's formative years, Foxe's *Acts* is an often graphic account of all Christian martyrs who suffered for religious causes from the first to the sixteenth century, complete with woodcut prints.³¹⁶ In it, Foxe imposed an English national myth on ancient Christology—the Church of Rome's incorporation of newer models of Christianity, seen clearly in the Norman subjugation of the ancient church and Saxon liberties—

³¹⁵ This is one foci of Thomas Goddard Wright's still influential study, *Literary Culture in Early New England, 1620-1730* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1920), from which I take much of my information. While Wright admits that written evidence remains scant as far as documentation is concerned, we can be sure colonists had "many good libraries" that they continued to stock with book shipments with the newest works. Indeed, they suffered, as Wright puts it, "no greater handicap than if they had been living in some remote place in the north or west of England"; 61. The flow of books from England increased rapidly with the second generation. By the 1650s, Wright notes, Harvard and the Boston Public Libraries were fast gaining steam as large repositories, mostly due to donations of personal collections. Copies of Camden and Foxe were plentiful and existed in the New World, as did the works of Purchas and Hakluyt and even lesser-known scholars such as Verstegan. In short, the colonists had a good number of antiquarian works. In looking at the evidence of a literary culture in New England in the seventeenth century, we must, as Wright has done, use public and private library records, correspondences, and ship's logs. To know for certain how many or exactly what type of books were in New England in the early 1600s is all but impossible; however, we do have examples of titles. Foxe was everywhere, and Camden was very popular in New England, as was John Bale's work, the writings of Sir Walter Raleigh, and others. The examples seems endless: William Brewster's death in 1643 revealed a catalogue of nearly 400 books, including Camden, Raleigh, and Hakluyt; Samuel Eaton gave a copy of Raleigh's *History of the World* and Foxe's *Acts* to start the Eaton library. Brewster's library shows two things: 1) we are able to see, comparing Brewster to other holdings and acquisitions, that the tenor of reading tastes in the New World was fairly congruous, and 2) given the late publication dates, it is evident that books were regularly shipped or brought from England since colonists had the newest editions. It is a mistake, argues Wright, to think that colonists were cut off from England; most either traveled back to England or had friends and family who would regularly ship them books. As Wright observes, "very few Pilgrims were without books"; 27.

³¹⁶ In *Actes*, Foxe essentially separates the history of the church into five rough divisions, each spanning three hundred years. It was his description of the third and fourth divisions, when Augustine comes to England and Christianizes the Saxons and the work of Satan is represented in the papacy, especially in Pope Gregory VII, that had a profound influence on New Englanders. Ultimately, the Norman rule imposed by William solidified the papal conversion, thus sparking the true reform, a part of which members of the New England clergy thought they were. It is important to remember that Foxe was one of the early Anglo-Saxon antiquarians who published Protestant tracts for purely nationalistic reasons. A vigorous proponent of the idea that the true British church was in constant conflict with the Roman Catholic Church, Foxe wanted to go back to a time before this dominance, and, with Bishop Matthew Parker's help, Foxe looked for documents attesting to this period which supported the notion that the English Church was first formed by the native Britons and then continued through to the Anglo-Saxons. Bale, too, was convinced the church was corrupt, so both men sought the "true church" that had been corrupted by Rome, especially digging for Augustine's influence, and put forth Anglo-Saxon texts by Matthew Parker to show his vision. Thus, these antiquarians incorporated these old documents, containing Anglo-Saxon laws and religious tracts, to justify the way England once was.

arguing for the ancient church as a microcosm of the history of the world. New Englanders simply relocated that Christological myth. Peter Gay observes that New Englanders were highly influenced by Foxe in more ways than have been previously imagined. “Generations of Englishmen saw history through Foxe’s eyes,” Gay claims; thus Foxe bolstered a new social consciousness for the true Church of England. Anglicans and Puritans alike loved *Actes*, Gay continues, “[they] memorized it, told their children stories from it [and] the illiterate ‘read’ the narratives through the woodcuts.”³¹⁷ Religious leaders in America constantly referenced Foxe, and the influence of Foxe on New England, as a source of connection to the English past, was so profound that by the time in which Mather was writing, he titles a chapter in his *Magnalia* (Book Five) “Acts and Monuments of the Faith and order in the Churches of New-England.” Kenneth Murdock has suggested that the popularity of the *Actes and Monuments* among New England citizens up until the seventeenth century ranked second only to the Bible, a text read by everyone from clergy to children, and that a great many people received their knowledge of English church history primarily from it.³¹⁸

What was important to New England was the way in which Fox argued for the promise of the true church. Although often misquoted, Foxe was used in such a way that New Englanders unquestionably accepted him as *the* source for English church history. Bradford, especially, was influenced by Foxe’s notion of the martyr, and he relies on Foxe for his model and as source material for *Of Plymouth*, going so far as to trace the Scrooby group’s lineage from Plymouth “to those reformers that stood most steadfast against popery”—the early Anglo-Saxon English

³¹⁷ Peter Gay, *A Loss of Mastery: Puritan Historians in Colonial America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), 15-17.

³¹⁸ See, for instance, *Literature and Theology in Colonial New England* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), 213, and Viggo Nørskov Olsen, *John Foxe and the Elizabethan Church* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 1.

church Foxe details in *Actes*—proving that “while the details might [have differed in points], they resonated closely enough with the Massachusetts vision of the past.”³¹⁹ Similarly, in *The Humble Request* signed during the Great Migration in 1630, Winthrop connects the movement to the true English church, taking the idea from Foxe that non-conforming churches were part of the true English church, the notion that the Gospels brought into Anglo-Saxon England confirmed that lineage. Simply put, early New England’s use of Foxe linked men like Bradford and Winthrop to what they believed was the *true* church, and they were the new Anglo-Saxons martyrs. As Francis Bremer observes, “in arguing for the true essence of the English Church, the colonial clergy were not only linking themselves to a tradition of true faith but were also justifying their decision to reject Separatism.”³³⁴ More than anything else, however, Foxe made Americans more aware that they were *English*; Foxe gave contemporary value to the crossing, which connected Puritans to a noble, historical vision. Foxe’s work provided such a strong link that “he did not contribute to their becoming Americans”; instead, “Foxe reinforced their self identity as Englishmen” and their “Christian right to English roots [making them more] likely to identify themselves with England and the seventeenth-century struggles for the reform of the

³¹⁹ “Foxe in the Wilderness: The *Book of Martyrs in Seventeenth-Century New England*,” *John Foxe at Home and Abroad*, David Loades, ed. (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 112. In fact, a copy of Foxe’s *Actes* was at Bradford’s side as he wrote his history; Douglas Anderson, *William Bradford’s Books: Of Plimmoth Plantation and the Printed Word* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 157.

³³⁴ Bremer concludes, rightly so, I believe, that in opposition to earlier notions, Foxe contributed more to Americans’ idea of themselves as *Englishmen*, not *Americans*. However, as Loades argues, the colonists’ use of Foxe linked them to a past *beyond* contemporary religious factions to what they believed was the true church; thus, colonists such as Richard Mather and John Cotton considered themselves part of the true lineage of Christianity that first arose in ancient England; 111. Bremer does remind us that Separatists argued the Church of England represented an anti-Christian stance; thus, his overall stance, which appears as a negation of Foxe, supports my argument primarily because of what I see as its strength: as he attempts to create an argument that dispels some notions concerning Foxe’s place in the wilderness, Bremer’s attack strengthens the notion that “Americans” saw themselves more in line with an ancient, more likely Saxon, past than was previously conceived; *John Winthrop: America’s Forgotten Founding Father* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 290-95.

English Church.”³³⁵ In this way, then, Foxe buttressed the mission of the colonial churches and served as the link to a glorious ancient past, an authoritative voice behind the New England vision of a religious connection to Christian Saxon liberties free from the constraint of a dominant power. Foxe’s ideological notions of communal identity building through national tales of martyrdom served as a force capable of simultaneously supporting New England’s physical distance and proximity to ancient rights.³²⁰ Thus, it became crucial to manifest the corporeal distance that would provide New England migrants space to reinstitute the myth of migration, for, as in previous Anglo-Saxon conquering of any *insula*, these Christians had won the right to occupy the land *de facto*; a shared and unifying vision of Christian ideals, they felt, gave them that right.

Bradford’s rightful place in the development of American Saxonhood deserves mention because he places the Saxon Christendom model squarely on New World shores with a purpose: to initiate a purposeful social crossing. Soon after the Pilgrims were directed to the funds by James, then, Bradford and company embarked for the New World, where, in autumn 1620, the small group actually found itself heading *away* from Jamestown, somewhere closer to New York; using Smith’s maps, they beached at Cape Cod, some 200 miles outside of the patent

³³⁵ Loades, 111.

³²⁰ Foxe (1516-87) lived for a time with printer John Day, a relationship which provided him easy access to dissemination of his material. What remains important is his interest in promoting the Alfred myth to the English, a myth that would eventually cross to America. As Foxe was always in search of Anglo-Saxon support for Protestant cause, he thought Alfred was an example *du jour* of the archetypal king and used him as an exemplar of what a king should be—“for Protestants, Alfred had the attraction of being a ruler of the English Golden Age, before the entry of Romish corruption”; during Elizabeth’s reign, Alfred even surpassed Arthur in popularity; Clare A. Simmons, *Reversing the Conquest: History and Myth in Nineteenth-Century British Literature* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990), 25. Since Arthur’s “existence” was based on somewhat flimsy evidence, what the English needed was a true historical ruler, someone they could link historically to the Crown, which they found in Alfred. It is true that there were abundant materials on Alfred, but, as Simmons points out, what readers got was Parker’s or Camden’s *interpretation* of Alfredian texts; thus, like Arthur, Alfred becomes an ideological tool; 27-31. Simmons argues “interest in Anglo-Saxon heritage thus became a means of social criticism and a strain in opposition to the celebratory remembrance of King Alfred, under whose leadership the Anglo-Saxon culture had reached its pinnacle”; 34.

boundary and the king's dominion. Bradford, likely taking Smith as a model, composed the smaller *Mourts Relation* about the landing.³²¹ *Mourts* attracted the attention of major English publishers in the same way that Smith's *True Relation* did; in fact, Smith even included a snippet in his *Generall Historie*, and Samuel Purchas's 1625 edition of *Pilgrimes* contains a brief condensation of it. By providing a geography of the region, as well as descriptions of the inhabitants, resources, and climate, *Mourts* essentially serves New England much the same as Smith's brief *True Relation* served Virginia: it geographically marks the literary entrance of its focal point and yields a powerful image for the region's spiritual promise. Clearly, Bede was the model in both cases, mapping out the British Isles before his ecclesiastical history of England.

Thus, just three years before the decimating Indian attacks on Jamestown, the *Mayflower Compact*, drawn up and signed on November 11, became the first legal code of New England. It remained Bradford's sole reassurance that the social group remained an entity. (Solidarity immediately became an issue as Bradford wisely realized that some Englishmen were *not* migrating for religious purposes; some merchants, taking no interest in the Puritan mission, chose to accompany the group for profit's sake alone). The *Compact* is a simple and telling early indicator of the direction of New England Saxonhood for two very important reasons—it emphasizes the importance of migratory group solidarity, and it situates the originary group within the interface of the geographical space of English historiography. In it, we find a definitive statement that links Bradford's "project" with the ancient English church: "All other Churches of Europe are brought to desolation ... and seeing the Church hath no place left to fly into but the wilderness, what better work can there be, than to go and provide tabernacles and

³²¹ Although scholars agree that Bradford authored *Mourts*, Bradford, Edward Winslow, or a third figure, George Morton, were all, at one time, considered to be the author.

food for her when she be restored.” In other words, the “restoration” of the ancient lineage justifies the migration and “permits” the seeds of this originary group to animate this new geographic space for these very reasons.³²²

However, it is in Bradford’s later history, *Of Plymouth*, written some twenty years after the events that took place, that we get a clearer sense of his ecclesiastical vision for New England. Bradford’s decision to write remains an important key to his vision.³²³ The completed text was finally printed in 1647, just two years before Winthrop’s death, and survives as an inconspicuously small volume; at roughly eight by eleven inches, it is nowhere near the size of Foxe’s tome, its inspiration. On his deathbed, Bradford told the only three witnesses to his death—Thomas Cushman, Thomas Southworth, and Nathaniel Morton—about his writings.³²⁴ *Of Plymouth* serves as Bradford’s interpretation of the divine occurrences that beheld the Puritans as instruments, according to Bradford, in God’s providential plan. From the passages flow, with varying degrees of fidelity, an account that reveals the tension in Bradford’s historical

³²² Morison and others have made this point, arguing that an original copy at some point existed; see *OPP*, 75 n. 2.

³²³ The “life” of the text remains interesting as well. In his study of Bradford’s authorial intentions, Douglass Anderson uses contemporary sources to reconstruct the sophisticated and often turbulent textual world in which Bradford wrote, arguing Bradford realized that “making a book could” help to “resemble as well as document the struggles entailed in making and preserving a compact religious and political community”; *William Bradford’s Books: Of Plimmoth Plantation and the Printed Word* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 18. Anderson here hints at an interesting juxtaposition between “resemble” and “document”; as Bradford documented, he could *shape* a history, ultimately for ends *beyond* mere documentation.

³²⁴ Bradford’s original copy now resides in the George Fingold Library of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the basement of the State House of Boston. John Kemp has alluded to the notion that during the Revolutionary War period in America, the book was “lost” for ideological reasons—a “loss” that bolstered the strength of New England ideology when discovered in the nineteenth century. See Kemp’s introduction to *Governor William Bradford’s Letter Book* (Bedford: Applewood, 2002). Unrecorded in Bradford’s will, *Of Plymouth* passed through many hands in New England circles: in his historiography, Increase Mather took the text as fact, as did, later, Cotton for the New England history section of the *Magnalia*. Then, *Of Plymouth* mysteriously disappeared. With no authorial hand to guide it, the small volume fell from circulation, leading a long and circuitous private life that ended only with its return to the public in the nineteenth century. Rediscovered in 1856 by an anonymous cataloguer, quite likely in the bishop of London’s employment, who decided to scrawl “America” across its spine, *Of Plymouth* was mysteriously removed to the Steeple Room of the Old South Church in the New England Library until the twentieth century, when it resurfaced in America; for an in-depth account of this “history” of the history, see Morison’s introduction in *OPP*, esp. xxvii–xxxviii.

imagination between actual, lived experience and “desires of the mind,” as Francis Bacon called them, wherein a “feigned” history is more of a stubborn resistance to the real in favor of the desired.³²⁵ Bradford has a clear narrative style and was a more skilled and cosmopolitan practitioner of historiography than he is given credit for. His depiction of the “rightful” migration to America shows a skilled use of earlier ecclesiastical accounts to shape his own nation-building model. Bradford envisions the Puritan mission as the unfolding of God’s plan for the English, citing Eusebius and Foxe in his introductory paragraphs, and situating himself in a lineage of historical ecclesiastical representations of nationhood and migration.

Unlike Smith’s individual *chevalier*, *Of Plymouth* represents a social vision: it is the textual expression of the community in the Anglo-Saxon tradition. Bradford lived in the juncture of geography and the need for written, historical connection. Thus, he models his own ideas concerning the spread of Christendom to continue the historical Saxon lineage, an idea that was started by St. Augustine with his mission to the Saxons and continued through to Foxe’s written records of Saxon martyrs. Foxe, who publicly promoted the press for spreading the gospels, wrote “God hath opened the presse to preach, whose voice the Pope is never able to stop.”³²⁶ Emphasizing the written word as *act*, he sought to bring England’s ecclesiastical Saxon past to the present. Similarly, Bradford’s *Of Plymouth* seeks to extend this act into the New World. For Bradford, Puritan success is proof of God’s grace and approval of the migration mission—that is, they *must* succeed to carry forward the Anglo-Saxon Christian vision—as well as proof of his own and others’ historical vision, such as that of his Anglo-Saxon predecessors. *Of Plymouth* would record that movement. In Bradford’s understanding, the Leyden group has been granted

³²⁵ *The Two Bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the Proficience and Advancement of learning, divine and humane* (London, 1605) 2:10r, 17v-18r.

³²⁶ Cited in David Loades, “The Press under the Early Tudors,” (1964), 29. See also Anderson, *Bradford’s Book*, 21.

this special providence within the storied English narrative; and, taking his cue from Foxe, Bradford depicted a social crossing that involves written expression.

As such, in Bradford we see the first written social history of American Saxonhood, a connection to the Anglo-Saxon Christendom tradition, part of which involved working together to spread the Saxon message of Christendom. We must remember that this Saxon practice stemmed directly from Augustine. Bede elaborated on this. In *Historia*, he had built upon Gildas's charge that the Britons were consummate sinners; however, Bede added the further damning accusation that they (the Britons) failed to preach to the Saxons upon arrival. Likewise, Bradford's symbolic crossing challenges the collective group. Where in Smith we see the individual working on a level that will move the community through individual heroics, in Bradford we witness more the reshaping of a social *ethnie* to fit in and carry forward the message of Christendom. The final point of the mission, Bradford writes, promoted these ends: "a great hope and inward zeal they had of laying some good foundation (or at least to make some way thereunto) for propagating and advancing the gospel of the Kingdom of Christ in the remote parts of the world, even though they should be but stepping stones to others in the performance of so great a work."³²⁷ But, continues Bradford, "their condition was not ordinary, their ends good and honourable, their calling lawful and urgent."³²⁸ In the Anglo-Saxon tradition, Bede wrote of the early Anglo-Saxon mission to bring Christendom to pagan regions. Bede's was a communal history; he believed it was *written* genealogies, not those oral or sung, which ultimately provide a solid national history. Coming from the monastic tradition, Bede sought to

³²⁷ *OPP* 25.

³²⁸ *Ibid.*, 27.

confirm the social creation of the proper Christendom narrative through the authority of the text.³²⁹

At times, then, Bradford's group emulates the wanderings of the Israelites, the individual's pilgrimage through consciousness to God, and the social movement of a group seeking religious toleration.³³⁰ But we can also read the narrative movement seen in *Of Plymouth* as the renewed connection to the ancient Saxons, who extolled the virtues of the nation as a social place. Bradford seeks to confirm the social authority of the text in *Of Plymouth*. The textual object itself becomes, for Bradford, a community of the book, a documentation of those wanderers who seek to "return" to a homeland. The history properly begins with the flight to Holland and moves to the "fearful storm at sea."³³¹ The next chapters brisk through the period at Holland, Netherlands, and their final removal to the New World. Thus, having weathered one "storm," Bradford hints, the group encounters a series of challenges to their new *terra*. Unlike the itinerant Saxon missionaries, Bradford emphasizes community over individual. As much as Smith's *True Relation* highlighted the heroic actions of the individual, *Of Plymouth* resounds with collective action. Bradford punctuates the text with the communal "we" as a literary trope. Following the sighting of Plymouth, he writes, "we espied land ... the appearance of it comforted us ... it caused us to rejoice together."³³² According to Bradford's report, immediately following

³²⁹ Bede believed that in the power of their texts, scribes could convince kings of the social and communal connections to the ancient past. Working as he did in a closed monastic environment, he was naturally inclined to view this in a social light; see Harris, *Race and Ethnicity*, 175-77.

³³⁰ Alan B. Howard, "Art and History in Bradford's *Of Plymouth Plantation*," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series 28:2 (1971), 237-266.

³³¹ *OPP*, 13.

³³² *OPP* 15, emphasis added. Smith's influence on the Pilgrims was negligible at best, his books serving as their guide to the New World. (Smith, for his part, writes sadly that "my books and maps were much better cheap to teach them, than myself," [*CWJS* 3:221]). Actually, Smith seemed somewhat envious of the Leyden group. In his documentation of the rise of the Plymouth Colony in *New England Trials*, Smith suggests that the pilgrim group was, in fact, the type of social group he wanted to build. Smith writes in "New England Trials" (1622): "It is too well knowne there hath been many undertakers of Patents and such sharing of them, as hath bred no lesse

this introduction to the New World, the Pilgrims set about creating a formal, legal compact, for “observing not some well affected to unity and concord,” they thought it best “there should be an association and agreement that we should combine *together in one body*.”³³³ (Later, in *A dialogue or Third conference between some young men born in New England, and some ancient men which came out of Holland and Old England*, written in 1652 during his focus on more spiritual and intellectual development, Bradford would expand this argument, further maintaining that true religion transcended national boundaries but not national characteristics; true religion, Bradford here argues, is best represented in an emigration not *from* but *to* a new geographic land in order to strengthen the unity between the true Church and the New World.) This textual presence reminds the reader of the social presence of an ancient Christian past, a tradition within which the New England region will unite.

Bradford’s symbolic challenges to the community (such as the “fearful storm”) develop most fully into the figure of Thomas Morton. The notorious character of Morton represents a dichotomy in Bradford’s thought, one that complicates and unsettles his historical vision. Morton becomes the representative outlaw in New World history. The notion of embedding martyrs in

discouragement than wonder, to heare such great promises and so little performances”; 1:440. One of the “performances” in particular impressed Smith: “Master Peirce” and “a few private adventurers” promoted their *own* brand of liberty, claims Smith. Peirce, it will be remembered, was actually an English clothier whose patent in 1620 replaced the Wincop Patent, becoming the primary patent for the Leyden group. In fact, the 1619 patent to John Wincop, pastor and “friend” of the Leyden pilgrims, mysteriously “appeared.” Wincop was the tutor in the household of Thomas Fiennes-Clinton, third earl of Lincoln, whose daughters were among the first settlers in New England. Wincop’s patent was one of what the Virginia Company of London called “Hundreds,” or “Particular Plantations.” The company passed out hundreds of these patents, which offered self government to interested groups. Thus, through Sandys, the Leiden group obtained not one but two patents—Wincop’s and Peirce’s, neither of which they used, since they landed farther from the Hudson region. Bradford and Smith did meet at least once. For his part, however, Bradford remains somewhat vague about Smith’s involvement, but Darrett B. Rutman claims that there was a deeper connection, that Smith writes “in veiled language [that] he had conferred with the Pilgrim leaders” secretly but “that they had refused him as a guide, trusting to his published Description and map.” Rutman points out that like the Pocahontas story, this is an “added” version of events, since the assertions are missing from his earlier works; “The Pilgrims and Their Harbor,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser. 17:2 (1960), 164-182.

³³³ *OPP* 17, emphasis added.

the public memory was not new, nor was the literary technique of creating a colorful villain. In the Elizabethan period, authors such as Richard Verstegan in *Theatrum Crudelitatum Haereticorum Nostri Temporis* (1592) impressed images of tortured martyrs visually in woodcuts for Elizabethans; similarly, Foxe's *Actes*, complete with its accompanying woodcuts, depicted providential martyrs. For a largely non-literate society, such images also forged unity in the group: they served as a constant reminder of the providential struggle and what *could* happen should the church lose control. Bradford's adaptation of this stock figure to written history transfers these models—and these fears—to the New World, invoking empathy for the martyr, in this case the whole group of Puritans, in contrast to the foil in the character of Morton.

Through not explicitly racist but thoroughly artful rhetoric, Bradford's Morton illustrates the nascent notion that, having escaped the physical bonds of England, "invasion" of the divine promise might be defeated from *within*, rather than from without. In line with the ideologically-based race theories that began to develop during this time—Las Casas's, for example, depiction of Spain's brutal treatment of the Indians, recounted in Hakluyt's *Discourse on Western Planting* (1584) infused the English with the idea that somehow, perhaps, they would act differently if English mixed with native Indians—Morton represents a Christian fall from Saxon roots. The fiction of a "lower" race, in this case Indians (and, later, Africans) did exist so that between the imaginatively and experientially "lived" worlds there existed the possibility of physical reduction in race, a reversion to the primitive state of mankind. Primitive peoples were depicted as better adapted to the savagery of forest life, or so the argument ran. But this darker, more threatening claim also argued for either assimilation or eradication as the only possible means for refinement. In other words, primitive life must somehow be civilized.

The account of Morton's rebellion, denunciation, retreat to "Merrymount," and eventual

capture illustrates a certain racial language that was constructed out of an Anglo-Saxon cultural tradition in the guise of a threatening Other. Anglo-Saxon literature famously positioned tropes of “good” and “evil” in terms of heroes and monsters; later, following the Saxon conversion, these were reformulated in a Christian model. In the 1570 version of *Actes*, Foxe included a large amount of new Saxon material, including, importantly, Ælfric’s “Easter Sermon,” a text with which Bradford would have been acquainted.³³⁴ Symbols of good and evil abound in Ælfric’s sermon, and Ælfric emphasizes spreading the gospel and the power of this connection to the good for the social group. Transferred to the New World, these tropes become the synthesis of heroic and ecclesiastical notions of good and evil. In the New World, this opposition positioned whites against the American Indians, and against all people of “lower races” and “lower states of civilization,” a trend that later shifted to *all* persons of questionable descent—in short, all those *not* Anglo-Saxon. An early depiction of this state of nature, Morton offers Bradford a foil to the Puritan mission.

As a narrative figure, Morton becomes a literary trope used to symbolize God’s opponents (and, by extension, the archetypal enemy of the Puritan mission). Bradford describes Morton as a rebel having “more craft then honestie,” an adventurer having “had some small adventure (of his owne or other mens) amongst [the men of Mount Wollaston]; but had litle respecte amongst them, and was sleighted by the meanest servants.”³³⁵ Figuratively, he threatens Christendom. Morton’s character embodies an evil that forecasts possible deterioration—of both colony, in the smaller sense, *and*, in the larger idea, of the lineage of Christendom. Following the

³³⁴ Ælfric (d. 1005) was Abbot of Eynsham. His Easter Sermon, an Anglo-Saxon version, was printed by John Day in 1566 in Day’s *A Testimonie of Antiquity*. Importantly Ælfric’s accounts of Christ’s Resurrection involved examples of how the Holy Spirit empowered people to spread the gospels; Kees Dekker, “Pentecost and Linguistic Self-Consciousness in Anglo-Saxon England: Bede and Ælfric,” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 104:3 (2005), 356.

³³⁵ *OPP*, 204.

infamous incident at Merrymount, Bradford contends, “Morton became lord of misrule, and maintained (as it were) a school of Athisme.”³³⁶ This charge came from the fact that Morton composed verses, traded with the Indians and French, and, in general symbolized corruption. Because of this narrative build up, his subsequent capture is loaded with symbolic details: “they found him to *stand stifly in his defence*, having *made fast his dors*, *armed his consorts*, set diverse dishes of *powder and bullets ready* on the table; and if they had not been *over armed with drinke*, more hurt might have been done.”³³⁷ This scene, which depicts Morton amidst his band of Atheists, paints a visual portrait of the forecast of doom upon which Bradford wishes the reader to reflect. In an authorial aside directed at the reader, Bradford forecasts dark days ahead:

O that princes and parlements would take some timly order to prevente this mischeefe; and at length to suppress it, by some exemplerie punishments upon some of these gains thirstie murderers, (for they deserve no better title,) before their coloonies in these parts be over throwne by these barbarous savages, thus armed with their owns weapons, by these evill instruments, and traytors to their neighbors and cuntrie.³³⁸

The narrative representation of the “re-fall” of the civilized white Saxon, Morton—as a literary character for Bradford *and* in his own writing—functions to serve as a foil for individual and state. He represents the corrupted individual and symbolizes social corruption. Further, Morton presents a problem to the migration myth: his place in the narrative serves to question the validity of the justified migration to another land, a geographical space already populated with inhabitants.

³³⁶ Ibid., 205.

³³⁷ Ibid., 209.

³³⁸ Ibid., 208.

Historically speaking, Morton's verified history with New England ran deep. Briefly, he was one of the merchant classes backed by Ferdinand Gorges to bring in indentured workers for the Virginia tobacco crop.³³⁹ As Bradford's descriptions of him attest, Morton was twice tried for infractions in New England, initially for his involvement in the famous Merrymount episode, and twice returned to England, ultimately charged with both empowering Virginia servants to seek their liberty and introducing gunpowder and also affiliating with the Indians. Finally exiled in 1630, Morton composed his *New English Canaan*. Afterward, Morton attacked the Massachusetts Bay Company, winning a lawsuit and, in a strange turn of events, becoming legal council of the company. He had some sway in the ultimate revocation of the charter—the major project of Charles I, who constantly struggled against the Puritans—thus further weakening the already tenuous social bonds in the Massachusetts Bay area. In one sense, then, Bradford's fears were realized.

In 1637, Morton published his own version of events. *Canaan*, the antithesis for the Bradfordian idea of New Israel, levels a vitriolic attack on Puritan practices. As such, Morton's narrative provides an excellent account against which we can read the dominant New England histories. For his part, Morton was trying to do more than simply mix with the Indians; his subtly crafted argument spins a wider web than that. In an intriguing argument that highlights Morton's push for a more diverse population, the very fear Bradford was addressing, Matt Cohen argues that the *Canaan* makes a "sophisticated argument for a plural, literate culture of intellectual

³³⁹ Bradford writes that Morton came with Wollonstone: "Captaine Wolastone, (a man of pretie parts and with him 3. or 4. more of some eminentie, who brought with them a great many servants, with provisions and other implements for to begane a plantation; and pitched them selves in a place within the Massachusets, which they called, after their Captains name, Mount-Wollaston. Amongst whom was one Mr. Morton, who, it should seems, had some small adventure (of his owne or other mens) amongst them"; *OPP*, 204.

exchange.”³⁴⁰ Essentially, Morton wanted to be as powerful, in a literary sense, as Bradford was, and he knew that differences in language and customs reflect differences in ethnography and history. If he could decentralize this literary culture, he could perhaps help fashion or construct a culture with more immediate discourses centered upon its multiple, and sometimes disjointed, parts.³⁴¹ In short, Morton *did* want what Bradford feared: he wanted New England to be more inclusive of its multiculturalism, to include Indians as members of a certain new geographic area, and to create a more diverse population than that of the “Israelites” who would, in the Bedean sense, shape a nation based upon insularity.

The context of *Of Plymouth* transplants Bradford’s history to a setting far greater than simply the New World: its conclusion must be *more* than simply the continuation of English history in the New World. Reflections in history remain fundamental to notions of race and lineage. Similarly, at the conclusion of his narrative, Bradford pensively reflects on what he wishes the reader to have witnessed in his retelling of the story:

I cannot but here take occasion, not only to mention, but greatly to admire the marvelous providence of God! That notwithstanding the many changes and hardships that these people went through, and the many enemies they had and difficulties they met with all, that so many of them should live to very old age!³⁴²

In this sense, Bradford’s work emphasizes purposeful reflection on all that has happened. “What was it then that upheld them?” Bradford asks rhetorically, answering, “It was Gods visitation that

³⁴⁰ “Morton’s Maypole and the Indians: Publishing in Early New England,” *Book History* 5 (2002), 6.

³⁴¹ David Read makes this point in his chapter on Morton in “Thomas Morton’s *New English Canaan*” in *New World, Known World: Shaping Knowledge in Early Anglo-American Writing* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005); see esp. 89-92.

³⁴² *OPP*, 328.

preserved their spirits.”³⁴³ Put into narrative form, Bradford’s exegetical “reading” becomes history. Again, Bede was the model. In his *Historia*, Bede presents a “young church born of the feats of great evangelists, wracked at first by a dispute over customs, saved from schism by a pivotal church council, and then blessed by miracles in a show of divine favor toward a new Christian people destined to preach the Gospel even beyond the seas.”³⁴⁴ For Bradford, *Of Plymouth* traces the paths of evil the Pilgrims encountered, of which Morton was symbolic, and shows the divine outcome.

This narrative manipulation was a purely ancient English technique. The path of evil represented, for Bradford, the more secular Indian obstacles in Smith’s New World narrative. The difference can be seen in Bradford’s borrowing of the ecclesiastical vision. At the close of *De Excidio*, Gildas had stressed faith in the few good shepherds and warned against the destructive forces of the “common enemy”:

May the same Almighty God, of all consolation and mercy, preserve his few good pastors from all evil, and (the common enemy being overcome) make them free inhabitants of the heavenly city of Jerusalem, which is the congregation of all saints; grant this, O Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to whom be honour and glory, world without end.³⁴⁵

In Gildas, “the common enemy” stands as representative of the invading force that must be overcome; the “few good pastors” symbolize those who take his prophecy seriously. For Gildas, integration from the outside represented doom, for the invasion is both spiritual *and* corporeal—

³⁴³ Ibid.

³⁴⁴ Roger Ray, “Historiography,” *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, Frank Anthony Carl Mantello and A. G. Rigg, eds. (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996), 643.

³⁴⁵ Gildas: *De Excidio Brittonum*, trans. John Allan Giles, *Six Old English Chronicles, of which two are now first translated from the monkish Latin originals* (London, George Bell and Sons, 1891), 388.

Saxon invaders will destroy the common bond of the Britons. Bradford imagines a similar fate. Writing almost twenty years after Morton's troubles in New England, Bradford imagines the socio-ideological threat of integration: "Oh! that princes and parliaments would take some timely order to prevent this mischief; and at length to suppress it ... before their colonies in these parts be overthrown by these barbarous savages, thus armed with their own weapons, by these evil instruments, and traitors to their neighbors and country."³⁴⁶ Had not Morton been exiled, Bradford claims, "this mischief would quietly spread over all."³⁴⁷ This is Bradford at his most alarmingly straightforward and racially most questionable. Not only can a figure such as Morton affect changes in the outcome of the plantation, Bradford cautions, he can also precipitate the refall for the entire group. For in Morton, Bradford is portraying the very real possibility of a second Fall, in this case the fall from the *promise* of a paradise rather than from an actual paradise itself. Morton, then transplanted from the Old Eden, becomes the archetypal English man but fallen in the New Eden; he stands for the threat to the link to Anglo-Saxon Christendom. "It was clear to Bradford that the 'Ancient Church' was one of the principal progenitors of the Plymouth venture," as David B. Quinn argues, and "this mischief" spurred by Morton's interaction with the Indians threatened the hope of a pure lineage, transposed to a new geographic paradise with the promise of salvation to become part of the new Exodus.³⁴⁸ Symbolically, for Bradford, this follows the direct path of the ancient English church.

³⁴⁶ *OPP*, 208.

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁴⁸ *England and the Discovery of America, 1481-1620, from the Bristol Voyages of the Fifteenth Century to the Pilgrim Settlement at Plymouth: The Exploration, Exploitation, and Trial-and-Error Colonization of North America by the English* (New York: Knopf, 1974), 363.

* * * * *

The new Exodus was most formally introduced in the massive Great Migration of 1630 by John Winthrop.³⁴⁹ Winthrop takes from Bradford the idea of an heroic endeavor and transforms it into a newer version of Saxon Christendom, wherein Anglo-Saxon notions of a covenant with God inform Winthrop's desire to further unify New England. The two men actually met in December of 1631. When Bradford was busily working on *Of Plymouth* and Winthrop was garnering material and ideas for his treatise, they held extensive visits, both influencing the other's work. Winthrop's New England was a far cry from the joint stock program initiated by the Virginia Company in Virginia—and it was just as far from Bradford's world. Although structurally organized in much the same way, the venture provided for the development of self-governance, thus eliminating any ties to Old England; his migrant passengers were wealthier than those in Virginia and most of Bradford's, most of them paying their own ways and coming with purchasing power. By this time, too, the old New England Company, formed to serve immigration to Salem in 1629 as a religious haven, had evolved into the Massachusetts Bay Company, a group that catered mostly to aristocratic Puritans and wealthy London merchants. Banded together under Winthrop's leadership, these one thousand-odd New England-bound immigrants owed no one and, led by wealthy pastors and clergymen, were intent on creating an autonomous society free from the transatlantic meddling of Charles I. Thus, the highly organized migration, which started with Winthrop's group in 1630, ultimately brought to the New World a somewhat balanced society in the range of some 25,000 immigrants, consisting

³⁴⁹ Richard S. Dunn makes these points; *The Journal of John Winthrop, 1630-1649*, Richard S. Dunn and Laetitia Yeandle, eds. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), xxxv.

of tradesmen, artisans, and religious leaders, leaving a large imprint on the step of Bradford's first, arguably "peaceable," mission.

Building upon Bradford, Winthrop emphasized the idea of a spiritual unification carried forward from past ecclesiastical historians, the notion of a covenant with God, something that had been an Anglo-Saxon migration and cohesion technique since Bede first aligned it with the English people in his *gens Anglorum*. Liberty and religious freedom as Bede wrote about them were, at the time, attractive historical notions, and as a well-educated man, Winthrop was no doubt familiar with Bede and his *Historia*. Calvin B. Kendall has elaborated on Bede's dichotomy of Old and New World, arguing that in Bede, we see a pairing in Anglo-Saxon thought of "Old Israel" and "New Israel," which privileges the younger, more migratory party.³⁵⁰ In Anglo-Saxon history, following Gildas, Bede was the one to create the *topos* of Chosen people: adapting England's tempestuous historical narrative, Bede applied it to England's destruction on account of their violation of the Covenant with God.³⁵¹ Winthrop did the same for North America. Following what he envisioned as a successful ideological myth, Winthrop became very much a part of what Stephen Innes has called the milieu of the seventeenth-century English people, "deeply influenced by the widely shared and culturally potent concept of the 'freeborn Englishman,' dating ... in some ways back to the *gens Anglorum* of the Venerable Bede."³⁵² Using Bede as his model, Winthrop builds upon Bradford's sense of group to further

³⁵⁰ The actual formula is this: Bede's Christians descend biologically from Japheth (third son of Noah), but typologically from Shem (the first son)—this becomes symbolic for the "Old" and "New" Covenant. Further, Ishmael represents the Old and Isaac the new, and so forth, until the Anglo-Saxons represent the new from the Israelites; see Kendall's introduction in *Bede: On Genesis*, Translated Texts for Historians 48 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008), esp. 26-7.

³⁵¹ Gildas considered the Britons' moral lapses so great they were in fact *Saxons* themselves in spirit; he called them the "princes of Sodom," referring to what he thought were the unspeakable sexual practices representing a complete fall from bond with God; Higham, 204.

³⁵² *Creating the Commonwealth: The Economic Culture of Puritan New England* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1995), 51.

shape the new *gens*, New Englanders, who maintain a clear compact with God and a divine plan, his covenant borrowing from Gildas the faith in its achievement and, from Bede, the idea of providential Saxon history.

In the spring of 1630, Winthrop delivered his famous sermon on board the *Arabella* to the migrating congregation, proposing the now legendary idea of a covenant with God. Winthrop's "Modell of Christian Charity" is his most Bede-like effort, adapting his message to the concept of spiritual kinship in an ecclesiastical lineage carried forward from England.³⁵³ The "Modell" has been called the "Ur-text" of American nationhood, a "social gospel," justifying the action in a strictly communal context and vocabulary.³⁵⁴ Winthrop's direct influence was in fact Foxe, to whom he had a rather close association; his paternal grandfather, William, had supplied Foxe with a large portion of his materials for *Actes* during his days of battling with the Papists and was closely associated with Foxe, John Field, and other Protestant reformers.³⁵⁵ In "Modell," Winthrop carries forward this family connection and ties the Great Migration to Foxe's notion of the unfolding of the Christian church, the true apostolic origins of the Church of England. As with the English Protestant struggles, Winthrop calls for community solidarity to unite a *New England* congregation to the true church and avoid certain "shipwrecks" waiting for those who do not cohere.

However, Winthrop follows Bede's historical adaptation of the Saxons as the Chosen People. The purpose of Bede's history was to encourage rulers and citizens to do good and avoid

³⁵³ I use "spiritual kinship" in the ancient Anglo-Saxon social sense, whereby the king "adopts" his followers in a literal and figurative manner. Joseph H. Lynch traces this practice from its development in and around the Anglo-Saxon period, especially in Alfred's reign, for reasons of group solidarity; *Christianizing Kinship: Ritual Sponsorship in Anglo-Saxon England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).

³⁵⁴ Andrew Delbanco, *The Puritan Ordeal* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 72, and Bremer, 293.

³⁵⁵ Field was actually Foxe's protégé. He and John Dee, whom Foxe called "a great conjurer," had both been examined by the Privy Council on charges of conjuring and witchcraft.

evil; he presents the conquest of Britain and the rise of the Saxon kings as part of God's divine plan. Bede writes of the Christian model the Saxons, under Alfred, displayed. Winthrop's familiar exegesis of Matthew 5.14 follows this hermeneutic style: "wee must Consider that wee shall be as a Citty upon a Hill, the eies of all people are uppon us,"—the fate of the Protestant lineage, from Foxe to the present, relies on them—and, Winthrop warns, "wee shall be made a story and a byword through the world, wee shall open the mouthes of enemies to speake evill of the wayes of god and all professours for Gods sake."³⁵⁶ The power of this claim lies in its double meaning. While taking on Bede's historical vision, Winthrop infuses a Gildean portent. In fact, nowhere in Winthrop's writing does the ghost of Gildas shine more clearly. In *De Excidio*, Gildas denounces the sins of the clergy. Likewise, Winthrop proclaims that in order to become the final culmination of the Protestant effort from the Anglo-Saxons through to Foxe, they must *all* become one, martyrs every one, for the providential can only become saviors by becoming destroyers.

What Winthrop accomplished in the development of American Saxonhood in New England was what Bradford neglected to realize: Winthrop promoted a common identity that arose from a constructed "memory" of an archetype of Saxon identity leading back to the true church, a vision of *necessary* migration that, in turn, relied on defenses for existence. By further infusing this identity with a migration mission tied to religious liberty, which develops out of Anglo-Saxon migratory practices, their notion of *settling* and *conquering*, and the drive for freedom from religious persecution, Winthrop discovered a vivid and historical imagery to recreate a dispossessed peoples' journey. He improved on Bradford's ideological move in a very

³⁵⁶ "A Modell of Christian Charity" (1630), *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3rd series, vol. 7 (Boston, 1838), 47.

dramatic manner, locating all of New England history in a dark and patristic regional centrism based in the notion of a genetic *ethnie* out of which national culture blossoms. In a sense, Winthrop provided the racial cause. His was a sense of spiritual and cultural identity not unlike Alfred's coalescence of the Anglo-Saxons in his creation of the first arguably "English" nation; for Alfred's England, as for Winthrop's *New England*, "this shared sense of religious and ethnic identity forms the kernel of each idea of 'nationhood.'"³⁵⁷ Thus, in Winthrop we find the more sinister foundational seeds of New England Saxonhood *ethnogenesis*, firmly planted within the Anglo-Saxon Christian lineage, and expressed not in Christianity or Christian terms, as so many have articulated, but through the evolution of Anglo-Saxon Christendom, a geographic notion of land-based conquering.

In fact, much of Winthrop's strong Christology myth comes from Foxe's notions of the Church of Rome's incorporation of newer models of Christianity, seen clearly in the Norman subjugation of the ancient church and Saxon liberties, and his arguing for the ancient church as microcosm of the history of the world. "Initially," as Richard S. Dunn has observed, "Winthrop believed—as he declared in 'A Modell of Christian Charity'—that God intended the colonists to build a united covenanted community in Massachusetts."³⁵⁸ Dunn argues, however, Winthrop's ever-growing and stolid symbolism of "good" and "bad"—first evident in intercolonial figures, such as Thomas Morton, and moving to the regional skepticism of neighboring colonies, such as Rhode Island—became so extraordinarily insular that from his arrival, he enacted a series of calculating moves to deter separatism and create a unified "state."³⁵⁹ He challenged any authority

³⁵⁷ Harris has articulated these views on Alfred in his "The Alfredian *World History*," 482.

³⁵⁸ From Dunn's introductory remarks in *Journal of John Winthrop*, xxxiii.

³⁵⁹ Winthrop was, essentially, *de facto* "ruler" of the state upon his arrival in Massachusetts, as Edmund S. Morgan points out in his groundbreaking and still relevant work, *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1958). The problem was twofold: the group accepted a commission that directed them to

outside of New England proper; to him, Massachusetts *was* the governing power. This line of thinking became evident in his dealings with Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson in the so-called Antinomian Crisis, especially since both were dependent on Christian values and the ideological power of a national socio-historical narrative.³⁶⁰ And Winthrop was not interested in democratic politics for New England; in fact, “the legislative power [in Winthrop’s mind] was lodged not in the people but in the select group.”³⁶¹ Winthrop’s greatest contribution to American Saxonhood is his marshalling of New England people, whether literally or symbolically, into a firm and cohesive group complete with a proud ancient history. Under his guidance, American Saxonhood found its shape in early New England. “Winthrop,” Emerson would later write, “is our Venerable Bede.”³⁶²

* * * * *

The Pequot War, fueled by the competition between the Pequots, Narragansetts, English and Dutch for commercial control of the Connecticut River, provided New England writers with an ideological outlet through which they could historically connect to ancient struggles for

follow a certain body of principles, but one of these principles was, by definition, the encouragement of the development of schism. Accordingly, Morgan sees the state as charged with “maintaining the colony’s commission” and “suppressing heresy,” but the largest role was yet undefined—and Winthrop stepped in to assume command for his own ends; 82-3.

³⁶⁰ For his part, Williams’ vision of community was, at the time, very pluralistic; going very much against Winthrop, he championed small intergroup discourse as a way of peaceful coexistence. Williams actually employed the ship metaphor, arguing with it a shared communal existence with certain shared interests. He states, “the ship of the commonwealth must share her weal’s and woes in common”; those on board should help, but all share the same “consciousness of the passengers,” he argues, “whether Jews, Turks, Persians, pagans, Papists [or] Protestants”; *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams*, Perry Miller, ed. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963) 7:209.

³⁶¹ Morgan, 94.

³⁶² *The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson: Volume 6, 1824-1838*, Ralph H. Orth, ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), 130.

freedom, as well as use for geographical and symbolic differentiation.³⁶³ The tension in New England between Christendom and heathendom was not a new struggle, and New Englanders began, like their ancient English counterparts, to document histories of these struggles, narratives structured around symbolic dark and light, good and evil. Stories of the Anglo-Saxon triumphs over the Danes had been written in the wider context of English history as the triumphs of Christianity over paganism; these had been easily assimilated into New England culture by 1634, the outset of the Pequot War. The earlier Anglo-Saxon narratives were intended to have a social effect, as Bede argued in his *Ecclesiastical History*, often validating the organic ethnic community that extended throughout all of Anglo-Saxon England, which culminated in Alfred's unification of the English nation state.³⁶⁴ Once again, this national narrative sought to reform the land into the home of the socio-historical group who now stood to conquer and demarcate—New England's place within the unification narrative remained central.

The final slaughter at Mystic River provided a setting in the new land that was manipulated by both Winthrop and Bradford, and this manifestation served America as part of the New England *mythos* for some 200-odd years. In narratives that functioned in much the same way as old Anglo-Saxon national struggle narratives, the narratives put forth by the four survivors contextualized the Puritan violence at Mystic in an ethical frame that seeks to “purchase belief,” as Phillip Gould observes, which they did. In essence, later New England historians, largely under Foxe's influence, began to create their *own* book of martyrs within the

³⁶³ Rapid English expansion in the 1630s in the Pequot region (what is now Connecticut) was the cause of the war, the first major conflict between Pilgrims and Native Americans. The war, which lasted from 1634-38, started with the murders of John Stone and trader John Oldham and sparked a retaliation of the English against the Pequots, which climaxed on May 26, 1637, when John Mason's soldiers torched a village on Mystic River, claiming around 500 lives. The brutal massacre at Mystic established New England dominance for nearly two generations.

³⁶⁴ These are recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, especially in Alfred's reign, where the bulk of the Viking attacks are recorded. These texts, Stephen J. Harris argues, present a common ethnic identity; *Race and Ethnicity in Anglo-Saxon Literature* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 104-5.

newly-emergent New England cultural landscape.³⁶⁵ For his part, Winthrop, whose journal was most often cited in later histories as source material of the massacre, tried to see iconic symbolism in the destruction; he actually envisioned an intense, and perhaps threatening, racial consciousness developing in the Pequot resistance to the English. Fearing the growing threat of the Other, Winthrop warned that the safety of the English identity in New England was at stake. He then instituted a “body metaphor,” which served as an imaginative boundary, a link between an historical racial bonding in the race as “one kind” of citizen, as well as functioning as a geographical association. “What warrant have we to take that lande which is and has been of longe tyme possessed of other sonnes of Adam?” Winthrop asked, rhetorically. He furnished two responses, arguing, “God hath consumed the natives with a miraculous plague” that left large tracts of land free; these tracts are free, Winthrop believes, since they have no “title or propertye.”³⁶⁶ Here, Winthrop assumes a stance akin to English writers who did not idealize the Other—as, we might argue, Bradford, and to a certain degree, Smith, earlier had done—continuing a practice that despised and vilified primitive societies.³⁶⁷ He argues for quick control, claiming the “first [order is] the importance of the worke tendinge to the enlargement of the Kingdome of Jesus Christ and winning them out of the snare of the Divell and converting others of them by their means” before the diligence of Catholic missionaries are able to “enlarge the kingdome of Antichrist.”³⁶⁸ Bradford, on the other hand, symbolically links the Pequots in *Of*

³⁶⁵ See “Catharine Sedgwick’s ‘Recital’ of the Pequot War,” *American Literature* 66 (1994): 644-45.

³⁶⁶ Winthrop, “General Observations, Autograph Draft,” and “Reasons to be Considered,” in *Winthrop Papers*, 5 vols. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1929-1947) 2:117, 140-41.

³⁶⁷ Winthrop, in a sense, borrows a tactic from various Elizabethan military writers, who first introduced this technique in discussions of Ireland, where reassurance was sought in comparison with other, more “uncivil” and nomadic societies: writers “needed to make the land seem more desirable but its people reprehensible”; Anne Laurence, “The Cradle to the Grave: English Observations of Irish Social Customs in the Seventeenth. Century,” *Seventeenth Century* 3:1 (1988), 65.

³⁶⁸ *Winthrop Papers*, Allyn B. Forbes et al, eds. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1968) 2:145-46.

Plymouth to the magistrates at Massachusetts Bay, creating an ecclesiastical vision in the network of relationships between the French and English and the web of various smaller English groups.

Bradford, then, held a much different view. Including Winthrop's letter in with other documents, Bradford metaphorically steps outside of history, foreshadowing Mather's later practice of *imitatio auctorum* in his *Magnalia Christi Americana*. He subtly argues that Winthrop and the Pequots were both equally coercive in their strategies for New England domination, and that power and control were evident in each of their respective goals. Simply put, Bradford felt a kinder respect for the Indians, appearing at times equally disturbed at Winthrop's machinations.³⁶⁹ Ultimately, the link between religion and community that shaped the later texts of Cotton Mather was first established within the narrative found in Winthrop's and Bradford's use (and misuse) of the Mystic River incident.³⁷⁰

³⁶⁹ Various Native American tribes played a different, more explicit role in the New England vision of American Saxonhood than they did in Virginia; there was no manipulation of literary representations as in Chapter Two, which examined the Pocahontas myth as it pertained to John Smith's participation in the development of American Saxonhood in Virginia. The contrast between Bradford and Mather is worth noting, however. Interestingly, it was actually Smith who related the information about Tisquantum, or "Squanto"—that he had been captured by Thomas Hunt (in Smith's absence), taken to Spain to be sold as a slave, and returned to America, fluent in English. In this narrative, however, the Indian figure plays less of a part than in Virginia. Squanto lived for a period in both Spain and England, taking passage to the New England coast under Ferdinand Gorges's mission with Captain Thomas Dermer, with whom he had resided in England. Squanto returned to New England and was introduced to Bradford's Separatists by Samoset in the winter of 1620. Bradford took an especially keen interest in Squanto, often rescuing him from Massasoit and, with Standish, saving him from certain death. In short, Squanto played an important part. Following this, the Pilgrims and Squanto had several run-ins with the great Sachem ruling over that part of Massachusetts, Chief Massasoit, leader of the Wampanoags, until they arrived at a treaty. This tenuous relationship with the Wampanoags, however, infuriated the Narragansetts, who openly declared war on the Englishmen. Squanto had been involved with both Massasoit, who eagerly wanted his knowledge of English and the Englishmen to help, and Bradford, who needed a go-between, wishing to remain important to both Indians and English. Thus, Bradford wished to remain less explicit than Mather regarding Indian policy and its importance in New England Saxonhood.

³⁷⁰ I am indebted to Stephen J. Harris for these observations on Alfred; *Race and Ethnicity*, 103-5. Alfred's characterization was thus: "Ac hit gelamp þæt we ealle on hædenum folc gebrocude wæron" (But [then] it came about that we were all oppressed by the heathen people); *Alfred the Great: Asser's 'Life of King Alfred' and other contemporary sources*, trans. Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge (London: Penguin, 1983), 174. An important point here is that *folc* is the Anglo-Saxon gloss of *ecclesia*, which shows the strong connection between religion and community; Harris makes this point; *Race and Ethnicity*, 229 n. 85.

COTTON MATHER’S NEW ENGLAND: AMERICAN SAXONHOOD JUSTIFIED

By the late seventeenth century, many various sects of religion and religious communities existed in New England, so it becomes increasingly more complicated to generalize about early American religious structure at this time. We can say for certain, however, that in the main, churches functioned as bastions of communal identity and civic practices. In this sense, colonial New England inadvertently found itself in a situation similar to that of late-Anglo-Saxon England, and colonial churches performed the symbiotic duties of religious and civic order handed to them from the seeds of Alfred’s Christian reign. Unlike in Alfred’s England, however, a disconnect between church and state remained. As V.L. Parrington claims, early Puritan governmental meetings were not democratic; the meetings separated duties of deputies and magistrates, and, Parrington argues, established the grounds for conflict in the ensuing struggle for power.³⁷¹ In *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650*, Perry Miller has, like Parrington, argued for a separation in class structure, claiming that the laws were enacted by a few members of the elite Massachusetts “aristocracy,” a group in which the Mather family played a foundational role.³⁷² By Charles II’s time, connections to church and state were so tenuous, as the early Massachusetts government was busily trying to extricate the colony from England’s legal grasp, that Charles became especially apprehensive of the Bay colony and its reluctance to adhere to English laws; and, after numerous warnings and investigations, the colony finally lost its charter in 1684.

³⁷¹ Vernon L. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought, vol. 1: The Colonial Mind, 1620-1800* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1927), 18-50. The initial decree, from the patent given by James I in 1629, held that a company of paying members and stakeholders would make laws governing company affairs in New England. Thus, the question of “freemanship” arises—and with it issues of voting rights. The charter was used as a sort of “constitution” at first, providing a temporary and unified plan that later became altered as needed.

³⁷² *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933), 243-44.

Historically, then, New England still remained in a state of flux. Like Alfred for the Anglo-Saxons, the Mathers attempted to create unity. In Cotton Mather's first month as a "formally committed Christian," writes David Levin, "[Increase] led an extraordinary session of all the churches in the colony to muster the energy of the entire commonwealth for a revival of the kind of religious faith that ushered in political action."³⁷³ New England was not only a haven for religious dissenters and seekers, it was a vast, unchartered frontier for pioneering economic ventures.³⁷⁴ These disparate conditions, coupled with growing power and defiance in the Massachusetts Bay, had earlier forced the Crown to attempt a commission in 1664, a year after Mather's birth, to settle existing boundary disputes and, most importantly, to reel in an ever-growing governmental structure to obey the Crown and Parliament. But while commissioners were successful in every other colony, the Bay Colony leaders refused this mandate, rejecting *any* attempt from the Crown to encroach on their governmental structure, showing how liberally New England had, at that time, interpreted its privileges, and evidencing how little control, out of any place in America, the Crown had on that region.³⁷⁵ Echoing Bradford and Winthrop, a carefully crafted rejoinder issued by New Englanders in 1665 claimed that they had come to the wilderness to "live a poore and a quiet life in the corner of the world" and that they "keep [themselves] within [their] line and medle not with matters abroad." In truth, they asserted, it was "a great unhappiness ... to destroy our oune being ... or to yield up our liberties, which are farr

³⁷³ *Cotton Mather: The Young Life of the Lord's Remembrancer 1663-1703* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), 74. It must be remembered here that "commonwealth" differed from "colony" or even burgeoning ideas of "nation," for the authorities in Massachusetts, while professing loyalty to the Crown, were at the same time insisting upon a separate integrity for religious freedom.

³⁷⁴ The Plymouth Colony (1620), The Massachusetts Bay Colony (1629), and Maryland, founded by Lord Baltimore (1633) were all founded on religious liberty. Similarly, surrounding inland areas such as Pennsylvania, settled by the Quaker Penn, were modeled on these early colonies.

³⁷⁵ Jack Greene makes this point in his introduction to "Obstacles to Enforcing Imperial Policy," *Great Britain and the American Colonies, 1606-1763*, Jack P. Greene, ed. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970), 62.

dearer to us than our lives.”³⁷⁶ The liberty they chose to enjoy was that of the free and democratic peoples from whence they originated—the Anglo-Saxons. Thus, like England during the tenuous years of Foxe and other antiquarians who carefully constructed arguments in support of the Protestant movement from the shards of old Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, Mather’s New England in the late seventeenth century was fraught with a checkerboard of religious and political agendas and missions. Like Alfred, his task seemed monumental. In a style adopted from his English predecessors, Mather manipulated arguments for his national desires out of the Anglo-Saxon past.

Mather’s own Saxon thought was influenced to a large degree by his father. If he did not start the comparison between Puritans and Anglo-Saxons, Increase Mather certainly employed it as a prominent metaphor in his writings. In his treatment of the coming of the Anglo-Saxons, Mather echoes the warnings of Gildas:

The Histories of our own nation declare, that whereas there were famous Christian Churches among the Brittaines, yet when in process of time, they scandalized the Heathen Saxons, who lived amongst them, and neglected to use means for their Conversion unto Christ. God was displeased with those churches, so as to dissipate and drive them out of their land by those very Heathen Nations, whose conversion they should have but did not endeavor, let us consider it in the fear of God.³⁷⁷

Further, Mather argues that Bede was *correct* in connecting the lineage of the Saxons with religion because they are, in theme, essentially interconnected:

³⁷⁶ *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, 1628 - 1686*, Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed., 5 vols. (Boston, 1853) 4:2, 131-33.

³⁷⁷ Increase Mather, *An Earnest Exhortation to the inhabitants of New-England, to hearken to the voice of God in his late and present dispensations as ever they desire to escape another judgement, seven times greater than any thing which as yet hath been* (Boston, 1676), 19.

These Saxons (from whom we are generally descended) became great Idolaters, serving graven Images, Canonizing Saints, and worshipping them; instead of God in Christ alone. For which case, God punished our forefathers with the Danish Persecution, and after that the Norman Conquest.³⁷⁸

Mather's use of "Anglo-Saxons" and "Britons" in general is particularly interesting here—the analogies are not only false, they are mixed, a habit that Cotton later adopts. (This practice finds its roots in Mather's reading of Foxe, who claimed that the English Church was first formed by the native Britons and then continued through to the Anglo-Saxons; Gildas, Foxe's actual model, uses essentially the same maneuver. For Gildas, too, that they are Britons in one sense traces a lineage, since the Saxons are the feared ones.) What matters for Mather is precisely this lineage; semiotically speaking, the various place names really do not matter. Ultimately, by arguing they descend from the Saxons, Mather's claim that *that* is the important link is extremely ironic, as New Englanders do in fact become the ravaging Saxons against whom Gildas's Britons battled.

Because of his wide reading and education, Cotton Mather became New England's answer to Sir Robert Cotton, amassing a huge library of ancient texts that far surpassed any in New England and most in England at the time (he amassed such a library that by the end of his life, it was the largest in America.³⁷⁹ One English bookseller compared Mather's collection to the Bodleian Library at Oxford).³⁸⁰ Early in his career, Mather read and was greatly influenced by Richard Baxter's *Gildas Salvianus; The Reformed Pastor* (1656), perhaps *the* instructional guide for young pastors favoring personal instruction over pulpit work. Baxter titled the treatise such

³⁷⁸ Increase Mather, *A sermon wherein is shewed that the church of God is sometimes a subject of great persecution; preached on a publick fast at Boston in New-England: occasioned by the tidings of a great persecution raised against the Protestants in France* (Boston, 1682), 10.

³⁷⁹ For more on Mather's education, see Levin, 19-25.

³⁸⁰ Kenneth Silverman, *The Life and Times of Cotton Mather* (New York: Harper and Row, 1984), 263.

“because [he] imitated Gildas and Salvianus in [his] liberty of speech to the pastors of the churches.”³⁸¹ Influenced by Baxter, Mather took all of New England as his “project,” seeking to become the social pastor and national Saxon prophet in a spiritual lineage with Bede and Gildas. Like Foxe, Mather waged war with the Papists. In rejecting popery, Foxe saw the establishment of the Elizabethan church as the true and saving ideal of national community. Mather simply followed suit. Stephen Arch has argued that following the second generation, New Englander Puritan historiographers (Johnson is his example), in the thick of Antinomian Controversy, employed a similar corollary line of reasoning, incorporating a soldier-warrior technique into their rhetoric (wherein the “soldiers” are in “God’s army”).³⁸²

The fullest expression of Mather’s notions of New England Saxonhood can be found in his massive *Magnalia Christi Americana*, where he attempts to capture the interplay between past and present, English and American, history and geography, and creates a national ecclesiastical history that situates him as natural successor to Gildas and Bede. Mather came to writing the *Magnalia* at an uncertain period in New England history: Massachusetts Bay had just lost its charter, men such as Joseph Dudley and Edward Randolph were being shipped back to England, a new charter gave power to the king to choose the governor, and there were disruptions concerning witchcraft within the colony. Further, ancient constitutionalism in New England tended toward a circuitous spiral upward, with a resurgence in Anglo-Saxon roots

³⁸¹ *Gildas Salvianus: the first part, ie The reformed pastor; shewing the nature of the pastoral work ...* (London, 1656), 26. On January 6, 1718, Mather writes in his journal, “Read Mr. Baxter’s *Gildas Salvianus* again, to animate a due Care for the Souls of the Flock”; *Diary of Cotton Mather*, 2 vols., Worthington Chauncy Ford, ed. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1911-12) 2:498.

³⁸² *Authorizing the Past: The Rhetoric of History in Seventeenth-Century New England* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1994), 51-87.

developing in Massachusetts as a way to combat England's encroaching legal power.³⁸³ By this time, too, the Bay area had invoked the English constitution for two reasons, both indigenous and English, which sought simultaneously to trace New World lineage back to the Anglo-Saxons and to maintain regional insularity. Since Mather was extremely well read in Anglo-Saxon historiography as well as classical literature, finding a suitable defense against England in this climate would be easy—he could ride the tide of English constitutionalism with its own history.

In part, then, the *Magnalia* seeks to highlight the New England religious mission by connecting it back to the English line of Anglo-Saxon historiography in light of the growing identification with England to provide a strong, racial, and ideologically charged link to contemporary events by situating New England history in the long line of prestigious English history that traced its roots to an Anglo-Saxon past. While his other works do, to varying degrees, include Anglo-Saxon references and some qualitative thematic Saxon statements, it is here in the *Magnalia* that we see the dominant Anglo-Saxon influence leading to the fullest expression of Mather's development of American Saxonhood. "If we may credit any Records besides the Scriptures," Mather begins, introducing the Saxon tradition within which he will work, "I know it might be said and proved well, that this New World was known, and partly inhabited by Britains, or by Saxons from England, Three or Four Hundred Years before the

³⁸³ Largely ignored in Winthrop's time, the ancient constitution appealed to New England. Facing various charter issues, New England quickly associated itself with the ancient English constitution, envisioning Massachusetts as a limb that sprung from the stout tree birthed of Anglo-Saxon roots. Ancient constitutionalism allowed Massachusetts to protect itself in both legal power and racial lineage. James S. Hart and Richard J. Ross make these connections and trace the circuitous route of the ancient English constitution in seventeenth and eighteenth-century New England; "The Ancient Constitution in the Old World and the New," *The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England, 1588-1649*, Francis J. Bremer and Lynn A. Botelho, eds. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005), 237-289.

Spaniards coming thither.”³⁸⁴ Strong Saxon links to the ancient English constitution provided the historical backdrop. Like Increase, Cotton Mather continues to borrow from *both* models of this Saxon tradition—the Britons and the Saxons.

Combining this historical structure with American biography, *Magnalia* traces the religious development of the New England area from the time of Bradford’s migration in 1620 to 1698, detailing major Protestant figures and summarizing critical points in New England’s history. Perry Miller has called it “the greatest effort [of Mather’s time] to organize the experience of this people.”³⁸⁵ Since spirituality, Mather thought, was at a nadir, he found himself in much the same situation as Gildas, faced with a growing population of disbelievers and spiritual dissidents. In one sense, Mather extends Winthrop’s Christendom. However, sensing that his people had lost sight of Bradford’s and Winthrop’s glorious mission, he intended to create a glorious past out of the information available to him, which culminated in the glowing idealization of the New England project as the ideal America. Mather’s success comes largely from his ability to link an ideological vision of New England to a glorious Saxon past, heralded by the ties to an Exodus *from* biblical times *to* the Saxon people to Mather’s New Englanders, and thus to position America as exemplified in “New England.” Thus, Mather’s narrative reverberates within the rhythm of each succession, a repeating migration drama, which, beginning in Bede, was highly influenced by notions of an Anglo-Saxon geographical belief that the island—the promised land that was granted by God for the chosen race—could only be held by those who kept and spread the faith.

³⁸⁴ All citations are from *Magnalia Christi Americana; or, The Ecclesiastical History of New England* [1701] (hereafter *MCA*), 2 vols. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1967) 1:42.

³⁸⁵ *The New England Mind: From Colony to Providence* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 33.

The first part of *Magnalia* concerns the historiography of Old World spirituality from pagan Rome through the several removals to the ultimate remove: the New World. Mather attempted to delineate the Puritan mission by finding out its true cause, detailing the course of the migration and settlement, and outlining it for future generations. As he states in the opening pages, *Magnalia* is meant to be a “a true history of the wonderful works of God in the late plantation of this part of America.”³⁸⁶ One topos that informs Mather’s entire *oeuvre* in general, but remains especially evident in the *Magnalia*, is the historical succession tradition and medieval authorial transference that sprung out of this concern with constitutional nationalism. Like Bradford and Winthrop before him, Mather’s technique was inspired and patterned after the religious and nationalistic style of Foxe.³⁸⁷ Also, like Bede and other earlier Anglo-Saxon historians, Mather justifies his method of intertextual composition with the Anglo-Saxon and medieval scribal interjections in the *Magnalia*; for example, his underlying method explicitly marks English antiquity as his territory: “These researches into antiquity had not in this place been laid before my reader, if they might not have served as an introduction unto this piece of New-English history.”³⁸⁸ By employing this historiographical strategy, Mather can accomplish two things: he can justify his claims for the relevance of the ancient past, and he can invert the traditional hierarchy between the authorial textual model and the imitative text. In this process, he redefines and inverts the concept of sole authorship as a whole. The work composed by means of an *imitatio auctorum* loses the stigma of a secondary text, and becomes indeed superior to its source texts as their full meaning is realized only in the new synthesis accomplished by the receptive writer. This revaluation of intertextuality, which forms the basis of Mather’s self-

³⁸⁶ *MCA* 1:15.

³⁸⁷ Levin, 262.

³⁸⁸ *MCA* 1:19.

authorization as a New English writer, recalls a time-honored technique of medieval Christian exegesis—the allegorization of the texts of pagan antiquity as typological foreshadowings of Christian revelation—with which Mather wishes to align himself.³⁸⁹ What he does with these placeholders informs his historiography and historical *ideas* of lineage, positioning him within the eschatological lineage of Gildas and Bede.

Yet, given Mather's new *terra*—Gildas and Bede had simply an island that had been contested for centuries—he transcends this lineage because he must deal with the utmost and unexpected challenges, one of which being the inhabitants of the land. Thus, for Mather, the New England mission actually synthesizes all that came before it, culminating from all branches in the whole of English history, and developing themes first built into Englishness as a racial concept to arrive at these radical and racially charged conclusions: The Anglo-Saxon was of white, Germanic roots, whose identity developed into its highest state with the advent of Christianity in Protestant form. *Magnalia* is meant to outline its progress in America. In the nature of religious progression, New English devotion represents the highest kind, originating from a free and democratic individual soul whose roots lie in the spiritual social community of ancient Saxons to which it belongs and of whom the New Englander is the rightful heir; the coming of the Lord, which would happen in this lifetime, will reward those who align themselves with this highest New English state. These ideas run completely counter to Catholicism, wherein Mather sees spiritual decline and eventual social depravity. In Mather's mind, iniquity began in the waning Roman Empire, and the Anglo-Saxon churches, sparked by the Augustinian mission, sought to save the people of the land. Anglo-Saxons were heroes,

³⁸⁹ For more, see Jan Stievermann's article "Writing 'To Conquer All Things': Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana* and the Quandary of Copia," *Early American Literature* 39:2 (2004), 263-97, which explores Mather's rhetorical inventions through a Bakhtinian lens.

rescuing the true church. One of Mather's primary missions was to reinvigorate the Augustinian mission, to justify New England as the spot for conversions in the preparation for the final revelation, especially against naysayers like Joseph Mede who argued that America would not be witness to the Second Coming.³⁹⁰ Mather believed America had been "concealed" by God until proper passage of a worthy people arose; early in the *Magnalia* he elaborates on this connection:

If we may credit any Records besides the Scriptures, I know it might be said and proved well, that this New World was known, and partly inhabited by Britains, or by Saxons from England, Three or Four Hundred Years before the Spaniards coming thither; which Assertion is demonstrated from the Discourses between the Mexicans [Aztecs] and the Spaniards at their first Arrival; and the Popish Reliques [Roman Catholics relics], as well as British terms and words, which the Spaniards then found among the Mexicans, as well as from undoubted Passages, not only in other Authors, but even in the British Annals also.³⁹¹

Thus, Mather argues, New England serves as "successors" to "the last spot of earth which the God of heaven spied out for the seat of such evangelical, and ecclesiastical, and very remarkable transitions, as require to be made an history."³⁹² New England was, for Mather, New Saxon.

Quite a lot of *Magnalia* builds support for these connections to the hardships endured by the Saxons; these, in effect, symbolize the hardships that must be born by New Englanders (and,

³⁹⁰ Mede, a Greek Professor and fellow of Christ's College in Cambridge, was essentially reviving the theory of millennium, which argued that the present revealed all progress toward the end—the course of history, as witnessed by the Roman Empire and the Church, led to the Second Coming; Robert Middlekauff, *The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596-1728* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 333. The complicated matters of Mather's take on Mede need not concern us here, but the sense of prophecy remains important. Through all his baffling prophecies and connections between books of the Bible—*Revelations* to *Daniel*, appearances of allegorical figures, and other religious mysteries—Mede essentially believed the end was a long way away. Mather, however, did not, arguing instead that the end of days would occur in his lifetime.

³⁹¹ *MCA* 1:42.

³⁹² *Ibid.*, 1:45.

by extension, which they have endured). Anglo-Saxon *topoi* informs Mather's reading of the past, and he exacts a certain kinship between the ancient English and the geographic land of North American New England, to, in other words, the rightful heirs of the true Saxon lineage.³⁹³ This is especially evident in the way that Mather sets himself up in the narrator-historian-prophet role, a literary union of the Saxon Bede and the Briton Gildas, in the work. In his own prefatory poem to the work, Mather claims that New Englanders have lost sight of the true connection to the original Augustinian biblical mission, the Saxon religion, and those of Bradford and Winthrop, a lineage they could trace back to the ancient church. "The poor Americans are under blame," writes Mather, "conjectur'd once to be of Israel's seed but no record appear'd to prove the deed."³⁹⁴ Following these epic formalities, Mather introduces his subject matter: "I write the wonders of the Christian religion, flying from the depravations of Europe to the American strand."³⁹⁵ Mather intends to evoke a *new* spirit of Christendom.

As a Saxon spiritual prophet, Mather claims that he will reinvent them as a people, that he can "revive New-England's nigh-lost origin" through his "preaching, writing, and his pastoral care," thus reviving the original "gentium."³⁹⁶ Mather's use of the term "gentium" is remarkable for two very important reasons. Mather revisits Bradford's and Winthrop's crossing by redeploying the original migration myth in the connection of the New England tribe to the Israelites. Second, Mather most specifically highlights Bede's argument for Japheth, especially

³⁹³ A bulky, overbearing treatise, the *Magnalia* garnered little respect in its early days. William Tudor, first editor of the *North American Review*, passed on the book in 1818 and probably left the most enduring mark on it.

Stievermann notes that his "caustic comment on the *Magnalia*'s 'numerous quotations in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew which rise up like so many decayed, hideous stumps [. . .] to deform the surface' and his consequent disapproval of Mather as a 'pedantick, and garrulous writer' have continued to reverberate through the negative responses of many readers well into the twentieth century"; Tudor 256, 272 qtd. in Stieverman, 263.

³⁹⁴ *MCA*, 1:19.

³⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 1:25.

³⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 1:19.

by using Bede's term for the English.³⁹⁷ Toward the middle of the second volume, Mather alludes to the Noah story but continues through to Japheth, emphasizing specifically that lineage within which, in his mind, the New England churches are currently aiming to be situated. Thus, by definition, the *Magnalia* becomes a tract of future promise and prosperity, not simply one of ecclesiastical descent. Through careful parallels, Mather alludes that New England will surpass these generations of humankind—the Pagan Romans, Chosen Hebrews, and English. Thus does Mather compile every piece of religious history thought up until that point. Even as, Mather writes, “English Christians into the dark regions of America,” he asserts that in America, “light hath arisen in the darkness.”³⁹⁸ The “golden candlesticks,” a metaphor first brought to the New World by Bradford's party will usher in a new Golden Age of reformed English Christendom. Once again relying on *imitatio auctorum*, Mather's figurative language attributes his history with the task of setting the course of New England history aright: “Whether New England may live anywhere else or no, it must live in our history!”

Historically, the narrative of *Magnalia* is sweeping. The work progresses from Europe, across the seas to the New World, to New England proper (all in Books One through Three), through the establishment of the Church-State in America (Books Four and Five), and into the various trials of the colonists (Books Six and Seven). At the center of this grand sweeping history of New England stands the figure of William Bradford, an allegorical symbol for New

³⁹⁷ To appreciate this, we must recall that in *Genesis*, all nations of the world were descended from Noah's son—important both in the Biblical and Anglo-Saxon sense. In the latter, which is to say the Anglo-Saxon *Genesis A*, the Babel episode explains precisely how this came to be, namely that languages disperse the tribes and Noah's sons head off in different directions and become “father” of the nations. The Anglo-Saxons thought themselves to be the sons of Japheth; Bede and other historians linked the divine migrations of the Anglo-Saxons to this biblical reference; see Kenneth Sisam, “Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies,” *PBA* 39 (1953), 287-348, and C.D. Wright, “‘Insulae Gentium’: Biblical Influence on Old English Poetic Vocabulary,” *Magister Regis: Studies in Honor of R. E. Kaske*, Arthur Groos et al., eds. (New York: Fordham University Press, 1986), 9-21.

³⁹⁸ *MCA* 1:27.

England Christendom. Bradford's position in the *Magnalia* serves as the historical link of the new gentium to the Saxons via Augustinian. As "missionary," he stands as allegory for the figure of New England sainthood. In a highly heroic portrait of a deeply personal moment, Mather glorifies Bradford's decision to act:

At last, beholding how fearfully the evangelical and apostolical church-form whereinto the churches of the primitive times were cast by the good spirit of God, had been deformed by the apostacy of the succeeding times; and what little progress the Reformation had yet made in many parts of Christendom towards its recovery, he set himself by reading, by discourse, by prayer, to learn whether it was not his duty to withdraw from the communion of the parish-assemblies and engage with some society of the faithful, that should keep close unto the written word of God, as the rule of their worship.³⁹⁹

"And," Mather continues, "the rest of his days were spent in the service, and the temptations, of that American wilderness."⁴⁰⁰ Memorializing their native land was a clear concern of early Anglo-Saxon writers, as was the practice of portraying their heroes as larger than life. This provided a foundational base upon which the national narrative rested. In Mather, we see a similar move. Bradford becomes memorialized as the savior of "Christendom towards its recovery," where "it was not his duty to withdraw" but to *act* in tandem with the movement of history.

Mather's main intent in the *Magnalia* following his placement of Bradford in the New World is to articulate an American-Saxon migration myth founded upon geopolitically-based

³⁹⁹ Ibid., 1:25.

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid.

ideas of Christianography and to defend Bradford's geographical move to America against charges of flight and heathenism. To do this, he invokes Winthrop's powerful ship metaphor, which finds its roots in Anglo-Saxon tales of crossing and migration, into a new myth that suggests America, more specifically New England, *will* be witness to the Second Coming. The Atlantic looms, as will the American Indians later in the *Magnalia*, as a manifestation of possible evil. Numerous works of Anglo-Saxon literature present particular uses of the ship metaphor, works with which Mather would have been well acquainted. Anglo-Saxon poets exploited the ship metaphor more than other literary technique and resorted to the device for the creation of special foundations for their migration ideology. In his translation of Augustine's *Soliloquia*, Alfred employed a ship metaphor because nautical metaphors—he uses three alone in the *Soliloquia*—function as well-known conceptual models to convey difficult information, paradigms that would be readily accessible to his readership.⁴⁰¹ In a similar manner does Asser, Alfred's biographer, describe Alfred's youth. The ship metaphor has a double function: it traces the course of narration while at the same time detailing the path in which the king secures his kingdom.⁴⁰² For Mather, the ship provides a way to explore the continuous interface between two histories—an ancient English, or Anglo-Saxon, model, and the New England similarity to this archetype—and to articulate New England's mission within the larger eschatological lineage. Thus, Mather's ship simile appears closer in line with the Anglo-Saxon migration ideas than

⁴⁰¹ These are works penned shortly after his conversion; Alfred thought them of the highest import for his spiritual program in the development of the English nation.

⁴⁰² Asser writes (translated): "But (to speak in nautical terms) so that I should no longer veer off course - having entrusted the ship to waves and sails, and having sailed quite far away from the land - among such terrible wars and in year-by-year reckoning, I think I should return [to the matter at hand—the history of Alfred]"; of Alfred's trials and tribulations, he writes, "yet once [Alfred] had taken the helm of his kingdom, he alone sustained by divine assistance, struggled like a pilot to guide his ship"; Keynes & Lapidge, 74, 76. Here, argues Alice Sheppard, Asser brings the "ship" of the text into port while Alfred "metaphorically secures his kingdom"; *Families of the King: Writing Identity in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 67.

Winthrop's or even Ephraim Pagitt's before him, the latter of whom likened the message of Jesus Christ to a sailing ship in his treatise *Christianography: Or, the Description of the Multitude and Sundry Sorts of Christians, in the World, not Subject to the Pope* (1674). However, whereas the "ship" for Pagitt married rulers and clergy, Mather's ship directly tied New Englanders to the freedom-loving Christianized English and their spiritual mission, which mission it became following conversion to spread Christianity.

While he concedes that others may have occupied the physical landscape before the English, or, at least, at the same time, the claim is still fundamentally Saxon in tone: "If this New World were not found out first by the English; yet in those regards that are all the greatest; it seems to be found out more *for* them than any other."⁴⁰³ Captain John Smith, continues Mather, crossed the Atlantic, settled the land, and had it (Virginia) renamed "New-England," thus positioning it as the daughter of England. For Mather, the vessel of Christianity sailed and was landed at Virginia (*not* New England, oddly enough)—whether that was Smith's intention or not remains irrelevant—and from the founding of Plymouth onward continued its mission. Examples of shipwrecks often extend the ship metaphor in the *Magnalia*, alluding to adherence to proper social conduct. The *Magnalia* thus serves as a logical, historical argument connecting the "ship" of Christianity from England to America, a defense against the charges that America, as Mather refers to the land *geographically*, will eventually become the Gog and Magog of the Second Coming. Shipwrecks define the passage to America. Indeed, later in the *Magnalia*, Mather defends the charges that John Cotton and his group were involved in a style of religious reform that actually hindered progress rather than promoted it. Again, Mather resorts to his vessel

⁴⁰³ *MCA* 1:43.

metaphor, that the coming of the English to the land of America opens up the Native Americans' eyes to the God they already know but haven't been properly trained to recognize.

Mather proceeds to document the historical setting of this nautical theme, casually ignoring all history of the Virginia expeditions, even Smith's. In a series of thematically developed nautical metaphors, he chides his imagined reader for being overly curious about these swashbuckling affairs; for Mather, there is not enough time in his history or any other for such secular stories. Instead of enduring "any stop in our hastening voyage," he refers the reader to Purchas' history. The "hastening voyage" leads ultimately to Mather's historical section; but he does not want to give a full history of the peopling of the country; for that, he again refers the reader to other histories. Acknowledging America's "presence" in the world long before its discovery, Mather essentially concludes that America's discovery and peopling by his forefathers functioned as God's plan for the unfolding and development of Christianity and the Second Coming, both of which called for the strong race of English. Importantly, this becomes Mather's historical thesis. According to this argument, three things qualitatively changed the course of human history, providing the transition from a certain medievalism (though he does not use that specific term) to the unfolding of God's plan, culminating in the peopling of New England—for Mather, the evolution of the ultimate Saxon peopling. First, there existed a resurgence of written literature which promoted Christianity (the allusion is to Alfred's engagement and focus on learning); following this, there was the physical discovery of America by the Saxon race for the chief purpose of the maturation and expansion of these Christian ideals; finally, there existed in the New England region a religious awakening, which represented the culmination of this progression. Mather's historiography is, simply put, defined by his terms. Like Bede and Eusebius before him, Mather includes all historical context of the ancient Saxons from whence

New Englanders originated, including both geography *and* religion. Further, like his two prophetic predecessors, Mather cannot separate the two: the resurgence in literature that appeared during Alfred's reign served England's national unification and finds its maturation in his era's advancement of New England ecclesiastical writing (here Mather is a little self-serving, as he means chiefly *his* writings). Consequently, in the vein of the Anglo-Saxon migration myth, unification, geography and religious flowering are inextricably linked; as one blooms so does the other. It was natural that the discovery of America coincided with the religious plans of the English in America.

Also borrowing from Winthrop's development of "Christology," Mather advances an Anglo-Saxon notion of verification and plan for the geography of New England. He writes, "The Church of God must no longer be wrap't up in Strabo's cloak: Geography must now find work for a *Christiano-geography* in regions; far enough beyond the bounds wherein the Church of God had thro' all former ages been circumscribed."⁴⁰⁴ Mather's most fundamental theme for his historiography and the elemental building block upon which the rest of the foundation is laid is, in fact, based upon his definition of "Christiano-geography," a geopolitically charged term meant to buttress and qualify the cause for religious expansion. By Christiano-geography, Mather suggests the spread of the gospels in a way that ensures the continuation of historical, geographical, and religious lineage, eventually becoming American Saxonhood in New England. In the larger scheme of history, their mission follows Augustine's—the creation of a virtuous world: "If a king of the West Saxons long since ascribed all the disasters [Mather has Alfred in mind here] on any of their affairs to negligencies in this point, methinks the New Englanders may not count it

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., 1:42.

unreasonable in this way to seek their own prosperity.”⁴⁰⁵ It will be recalled that part of Alfred’s agenda, besides rejuvenating literature and education and defending the Anglo-Saxon state against Viking invasion, was the spiritual improvement in the social culture so that God would be pleased with those churches and so not drive them out of their land or *allow* them to be conquered by the Danes. Because of the growing interest in antiquarianism, a small cult of Alfred had been growing for a short period by this time; however, his unification successes had been well-known for centuries. Mather’s allusion to Alfred is a strong and clear link to the Saxon past.

For Mather as for Alfred, it was important to establish a *geopolitical* relationship with the past that could inform the present and the future—a temporal geography of Christianity within which the lineage might be envisioned politically, maintained socially, and continued historically, all through which to serve God’s grace. In *Directions for a candidate of the ministry*, Mather plainly states that, first and foremost, geography should be studied by all well-intentioned ministers; he writes,

while I suppose, that what a Camden has given you in his Britannia, will be no unacceptable entertainment for you, I cannot but notify unto you, that, the English empire in America ... is the most foolish and faithless performance in this kind, that ever mankind was abused withal. I am desirous, that you proceed and peruse many of the travels that have been published; and (if you dare not venture upon a Purchas) by conversing with many more than what are exhibited in that rich

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., 3:209.

collection ... you may become a notable traveler ... methinks, Paget's
Christianography ... may deserve a reading.⁴⁰⁶

Importantly, then, geography buttressed the spread of Christianity, from the Saxon forests to the forest of New England. Similarly, Mather believes, Alfred did this for Anglo-Saxon England. Alfred's translations were not simply translations of older works; they were almost entirely revised to include his geographical skill so that he might more sensibly adopt ancient practices to the current geography of the state.⁴⁰⁷ Alfred laid out the path of Christianity, geographically, as he saw it. What began in Anglo-Saxon England, then, became more unified in the New England model, a copy of the divine English original. Thus, Christiano-graphy's fundamental role in Mather's historical vision of American Saxonhood reflects the Alfredian sense of both religious and geographical purpose.

Essentially, what Mather means by "Christiano-graphy" is the very nature of Christianity playing itself out on the physical world in historical time. (In this sense, for example, the fall of the Roman Empire and the rise of Augustine and Christianity would be at the fore of such a theory.) Mather in fact borrows the term from Pagitt's use of it in *Christianography*, which claims that while variants of Christianity exist, there exists a certain harmony, or unity, leading from early British churches (the "forefathers") to the present day. Pagitt argues that the Saxons when converted—he claims the Saxons "converted the better part of this Kingdome [Europe] to idolatry"—transformed temples into churches and their priests to pastors of Christian faith.⁴⁰⁸

However, even paganism, Pagitt claims, is actually *better* than Catholicism, for the latter is an

⁴⁰⁶ *Manuductio ad ministerium: Directions for a candidate of the ministry : wherein, first, a right foundation is laid for his future improvements...* (Boston, 1726), 56.

⁴⁰⁷ For more, see Jerzy Linderski, "Alfred the Great and the Tradition of Ancient Geography," *Speculum* 39:3 (1964), 434-439.

⁴⁰⁸ All citations from *Christianography, or Discription of the multitude and sundry sorts of Christians in the World, not subject to the Pope* (London, 1674), 88.

infection that cannot be healed (thus the problem with the Papists, since theirs was an “infected” Christianity); for Pagitt, at least Christian ideals have the possibility of flourishing in pagans.⁴⁰⁹ The problem, he claims, rests on the fact that the church and state are tied together. If one could fall without the other, these matters wouldn’t be important, but “when Church and Common-wealth are embarked in the same vessel; and faile together in the same danger,” Pagitt argues, why should the ecclesiastical survive unscathed?⁴¹⁰ For him, there cannot be both a secular and an ecclesiastical ruler: Pagitt’s answer is to coalesce all the power in the hands of the church.⁴¹¹

Thus, it is clear by Mather’s use of Alfredian geographical notions and his borrowing of the term Christiano-graphy that he plans to situate himself in line with the great Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical historians before him, and the play on time and space becomes evident. Christiano-graphy becomes the essential tagline for the New England project, as it always has been, Mather argues, which is to extend the line from early Welsh, Britons, or Anglo-Saxons—Mather seems to conflate these, and for ideological purposes, racial demarcations do not seem to matter to either Pagitt or Mather—to the New England project. Importantly, he claims that for all intents

⁴⁰⁹ Essentially, Pagitt argues, when a “heathen” becomes a Christian, he begins again, in the Lockean sense, whereas a converted or reformed Catholic still must bring some baggage, notions that will always challenge the status quo.

⁴¹⁰ *Christianography*, 192.

⁴¹¹ We might even look at this as Smith does, as a national ideology “[that is typically] a subspecies of the wider category ‘belief system’ *alongside* religion”; *Theories of Nationalism* (London: Duckworth and Company, Ltd., 1971), 54. Against the charge that no man can serve two masters, Pagitt argues that a man can if the goals are the same; in his mind, “the Church is the Common-wealth and the Common-wealth is the Church”; *Christianography*, 177. While there should be two distinct positions, however, he concedes that if a clergyman wants and can, he should also hold public office. Here, Pagitt’s thought gets tricky: Bishops in earlier periods did this (Pagitt cites as one Augustine, Bishop of Hippo); presently, however, they do not. His main arguments appear to be that Jews did not recognize Jesus as the Lord and Savior and are heathens and that popes now have too much power to go against rulers. Thus, in Pagitt’s mind, the Church of Rome divided itself and did not follow the grand plan of having rulers work with clergy. Pagitt’s treatise also offers an interesting take on the colonization theory. In the *History of Wales*, the voyage of Madoc sailed to the West Indies in 1170 and planted ten ships of settlers there. Pagitt actually cites linguistic evidence for English rights to America—“penguin” is used by both Britons and Americans—and calls the natives “Americans” in the name of religion: “Heretofore the arme of God hath wonderfully declared itself, working by weak means, as the whole World was converted by a few fishermen despised of the world, and subdued by the obedience of Christ”; 47. However, he notes that although conversion of the “Indians” was on the whole successful, it was “a warlike conversion ... not Apostolicall,” further claiming that the Jesuits were forceful and, while successful, desired victory (in the form of subjugation), not truth; 47-8.

and purposes, and against any early histories tying Columbus to America, America was first peopled by Anglo-Saxons: “I know it must be said and proved well, that this new world was known, and partly inhabited by Britains, or by Saxons from England, three or four hundred years before the Spanish came hither.”⁴¹² Although Columbus receives credit for the *modern* discovery, then for the *rediscovery*, that credit is somewhat undeserved. Mather’s proof, apart from the “Popish reliques” and other annals and histories, is the number of English terms and words in the “Mexican’s” dialect (a similar, non-scientific evidence to what Pagitt offers). Either way, Mather contends, “A World... is now found out, and the Affairs of the whole World have been affected by the finding of it. So the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, well compared unto a Ship is now victoriously sailing round the Globe after the rest, and which alone therefore has been called New-England.”⁴¹³

Here, too, Mather makes his most specific extension of the darker and devastating racial consciousness developed earlier by Winthrop in the Pequot resistance to the English.⁴¹⁴ To offset the growing threat of the Other, Mather manipulates Winthrop’s “body metaphor,” which served as an historical racial bond and geographical association, into a purely Anglo-Saxon defense

⁴¹² *MCA* 1:43.

⁴¹³ *Ibid.* Strikingly, this passage foreshadows the Anglo-American exceptionalism that will explode in the later nineteenth century.

⁴¹⁴ My focus on the racial aspect of Mather’s American Saxonhood goes further back than Horsman’s original thesis, which makes no claims during this period of American history. Horsman suggests that “colonial settlers ... perceived the Anglo-Saxons only through the distortions of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century” work of the antiquarians; *Race and Manifest Destiny*, 15. 37. Two important works related to race and colonial religious missions are Dana D. Nelson’s chapter on Mather in *Black and White: Reading “Race” in American Literature, 1638-1867* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 22-37, and Laura M. Stevens, *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006). While never explicitly claiming Anglo-Saxon influence, White views Mather’s use of race as symbolic for the struggle of Christendom. Similarly, Stevens explores the fictional construct of the Indian figure; in Steven’s work, however, the focus is largely how this ties to commercial enterprise and imperialistic notions in the colonies. Another useful work is Burnham’s *Captivity and Sentiment*.

charge. In Mather's mind, the people of New England should be exculpated from any charges of violence against Native Americans because this is simply the playing out of history: as the Romans defeated and persecuted the Jews, the Saxons came and conquered the Britons. For Mather, it is the pattern of the process of religiously-based historical narrative; his greatest concern, and one which permeates his every work, was to depict for his readers that this "spot" on God's chosen "seat" was tenuous. Mather concludes for his readers that New England was facing problems similar to those of Old Briton during the Danish invasions, that there existed a very real possibility of a complete takeover by subversive forces, a fear seen most clearly and outright in his later *Three Letters from New-England* (1721), a treatise to English ministers on Mather's present concerns. "The heart of the Glorious God being so set upon the glorifying of his infinite and infinitely Beloved Son," writes Mather in "Three Letters,"

and He havin so awefully threatened, I will plague them that hate him; there are some who cannot but fear lest this sinful Nation (Ah! Sinful Nation, a People laden with iniquity!) be apace ripening for a Wrath set unto the uttermost, and lest such Plagues be inflicted on it, as will call for the pens of another Gildas to give the relations of them.⁴¹⁵

Mather is the "other Gildas"—at least he had hoped by this time, some twenty years following *Magnalia's* publication, to have achieved that goal—and he reiterates his prophetic vision, that the sins of the "Saxons" sweep across his country and cause widespread destruction.

Mather envisions the largest threat arising from the Indians, who, in the *Magnalia*, are represented as barbarous Saxons—ironically, the race from which Mather claims New England

⁴¹⁵ *Three letters from New-England, relating to the controversy of the present time by Cotton Mather* (Boston, 1721), 25.

attributes its origins. This authorial move highlights another *topos* that informs Mather's historiography because his American Saxonhood reverses roles, whereby the oppressed becomes the oppressive element, the subversive forms become subverted, and, finally, the fearsome becomes the fearful. For Mather, these oppressive, subversive, and fearful forces came in multiple forms. Like Winthrop, all of Mather's *topoi* rests squarely on a fundamental foundation of symbolic "good" and "evil," wherein "evil" comes to be represented by, often, "Other." Further, among all of the hindrances to the New England Saxon lineage, Indians remained the greatest threat. Mather saw the un-Christianized Indians as the devil, and earlier, fearing for New England's safety, he threw himself into missionary work in 1698 prior to the publication of the *Magnalia*; later, he was promoted to lead the New England Company, founded some fifty years prior, an outfit backed by Parliament for the sole purpose of Indian conversion.⁴¹⁶ But "conversion" seems contrary to Mather's true beliefs. Mather often uses the term "dog" to describe the Indians, as did Gildas with the Saxons.⁴¹⁷ He claims, "there were enough *Dog* in their *Temper*," and they paddle their canoes like dogs.⁴¹⁸ Mather employs this *double entendre* epithet constantly when recounting the dead in the English-Indian Wars, echoing Bradford's

⁴¹⁶ The origins of Indian reservations in the Massachusetts Bay area remain clouded under the umbrage of Anglo-Saxon racial ideas of religion: Although Massachusetts expected to assimilate Indians *in theory* to Christianity, Indians laws eventually killed this chance. The most important law concerning reservations was the act "for the Better Rule and Government of the Indians in their Several Places and Plantations" (1694). It was under the former act that white "governors" were allowed to rule over Indian villages in all respects—town issues, legal problems, and overall justice. While these governors had several Indian constables, they still remained in charge. This law led to the later statute for "Better regulating the Indians" (1746), in which three overseers were appointed for each reserve, thus weakening Indian control and autonomy even more. This statute simply rolled over every so often, as elections arose, providing less and less control to Indians. Yasu Kawashima, "Origins of Indian Reservations in Massachusetts," *Race Relations in British North America, 1607-1783*, Bruce A. Glasrud and Alan M. Smith, eds. (Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1982), 65-84.

⁴¹⁷ Gildas used "dogs" in a pejorative sense, and it featured prominently among his metaphorical visions of the Saxons. Having just referred to tribute paid by the British churches, Gildas' using "dogs" as a metaphor for the Saxons is very real; he claims that Britons should not pay over their own goods to the Saxon dogs in tribute; Higham, 83.

⁴¹⁸ Published separately first as *The triumphs of the reformed religion, in America. The life of the renowned John Eliot* (Boston, 1691), the biography of Eliot appeared later in *MCA* 1:561.

struggles with Morton and emphasizing the necessity of eradication for the good of the colony's mission: "when the Dog is dead, all his malice is dead with him."⁴¹⁹ Thus, the Indians stand symbolically for "Old" and their Christianization for "New." In this metaphorical treatment of the Indians, however, Mather's stance is not *recounting* an oppressive Saxon so much as providing authorial assurance for the providential *right* to become the Saxon. He inverts the traditional hierarchy between the textual model and the imitative text and methodical metaphorical transference, positioning the Indians as the "Saxon" while at the same time instituting Saxon ideologies of conquest, thereby providing historio-religious support for *any* solutions dealing with this danger.

In Mather's figuration of New England, Indians pose multiple threats—or, more precisely, they might be said to symbolize them. As in the case of Morton, their proximity to the forest represents the brink of civilization; their proud and savage demeanor fates them to die or become converted, after which all remnants must be integrated quickly into the superior race; and Indian men desire white women, from whom they can birth a corrupted race, thus threatening the pure Saxon lineage. Thus, to combat these fears, Mather once again assumes Gildas's prophetic posture, whose history recounts the British relationship with them as one of initial fellowship followed by periods of revolt, unrest, enslavement and brutality, and, finally, racial expulsion. As his main interest was saving his countrymen from the heathens, Gildas shows how they have become transformed into the heathens' conquerors:

For in processe of time by carefull diligence commeth the correction and
amendment of Countries, and by carelesse negligence falleth the corruption and
destruction of Nations. The last are the *Saxons* and *English*, called by him a

⁴¹⁹ *MCA* 1:615.

people odious to God and man, to God, because they were Idolatrous Infidels, to man, because they murthered and oppressed the Christian *Britaines*, and although he enlargeth himselfe in the dispraise of the Nation, let no man neverthelesse suppose that he uttereth this of any malice as stung with the dreadfull miseries with the which they vexed his Country.⁴²⁰

In Gildas's recounting, the Britons come under the devil's charge, a position first held by the Saxons; transferred, this became the New World fear first sparked in Bradford's symbolic treatment of Thomas Morton and Merrymount. Thus, the Indian "treatment" called for extreme measures.

Mather had earlier conceded in *Observable Things* that New Englanders had done some regretful deeds to the Native Americans, but this was in the name of self-preservation. Here, Mather likens New England to the Britons: "The old Britons did not what they should have done, to convert the Saxons unto Christianity; and when the Britons were afterward fearfully destroyed by the Saxons, their famous countryman Gildas told them, *this is the vengeance of God upon you because you did no more, for the conversion of those miserable heathens.*"⁴²¹ It was Mather's duty, as he saw it, to use whatever means necessary to convert the "heathens" and maintain the flock. Gildas culls his early ideas from Tacitus's *Germania*, wherein Saxons do battle with savage Romans, the former showing their moral strength when battling the latter. Mather argues that the historical cycle of Christianity upsets certain civilizations in different ways. The biggest problem in the New World, for Mather, is that the French papists got to the Indians first, corrupting the Natives with an unholy brand of Christianity.

⁴²⁰ *Epistle of Gildas*, 32-3.

⁴²¹ *MCA* 2:109.

Because Mather funnels all of his fear tactics into the figure of the Indian, Indians come to represent the complete collapse of the ultimate cosmic American-Saxon order that successfully progressed from the direct representations of the true Christian church in the forests of England to New World shores. Except for “shipwrecks,” Mather comprehensively blames Indians for nearly all New England misfortunes. Indians even play a part in the witchcraft troubles in New England because “[the] chief Sagamores are well-known unto some of our captives, to have been horrid sorcerers, and hellish conjurors, and such as conversed with demons.”⁴²² In fact in *Wonders*, Mather highlights a spiritual war. He justifies the idea that witchcraft was just another way in which God was dissatisfied with the “English,” as he calls Americans: “A variety of calamity has long followed this plantation; and we have all the reason imaginable to ascribe it unto the rebuke of heaven upon us for our manifold apostasies.”⁴²³ At this point, literally *all* misfortunes in New England become tied to the Indians; the problem of racial conquering, the certainty of the need to convert, exists as the only goal left for the colony.

Ultimately, Mather treats *any* non-Anglo-Saxon in the same manner. In his small tract, *The Negro Christianized*, for example, he outlines an argument for the “Good,” in the most Platonic sense—most importantly, the threat to the integrity of the white race.⁴²⁴ The “Good,” for Mather, always tends toward Christ, but he positions this concept in a way that necessarily links “good” with “white”—that is, the “Good [New England] Man.” Naturally, this good New Englander tries to show others the way to Christ: “A good man; He is one who does all the good that he can.

⁴²² David E. Stannard, *American Holocaust: Conquest of the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 230.

⁴²³ *On Witchcraft: Being the Wonders of the Invisible World* (Boston, 1693), 6.

⁴²⁴ Printed in Boston in 1706, *The Negro Christianized: An Essay to Excite and Assist that Good Work, the Instruction of Negro-Servants in Christianity* was published in response to Samuel Sewall’s condemnation of slavery, “The Selling of Joseph” (1700). For his part, Mather argues that a slave owner has the obligation to Christianize his slaves.

The greatest good that we can do for any, is to bring them unto the fullest acquaintance with Christianity.”⁴²⁵ But, Mather questions, will this simple act make a person “good”? He puzzles it out: “Will Christianity allow him then to be, a good man, or, which is the same thing, a Christian who refuses to do this good, for the servants that are under his influences?”⁴²⁶ Once Mather has this figured out for himself—that a “good” New England Christian will command his family and household to know the way of the Lord (using Genesis 18:19)—he can extend the argument from the family unit to the region. The black slave, for Mather, becomes an “opportunity” for conversion, one of the noblest works.⁴²⁷

The Indian offers the same opportunity. Missionaries had, at this point, become involved with various methods of proselytizing, and numerous villages of “praying Indians” cropped up. As Kristine Bross has observed, these praying Indians were used for a variety of claims in colonial New England; most importantly, perhaps, “the figure of the praying Indian helped shape the belief, at a time of spiritual, economic, and political crisis in the colonies, that New England had a place and purpose in God’s plan that was special to itself but intimately connected with events in Old England.”⁴²⁸ Mather appropriates this technique for his claims of American Saxonhood. An important anecdote that he introduces in the second volume of *Magnalia* is the story of “Japheth.” Like all of the short summaries in Mather’s anecdotes of Indian conversion, Japhet’s story offers narrative evidence to portray the ends in the mean. “The Unknown God Wonderfully making Himself Known to a Poor Pagan” names the Indian from the root of what came to be called Aryans and Caucasians. Mather’s instructional tale can be summed up thus: An

⁴²⁵ *Negro Christianized*, 9.

⁴²⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁷ Nelson makes this point, arguing for its relation to the economic structure of the colony; 27.

⁴²⁸ *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons: Praying Indians in Colonial America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 27.

Indian woman on Martha's Vineyard, according to Mather's story, having lost her five previous children within a week of their births, takes the sixth out to a field and has a divine revelation wherein a voice tells her to dedicate the child to the service of God so that it will live. When the English settled on the Vineyard, the woman, espying a church service, knew then exactly what they were gathered for, having the heightened revelation, and was subsequently admitted publically to the church. The child, a son, remained faithful to the gospel and became a preacher to other Indians, taking great pains to convert other "unregenerate souls"; his name, of course, was Japheth.⁴²⁹ The story of Japheth takes on additional meaning as the promise of Indian survival through assimilation into white culture.

Like Gildas before him but unlike Pagitt, Mather envisions an imminent destruction from the rising wellsprings of heathenism; unlike Gildas, however, Mather's problem is twofold. Non-whites represent a threat to the order: Indian men desire white women, and the proximity of both blacks and Indians to Anglo-Europeans in New England raises the risks of corrupted race. If the slave owners simply avoid Christianizing because they need work from slaves and remain apathetic toward the slaves' spiritual growth, then, Mather claims, *they* will be judged for not helping the slaves along the path. Here, he *seems* benevolent, but he is not. What Mather is *not* saying is this: Christianized servants will not rebel, and attack, and try to assume any kind of control, as the Saxons had done to the British. This is the oppressive subtext. It was when the Saxons converted to Christianity that they conquered. Mather was too well-read in history not to make this connection. Thus, integration of non-whites into the master race obviates the need for force, for by definition, integration swallows the weakest variable, thus making it *disappear* to make way for the culture of the superior race.

⁴²⁹ *MCA* 2:441-42.

Consequently, the only way America can, in Mather's mind, avoid the destruction of the Britons, about which Gildas wrote and warned, is to remain defensive, as should have the Britons. In his own subversive language, he makes this clear: "Were your servants well tinged with the spirit of Christianity," he warns, as Gildas warned the Britons, "it would render them exceeding dutiful under their masters, exceeding patient under their masters, exceeding faithful in their business, and afraid to do anything that may justly unpleased you."⁴³⁰ Similarly, Mather argues, Christianity does not simply provide a law to give slaves freedom: Christianity "directs a slave, upon his embracing the law of the redeemer, to satisfy himself that he is the Lord's free-man, tho' he continues as a slave."⁴³¹ In fact, slavery for the individual and enslavement of the nation must be said to coexist: the advent of one leads to the advent of the other, and there exists no middle ground. Mather argues, "'Tis true, they are barbarous. But so were our own ancestors. The Britons were in many things as barbarous."⁴³² Thus, his provision for a catechism for slaves to learn Christianity, and a teacher to go from plantation to plantation to instruct, merely expedites the subsumption of the slave nation into the master.

In fact, the entire point of the second volume of the *Magnalia*—apart from the first sections delineating Christian practices as they should be followed—explicitly follows and improves upon Gildas' treatise to the Britons and the notion of enslavement, spiritual and corporeal. This is especially apparent in the section entitled "Observable Things," which documents the French and Indian War. Like Gildas, Mather exclaims, "The very *objects* of our *sins* have been made the very *engines* of our *plagues*."⁴³³ Where Gildas claims spiritual fear as the driving force, however, Mather's examples are more enumerated and rationally expressed.

⁴³⁰ *Negro Christianized*, 21.

⁴³¹ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁴³² *Ibid.*, 23.

⁴³³ *MCA* 2:664.

For Mather, God's displeasure results in multiple devastations, all of which he recounts—shipwrecks and troubles at sea, captivity, and battles with the natives. The problems command attention lest history, according to Mather, repeat itself. Like Gildas, Mather claims New Englanders are at fault for the war with Native Americans, since, as in the case of the Britons, *the people did not take time to convert them*. In fact, the fault is theirs for everything, but the Native American problem seems, for Mather, a more tangible way to explore the conscience of the people. Examples become problems of historical repetition. For this reason, the French and Indian War appears last in the *Magnalia*—representing the final Winthropian conflict between “light” and “dark.” Further, this is precisely why captivity narratives are so important to Mather; they represent the historical shift from Briton to Anglo-Saxon England, an awful turn of events. This historical reversal represents for Mather the *worst* possible scenario: A loss of privilege of land (even though it is not theirs). Captivity underlines this idea, that in war “many *tragical* things [are] undergone by many in captivity.”⁴³⁴

Mather ends the *Magnalia* with the horrid images of captivity set symbolically in religious terms. He entitles the fifth book in volume two of the *Magnalia* “The Acts and Monuments,” setting up a direct literary link to Foxe and the notion of Anglo-Saxon Christianity.⁴³⁵ Here, and employing a collective pronoun—“Our ecclesiastical history shall now give a plain and pure confession of our faith”—he navigates swiftly into the heart of his material.⁴³⁶ Throughout the *Magnalia*, Mather has intended this history to be *absorbed* when read, meaning his full intent is either to supplicate faith further or to transpose faith to readers. At the close, he wishes for conversion: “may the reader now find an irresistible power of God and of

⁴³⁴ Ibid., 2:668.

⁴³⁵ The full title is “Acts and Monuments of the Faith and Order of the Churches of New-England, Passed in their Synods.”

⁴³⁶ *MCA* 2:181.

grace, irradiating his mind” so that the reader may make a “more hearty and conscionable obedience to [the laws].”⁴³⁷ Writing openly now about the direct lineage from England to New England, Mather evokes the freedom of the Anglo-Saxons to choose Christian Protestantism; and just as England “has been honored above most of the Protestant and reformed world,” so shall New England—it remains their inherent right to be so honored.⁴³⁸ Without this proper choice, Mather seems to suggest, the Saxons would have remained in direct captivity to Satan; thus, the promise of Christianity coincides with the advent of true liberty.

* * * * *

When Winthrop died in 1649, Bradford remained pensive about his participation in New England, and he spent the final seven years of his life composing poetry. Here, he again revisited the theme of the Indian. As Michael G. Runyan has suggested, perhaps the most sophisticated achievement of the poetry comes in the metaphorical and literal union of the figure of the Indian in his long poem *Some Observations*, wherein Bradford “seizes upon the menacing figure of the Indian and represents him as both a literal threat of physical destruction and a metaphor for a state of spiritual poverty,” one which could serve as metaphor for both whites *and* Indians.⁴³⁹ Bradford writes, “Methinks I see some great change at hand,” a change that, by 1654, had already occurred.⁴⁴⁰ Bradford’s fear, however, rests in the spiritual decay of the colony; the faith of the following had strayed far from the original church, the institution of the ancient English

⁴³⁷ Ibid., 2:181, 235.

⁴³⁸ Ibid., 2:276.

⁴³⁹ As of this writing, Runyan’s work contains the only published collected work of Bradford’s poetic works; *William Bradford: The Collected Verse*, (St. Paul: John Colet Press, 1974), xiii.

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid., 262.

that had served as a model and that Bradford had, like Foxe, connected to his church. “True godliness doth not now so shine,” Bradford writes, which “will cause God’s judgments soon for to break in.”⁴⁴¹ The Indians represent, as the Saxons did for Gildas, a national *and* spiritual decline, where they symbolically signify spiritual degradation and they literally represent removal from the physical land upon which the settlement connects to its national heritage. The Norman-Saxon model becomes reversed. Further, in a warning that hearkens back to Gildas and looks forward to Mather, Bradford views them as capable of mustering enough force to hinder the English or, in fact, to drive them away forever.⁴⁴² In a vivid and subtly intricate use of the Indians as metaphor for the New England whites, Bradford’s warning carries a twofold caveat: “Their government, if any such be, / is nothing else but a mere tyranny.”⁴⁴³ A loss of unification, warns Bradford, leads to this overrun, as does the constant threat of the symbolic Other first narrated in the figure of Thomas Morton. This, Bradford’s final point on the myth of American Saxonhood, is most telling as it concludes both his and Winthrop’s addition to the Myth of American Saxonhood: the reading of salvation can only be attained by God’s intervention in history, which itself is granted by the continuation of the *folc* into the collective Christian historical consciousness which aligns the Israelites, Anglo-Saxons, and New Englanders. Had Bradford and Winthrop failed to transform the founding Saxon migration myth, it might have slowly vanished away and been forgotten. Whatever strength was left was picked up by Mather and transformed into the strongest regional feature of the eighteenth-century New World, and the best representation of the legacy of Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical writing adopted for purposes of national unification became New England Saxonhood.

⁴⁴¹ Ibid., 266, 273.

⁴⁴² Ibid., 346-49.

⁴⁴³ Ibid., 5-6.

Extremely fond of Bradford and sympathetic to the inherent difficulties in that first crossing, Mather wrote, “for all the fires of martyrdom which were kindled in the days of Queen Mary ... among those devout people was our William Bradford.” Mather here positions Bradford in the New English martyr lineage. “The leader of a people in a wilderness had need be a Moses,” continues Mather, “and if a Moses had not led the people of Plymouth Colony, when this worthy person was their governour, the people had never with so much unanimity and importunity still called him to lead them.”⁴⁴⁴ Mather’s vision of Bradford as a martyr—in line with the continuation of Foxe’s earlier model—helps to position his own writings in direct lineage with those of Gildas, Bede, and Foxe and opens the door to Mather’s fundamental Saxonism; “Whoso is wise, may observe” these things, Mather repeats, observing in Gildas and showing through various examples in hopes that the ruin of Briton will not befall America. This is the key behind *every* Mather work and every example in the *Magnalia*. In Bradford, Mather writes, “The plantation was quickly thrown into a storm that almost overwhelmed it, by the unhappy actions of a minister sent over from England by the adventurers concerned for the plantation; but by the blessing of Heaven on the conduct of the governour, they weathered out that storm.” But—and this comprises Mather’s position as well—in order for this to happen, New England had to assume the role of the conqueror. Thus, almost by default, New England Saxonhood develops, and Mather equates the idea of the love of liberty, one’s country, and one’s past with the love of Christianity. The Saxon vision of slavery, as in captivity, ideologizes the subjection, or slavery, of the Christian. Bondage such as that imposed upon the historical Saxons by the Normans represented what the colonists in the eighteenth century viewed as a condition of those who had lost all power of self-determination, whose “degradation was the final realization

⁴⁴⁴ *MCA* 2:207.

of what the loss of freedom could mean everywhere; for there was no ‘partial liberty.’”⁴⁴⁵ In other words, the victor who has the power of subordination can control the will and actions of the victim—and for Mather, this also meant movement away from the will of God. Justly speaking, New Englanders, according to Gildas through Mather, simply had that right.

⁴⁴⁵ *Pamphlets of the American Revolution, 1750-1776*, Vol. 1, Bernard Bailyn ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), 141-42.

CHAPTER FOUR

MADOC'S LAST HURRAH AND THOMAS JEFFERSON: SEALING THE FATE OF AMERICAN SAXONHOOD

*Madoc ... abandoned his barbarous country,
and sailed away to the West in search of some better resting-place.*

-Robert Southey

*The broken-boned Saxon chief: They were perhaps right
In limiting as far as possible the power of the dead.*

-Robinson Jeffers

On September 4, 1805, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark's Corps of Discovery entered Bitterroot Valley, Montana, near the Western Montana border by what is now called Lost Trail Pass. There, as they traveled around West Fork Creek, and, once inside the Sula Basin, the group encountered a small faction of Salish Indians. Because the Salish were completely unknown to white citizens, Clark famously declared himself "the first white man who ever were [sic] on the waters of this river."⁴⁴⁶ However, the Salish language was *dehors* the colonists' records of American Indians; further, the Salish spoke no language resembling that of any eastern tribe. Communication was therefore difficult, and the strange group of Indians confused the company. When he wrote about the event two days later, Private Joseph Whitehouse, the lowest ranking member of the Corps, penned these notes in his journal: "we take these Savages to be the Welch [sic] Indians if their be [sic] any Such from the Language. So Capt. Lewis took down the Names of every thing in their Language, in order that it may be found out whether they

⁴⁴⁶ September 5, 1805; *Original Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, 1804-1806*, Ruben G. Thwaites, ed., 8 vols. (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1904) 3:53.

are or whether they Sprang or origenated [sic] first from the welch or not.”⁴⁴⁷ Whitehouse goes on to relate the Salish incident to the myth that some Indians of the interior may have descended from legendary Welsh travelers. In fact, President Thomas Jefferson, himself Welsh, had personally told Lewis to look out for the mythical “Welsh Indians,” providing him with a map of exactly where he should find them.⁴⁴⁸

Legend had it, then, that there existed a group of Welsh descendants living as Indians in the Northwest Territory. Some versions held these individuals were from Welsh adventurers originally in Captain John Smith’s 1607 Jamestown colony. Word about these Indians spread first in Wales, then moved to all of Europe, ultimately reaching America. Jefferson’s map, in fact, came from one of the principal promoters of the myth, Welshman John Evans, who, after leaving his home in rural North Wales in 1792, traveled first to London and then across the ocean to more remote parts of North America in search of Prince Madoc’s Welsh Indians. Madoc, as a colonialization force first used in North America by the Virginia Company of London’s, had been dormant for some time. Fueled by an eighteenth-century revival of Prince Madoc—the Welsh myth first set forth by the Elizabethan John Dee in Britain’s imperial claims on North America—and with the strong support of his London-Welsh contemporaries, the young weaver set out to prove the existence of the Welsh Indians in America. Evans inherited this story, which had gained energy as an ideological tool in literary and historical circles of Wales, from trace narratives that connected John Dee’s earlier Tudor claims to more recent and contemporary North American sightings. The accounts reported that distant relatives of Madoc still lived as North American Indians in the Northwest Territory. Advanced largely by the poet/bard Iolo

⁴⁴⁷ Thwaites 7:149.

⁴⁴⁸ Stephen E. Ambrose, *Undaunted Courage: Meriwether Lewis, Thomas Jefferson, and the Opening of the American West* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), 290. See also James P. Ronda, *Lewis and Clark among the Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 178-9.

Morganwg (Edward Williams), literary genius of the Welsh-London Society and dilettante Welsh historian, though not necessarily renowned for his devotion to accuracy in the sphere of hard, factual history, the legend linked the twelfth-century Welsh Madoc myth to a startling new addition put forth by New York minister Morgan Jones, who himself had issued a formal statement that attested to his encounter with a small band of Welsh Indians in Virginia in 1686. These stories continued into the mid-eighteenth century, sparked first in the colonies by William Penn, until they reached then-president Thomas Jefferson who, tantalized by the thought of discovering the Welsh Indians for reasons of lineage, sent Evans's map with his adventurers, Lewis and Clark.

North American Indians—Welsh or not—represented a very real problem for Jefferson. Despite the success of the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, he knew that neither the French nor the Americans held any legitimate “rights” to the land west of the Missouri. To advance a peaceful conquest of the Northwest Territory, Jefferson needed a legitimate narrative—so he created one.⁴⁴⁹ Under the watchful eyes of Spain and France, martial conquest would be too bold; thus, the stated object of the Lewis and Clark expedition was confirmed to trace the best water route from the Missouri River to the Pacific for the establishment of a fur trade; this, along with Jefferson's own personal agenda in the project's scientific and exploratory value, served as the overarching goal. Since the Indians at this point had become increasingly adamant in their opposition to land concessions, however, any dealings with them would be tenuous at best. Consequently, the serendipitous meeting with the amicable Salish, coupled with the ideology

⁴⁴⁹ Stephen Aron, *American Confluence: The Missouri Frontier from Borderland to Border State* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 130. To better buttress this creation, as Anthony F. C. Wallace observes, Jefferson's “Policy of Civilization and Assimilation” included seven key points, which later included two important constitutional provisions: the right for Congress to supervise commerce with the Indians and the power for the president to buy Indian lands; *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 225-26.

behind Evans's map, presented the Corps members with a conundrum: Could this be the long lost tribe, Welshmen living with the American Indians, distant relatives of Prince Madoc, supposed original discoverer of North America? Despite their amicability, these Indians spoke no language close to what any American knew, and the two groups were forced to communicate through a crude sign language system. The Salish provided the Corps of Discovery with food and outfitted them with horses so that the Americans were able to continue westward. Unsure of any Welsh connections due to language restrictions, the group proceeded on. Writing of the incident later, Sergeant John Ordway noted that the Salish provided the group with "40 good pack horses," adding that they were "the likelyist and honestest Indians" the Corps of Discovery encountered on the journey.⁴⁵⁰ When they left the Salish and proceeded to Lolo Creek, members of the Corps headed toward present-day Idaho on Salish horses, which allowed them to cross the trail, any hopes of finding the long lost Welsh quickly vanishing with the remnants of the Madoc myth in North America.

The "exploratory value" of Jefferson's interest in the Welsh Indian myth has never been satisfactorily discussed, and this chapter intends to fill in that gap. The connections between Madoc and him in the arena of American identity have remained virtually untouched. Essentially, Jefferson's renewed interest in Madoc stems in part from the Welsh national myth that serves as a bridge from seventeenth- to eighteenth-century American Saxonhood. Specifically, in this chapter I argue Jefferson's interest in Madoc serves a dual purpose: although his interest in Welsh origins infuses the Corps of Discovery mission, the final traces of Madoc, which first arise out of William Penn's push to create the beginnings of a new Welsh territory in North America, ultimately dissolve with Jefferson. His eventual use and abrupt dismissal of the

⁴⁵⁰ John Ordway, September 5, 1805, entry; Thwaites 3:56.

ideology forever ends its power in American Saxonhood. First, I shall examine these last remnants in Penn's use of the myth, where we see the final glimpses of the myth of Madoc used as a nation-building tool in the colonies. Penn, who drew on the Madoc myth for the sole purpose of attracting Welsh Quakers to North America for the purpose of rightful reconquest of the lands, did not employ a new argument. As we have seen, Madoc had surfaced, with some degree of success, in American Saxonhood once before. Following John Dee and Sir Walter Raleigh's claims for Welsh rights due to Prince Madoc's twelfth-century "discovery" of North America, Captain John Smith had earlier written that the Virginia Company project was an act of *recovery* of these lands, not a *discovery*. Although these arguments never solidified, the myth of Madoc never faded in the Welsh collective memory, and, seeking to bolster the Welsh nation in the colonies, certain circles began to publicize Madoc stories. In his colonization plans and with full financial support of the Stuarts, Penn promoted a new and slightly altered version of the myth to acquire funds for his own project, which ultimately failed under the power of New England American Saxonhood. However, the myth of Madoc had gained such momentum at this point that when, in the late summer of 1682, the first of twenty-three ships of Quakers landed in the eastern Delaware region of what is now Pennsylvania, the Welsh prince reemerged as a publicly relevant mythical figure in both Europe and America. Penn created such an international stir that Romantic poet Robert Southey would famously write of this momentous occasion in his epic, merging the Madoc and Penn protagonists, portraying both figures as heroically fleeing a constricting, monarchical tyranny and forming an original national narrative in a new land.⁴⁵¹

⁴⁵¹ Caroline Franklin, "The Welsh American Dream: Iolo Morganwg, Robert Southey and the Madoc Legend," *English Romanticism and the Celtic World*, Gerard Carruthers and Alan Rawes, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 70.

A Welshman himself and constantly on the alert for racial connections between North America and the past, Thomas Jefferson became intrigued with the Madoc myth. In the second part of this chapter, I shall examine Jefferson's path to Madoc in the Northwest Territory by tracing his complex relationship with Anglo-Saxon texts, history, and the Old English language, and his pronounced and lasting impact on American Saxonhood. Since Jefferson's manipulation of American Saxonhood comes out of a period fraught with revolutionary Anglo-Saxon-based arguments concerned largely with American independence, I first turn to eighteenth-century pamphlet material. American pamphlets impelled "Saxonism" into the public consciousness. Many of the arguments in this material claimed an Anglo-Saxon superiority and promoted a democratic Whig cause against a Norman-Tory opposition of aristocracy and monarchical individuality. As a young lawyer, Jefferson was immersed in the dialogue and became increasingly interested in Elizabethan Sir Edward Coke's Anglo-Saxon writings on the law. Going much further, however, Jefferson launched into a massive socio-linguistic study of Old English, creating a complex and systematic notion of how Anglo-Saxon language works and matters to America.

Finally, I offer a close analysis of Jefferson's two core American Saxonhood documents—"An Essay Towards Facilitating Instruction in the Anglo-Saxon and Modern Dialects of the English Language" and *Notes on the State of Virginia*—and explore how the Saxon ideas in these advance Jefferson's vision for the nation's future and lead him, at the end, toward goals of expansion in the Pacific Northwest. The two documents support each other. In a method similar to Cotton Mather's "Christianography," which argued for Saxon historical ties in its geographical approach, Jefferson creates a new map for the American-Saxon argument involving land tenure and rightful conquest and expansion. While "Essay" highlights the

importance of language and history in the foundation of this geographical model, *Notes* is an American pastoral in the most medieval sense, a reimagining of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* for America in both scope and tenor that paints a glorious and auspicious vision of Jefferson's emerging Saxonhood. Its narrative stands as the cultural synecdoche for American Saxonhood, where a wholly Saxon vision of Virginia emerges as the model *terra*. With *Notes*, however, comes the fatal claims of Saxon rights of conquest. The notions of land control that inform Jefferson's Corps of Discovery led to his eventual quest for the Madoc Indians, and the northwest "discovery" of Lewis and Clark confuses and, ultimately, reshapes Jefferson's historical narrative of American Saxonhood: notions of American superiority become factual, thus altering the course of American Saxonhood forever.

WILLIAM PENN AND THE WELSH RECOVERY PROJECT

As we have seen in the preceding chapters, interest in Madoc for nation-building purposes had waned following the Virginia Company's settlement at Jamestown. For other English migrants, such as Cotton Mather, the Saxons simply provided a stronger migration model. Moreover, as more Germanic Saxon stories were being unearthed in the late-seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries—and with them, new scholarly interest in language as a source of national identification and law codes as a way to connect historical ideologies—English interest in the Welsh role of Arthur, once the central core of a powerful nation-building narrative and one which for decades had been circulating in stories and poetry, waned. Marginalized by growing Saxon pride and new textual scholarship, Arthur and the Welsh kings had lost their power, their limited appeal further weakened by the political upheavals of the seventeenth century. As David

Cannadine succinctly observes, Welsh culture lacked any national status at this time.⁴⁵² The Madoc myth that had served Virginia also languished. To the late seventeenth-century English, the Saxons simply seemed more *real*, where, on the other hand, partly due to the paucity of written historical documentation and the ensuing rationalist mindset, Welsh myths such as Madoc seemed far too folkloric. Even Milton, who had planned to use Welsh Arthurian matter for a national epic, ultimately rejected the subject. Apart from a few works such as Dryden's opera *King Arthur; or, the British Worthy* (1691) and Richard Blackmore's *Prince Arthur* (1695) and *King Arthur* (1697), the Matter of Britain, or the characteristically national romance ideology, so previously attractive in the hands of Geoffrey of Monmouth and, later, Sir Thomas Malory now seemed moribund. Thus marginalized in respect to the English national dialogue, the Welsh remained on the liminal edge, in terms of nationhood, as England ushered in the eighteenth century.

In North America, visions of Madoc had faded with the last adventurers of the Virginia Company until William Penn employed Madoc for his colonial purposes, including the Quakers, Cotton Mather's *bête noire* religious group in the late seventeenth century. Penn links Madoc to Jefferson. He had resuscitated the myth's connection to American Saxonhood, arguing for national recovery to his Quaker following. Arlin M. Adams, Charles J. Emmerich, and Edward Corbyn Obert Beatty have all explored and elaborated on Penn's radical Quaker vision as an ideological source for his notions of religious liberty. Here, however, I wish to stress the complications involved in his endeavor to recreate a recovery of the British Empire in America

⁴⁵² "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition,' c. 1820–1977," *The Invention of Tradition*, Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 69.

rather than the making of a religious-based colony.⁴⁵³ These ends create a path that is followed, in later years, by Jefferson in his quest for the Welsh Indians.

Penn worked with the Quakers because once eager to relocate, like Bradford's Leyden group, they were fiercely loyal. To the Quakers, America appeared attractive for two reasons. First, the land might provide Welsh Quakers with a region wherein they could practice their own form of religion, and, second, the colonies could serve as a kind of originary spot where independent-minded Quakers might exist free from the Welsh Barony. In an attempt to quell any possible proselytizing in the colonies, Protestants furiously began circulating anti-Quaker pamphlets in New England. The Quakers soon discovered a powerful ally in James II. Like them, a religious outsider, James had been considering a new policy of religious tolerance and thus sided with the Quakers against the Anglican establishment, which remained in bitter opposition to them.

To Penn, the New World seemed auspicious. North American lands were owed to the Penn family, and the geography provided an opportune location for religious liberty. His father, Admiral William Penn, Sr., had financially supported both Charles I and Charles II, the latter in his attempts to be restored to the throne. By the time of the elder Penn's death, the Crown of England owed the Penn family 16,000 pounds plus interest, as well as all of the back salary to the late admiral for his service to England. In March 1681, the king agreed to grant young William charter for American lands as due payment. Ever close to the present king as he was to James, well read in English legal codes, and seeking to put his ideas of religion and liberty into action on a new geography, Penn saw this as a fortuitous opportunity. Since, too, he was already

⁴⁵³ See Arlin M. Adams, Charles J. Emmerich, Warren E. Burger, *Nation Dedicated to Religious Liberty: The Constitutional Heritage of the Religion Clauses* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990) and Edward Corbyn Obert Beatty, *William Penn as Social Philosopher* (Columbia University Press: New York, 1939).

planning a move to America, recent Quaker convert Penn had the power in numbers to lead a successful migration. He simply needed a selling point.⁴⁵⁴

Like Mather and John Winthrop before him, Penn viewed the Saxon migration model favorably. The Saxons, Penn claimed, “lost nothing by Transporting of themselves [to Britain]; and doubtless found a greater Consistency between their Laws, than their Ambition.”⁴⁵⁵

However, he required a more lucrative model. In stark contrast to New England, which, at least for the time, was financially secure in its operations and land holdings, Penn’s “holy experiment” needed money; and to make more money from his lands, Penn subsequently needed to attract productive workers. Since Penn meant to profit by selling and collecting on land, the “Free Colony” was essentially a misnomer—it wasn’t *free*. Penn was under a lot of pressure to sell as he was in debt going into the colonization project. He owed fellow London Quaker and financial backer Philip Ford a debt of 2851 pounds and had already given him a mortgage of 300,000 acres. Penn would remain in debt for the duration of his involvement with Pennsylvania. Since his primary goal was to make money, Penn needed a large support group with a shared purpose looking for a place to emigrate. He knew the Quakers and their struggles, and he saw his fellow Quakers as a perfect fit, primarily because they wished to do well by thinking they were doing some serviceable religious “good”; Penn was, after all, one of them. The “good” could be defined, or adapted, later. By 1683, James assigned Penn all rights to the Delaware Territory, and

⁴⁵⁴ Penn’s closeness to James has not been significantly studied but should not be underestimated. As records show, he enjoyed great favor with the king, often acting as Ambassador for England and in other top positions. For more, see J.R. Jones, “A Representative of the Alternative Society of Restoration England?” *The World of William Penn*, R.S. Dunn and M. Maples Dunn, eds. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 55-69.

⁴⁵⁵ “England’s Present Interest Considered, with Honour to the Prince, and Safety to the People” (1675) in *The Select Works of William Penn* (London, 1835) 2:274. Penn’s erudition on the common law and English history fills his earlier writings; he modeled Coke, who scribbled English legal codes and notes everywhere in his marginalia and often in his public writings. Suffice it to say, he was solidly versed in the English common law and knew well the migration myth as handed down by the Britons and Saxons.

Pennsylvania soon became the most widely advertised land in American history up to that point.⁴⁵⁶

Controversies over the methods with which Penn so successfully accomplished the “sale” of the Welsh Quaker migration abound in part because the facts of the matter are inexplicably scant. In this section, I would like to piece together evidence from what literary material does remain. The first issue revolves around Penn’s imagined community, or his idea of the “Free Colony.” Alan Taylor explains Penn’s concept of nation-state this way:

Penn’s plans for Pennsylvania expressed his double position as a Quaker and a gentleman, bent on sustaining his own fortune while benefiting his persecuted faith. Putting a Quaker twist on the Puritan concept of a colony as a “City upon a Hill,” Penn spoke of Pennsylvania as a “holy experiment” and an “example to the Nations.”⁴⁵⁷

Unlike Winthrop’s City on a Hill or Mather’s Puritan New England, Penn’s colony had no large, tax-supported system of religion, no ideological power of the church behind it, so while he spoke freely of a colony where *all* immigrants could travel, he certainly meant, first and foremost, to provide a haven for his own persecuted group. In this way, Penn and Mather differed greatly. However, the former’s thought was influenced to a large degree by New England’s success in its development, scope, and appropriation of American Saxonhood as a driving force for colonization. Mather’s success was never far from Penn’s mind, and the resolution to advertise the territory as a *new* land expanded its possibilities, both geographically *and* demographically.

When his charter was first granted, Penn wrote as follows to his friend and leading Welsh

⁴⁵⁶ The original contract, drawn up by Penn’s amanuensis Joseph Curteis, is currently preserved in the State Public Records Division of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Albert Cook Myers, *William Penn’s Own Account of the Lenni Lenape or Delaware Indians* (Somerset: Middle Atlantic Press, 1970), 85-7.

⁴⁵⁷ *American Colonies: The Settling of North America* (New York: Penguin Putnam, 2002), 266.

Quaker Robert Turner in March 1681: “this day my country was confirmed to me under the Great Seal of England with large powers and privelages [sic] by the name of Pennsylvania,” a name chosen by the king, Penn writes, for he had suggested “New Wales.”⁴⁵⁸ Pennsylvania’s first land advertisement, written by Penn himself in 1681, portrays the successful conviction of Welsh migration: “I thought it not less my duty than my honest interest to give some public notice ... that those of our own, or other nations, that are inclined to transport themselves or families beyond the seas, may find another country added to their choice; that if they shall happen to like the place, conditions and constitutions.”⁴⁵⁹ Although here and in his public correspondence Penn links Wales to North America and argues for the propriety of a Welsh migration, many Quakers imagined that the true holy experiment was centered in England and believed they should stay and endure the opposition in England rather than journey to Pennsylvania.⁴⁶⁰ Thus, Penn’s task grew increasingly more difficult. In order to succeed with the Welsh Quakers, he needed a radical plan.

Penn advertised most to the Quakers for two very important reasons. First, he knew their background. Quakers were different from Mather’s New England Puritans, who largely hailed from more sophisticated and prosperous parts of England, such as East Anglia and London; in this sense, Puritans were more Saxon. In contrast, Quakers generally hailed from smaller, more rural northern country lands farther inland. To make Pennsylvania seem more attractive, he offered localized “tracts” of land to willing immigrant groups, such as the “Welsh Tract” near

⁴⁵⁸ *The Papers of William Penn* (hereafter *PWP*), Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, eds., 5 vols. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981-87) 2:110.

⁴⁵⁹ *Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania; Lately Granted under the Great Seal of England to William Penn, etc. Together with Privileges and powers necessary to the well-governing thereof* (London, 1681).

⁴⁶⁰ Richard S. Dunn, “William Penn and the Selling of Pennsylvania, 1681-1685,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 127:5 (1983), 322. See also Barry Levy, *Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware Valley, 1650-1780* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1988), 110-12.

Merion, Pennsylvania, an impressive region with no English equivalent and one similar to that of the Scottish Quakers. In 1682, he gained even more Quaker support by spearheading a joint-stock company headed by the leading group of London Quaker merchants designed solely to mobilize sales and profits in Pennsylvania.⁴⁶¹ These tracts attracted Quakers because, as Penn knew, they shied away from government and warfare, saw no need for social or religious hierarchy, and principally believed they should hold themselves apart from other faiths. Further, in selling lands to the Quakers, he had agreed to demarcate lands for a New Wales. The area, Penn stated, would consist of “all land purchased of me by those North and South Wales together with the adjacent counties, as Haverfordshire, Shropshire and Cheshire, about forty thousand acres, may be lay out contiguously as one Barony.”⁴⁶² Thus did the entire project boast of itself as a New Wales in North America. Importantly, too, Penn knew the Quakers intimately, offering them various leadership positions, much in the vein of the leading members of the Virginia Company some seventy years earlier.⁴⁶³ New Wales offered an individual stake for its members. Penn’s vision combined this type of social inclusion of the Welsh with the rhetoric of the British Empire’s quest for dominion into a mythic vision of recovery, the most important reason for his aggressive selling to the Quakers. That is, Penn knew the myth of Madoc well, which story became the ultimate advertising weapon for selling Pennsylvania to the Quakers.

Although the Madoc narrative had lain dormant for some years following the Tudors’ use of it in their early Virginia Company dealings, it was not completely forgotten, nor was Welsh interest in America. In the years prior to the American Revolution, Welsh migration to the

⁴⁶¹ *PWP* 1:327.

⁴⁶² Qtd. in Charles Huston, *An Essay on the History and Nature of Original Titles to Land in the Province and State of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: T. & J.W. Johnson, 1849), 93-4.

⁴⁶³ John W. Jordan, *A History of Delaware County, Pennsylvania, and its People*, 2 vols. (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1914) 1:114-15.

colonies boomed. Immigrants were predominantly Baptists and Quakers, the latter most prominent in the early settlement of Pennsylvania, 40,000 acres of which were sold to immigrants from Merionethshire in North Wales in 1682.⁴⁶⁴ Around this time, too, there had been mention of “lost tribes” of Welshmen living among the Indians since the time of Humphrey Gilbert’s voyages. Future Pennsylvania governor Thomas Lloyd and his brother Charles were especially convinced that Welshmen resided in the southeastern area of America, having supposedly been spotted by various expeditions. The argument ran that a tribe of Welsh-speaking Indians, the Madogwys, themselves descendents of Madoc, still lived somewhere on the eastern seaboard. Unfolding at first slowly within smaller Welsh circles, the story spread rapidly, and the renewal of the Madoc myth became a large part of the growing Welsh interest in discovering and then resurrecting the ancient Britons. “The migrations,” Gwyn Williams notes, “were consciously directed towards the creation of a new, free, ‘restored’ Wales [the ancient British state] in the west.”⁴⁶⁵ In truth, it was the lasting embers of John Dee’s claims on Madoc that likely sparked most, if not all, of this speculation, for Dee was still read and heralded, his scholarly reputation reaching well into the eighteenth century.⁴⁶⁶

During the years surrounding Penn’s migration to America, however, it was the narrative of “Morgan Jones” that carried the most weight and would help Penn in his recruitment of Welsh immigrants. In 1666, Morgan Jones was, allegedly, a traveler with William Berkeley in the Port Royal Plantation area of South Carolina. Separated from Berkeley, he reportedly was captured in 1669 by a tribe of Tuscaroras called the Doeg. As he was being dragged to captivity, a war captain whom Jones thought to be wearing a crest from the Doeg Indians (he claims “whose

⁴⁶⁴ Elizabeth Rokkan, “America as Idea and Reality in the Context of Welsh Settlement,” *American Studies in Scandinavia* 19 (1987), 85-91.

⁴⁶⁵ *The Search for Beulah Land: The Welsh and the Atlantic Revolution* (London: Croom Helm Ltd., 1980), 35.

⁴⁶⁶ See French, *John Dee*, 11.

original I find must needs be from the old Britons”) told him in “the British tongue” that he would not die. For the remainder of his stay, Jones conversed in English with his captors.⁴⁶⁷ Jones supposedly lived with the Doeg for several months, preaching the Gospel in Welsh, and then returned to the British Colonies where he eventually recorded his adventure in 1686 (though the story had already circulated orally for years). Jones’ story came to Penn by way of Charles and Thomas Lloyd, the latter of whom apparently received the “original” transcription, albeit from sources unknown.⁴⁶⁸ Welsh vicar Theophilus Evans, a member of the audience at one of Lloyd’s presentations—a talk promoting American lands to the Welsh, and one for which, oddly, all other written accounts were mysteriously deemed “lost”—then told the narrative to *Gentlemen’s Magazine*, through which it publically spread. The Jones story reappeared in a 1682 pamphlet circulated around South Wales informing the Welsh Quakers of Penn’s plans for America. Inserted into this pamphlet were “many credible accounts that had been received of a discovery of a people among the Indians who spoke Welsh, and that they were supposed to be the descendents of Madog’s [sic] colony.”⁴⁶⁹

Penn reportedly gathered the Quakers in South Wales and told the Madoc story, including the Jones narrative.⁴⁷⁰ Many of Penn’s “attendants” were later said, in fact, to have witnessed this colony (a number of later travelers claimed to have found these Welsh Indians, and one even reported the tribe he visited generated a copy of the Gospel written in Welsh). The Jones

⁴⁶⁷ Taken from the transcription of the account in Benjamin Franklin Bowen, *America Discovered by the Welsh in 1170 A.D.* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1876), 48-9. See also Williams, *Madoc: The Making of a Myth*, 75.

⁴⁶⁸ Not surprisingly, this was future Welsh governor Thomas Lloyd who came to play a profound role in the Welsh shaping of Pennsylvania (and who would continue to play a vital role in Pennsylvania until his death in 1694). When Penn returned to England, Lloyd, acknowledged by then as Deputy Governor by the Province and acting in that capacity even though he was not recognized as governor by those within the territories, continued to circulate the story verbally.

⁴⁶⁹ *The Cambrian Journal*, (Tenby: R. Mason, 1861), 103. See also Thomas Stephens, *Madoc: An Essay on the Discovery of America by Madoc Ap Owen Gwynedd in the Twelfth Century*, 3rd ed. (London: Longmans, 1983), 70, 136-37.

⁴⁷⁰ Stephens, 136; *Cambrian Journal* (1859), 105.

narrative served as the best advertisement for America, which was, in Jones' story, the native lands of the Britons, ancestors of the Welsh. Madoc had been reborn. Penn additionally claimed that there existed a "Norman Yoke" on the Welsh and that due recovery was not only possible, it was rightful. Penn succeeded in attracting scores of Welshmen; his inspired eighteenth-century mass migration caused, in turn, a resurgence in Welsh culture. In its new manifestation, the Madoc myth even encompassed Penn's immigrants, some of whom claimed to be "lost descendants" of Madoc fleeing monarchical tyranny. Thus, the Welsh, who had had no desire to live among the English settlers, arrived in Pennsylvania for the very purposes of preserving their nationality. Promising to give them exclusive title to the "Welsh Tract"—"a barony where they could keep up their old language and their old custom"—Penn continued throughout the venture to attract as many as he could in this manner.⁴⁷¹ Ultimately, "[it was in that social and] 'patriot,' radical-national sense, that the Madoc myth worked its magic [because] it fused with that missionary impulse which was so potent in Welsh Dissent and which could assume a political as well as a religious dimension."⁴⁷² Madoc provided a socio-cultural link *away* from manorial English powers, and the myth's veracity became a moot point. To the Pennsylvania Welsh, and certainly to Penn, who was trying to populate the region with like-minded citizens, Madoc supplied power against marginalization of the Welsh and in support of Welsh American interests alone: "even the movement of the myth itself, its focusing on the Mandan Indians was a product

⁴⁷¹ This "Welsh Tract" is now on the outskirts of Philadelphia, and its place names reflect the Quaker history of South and North Wales. Like the Armenian Baptists, who also settled and flourished in this area, the Quaker community in Wales disappeared shortly afterwards; David Salmon, "The Quakers of Pembrokeshire," *Historical Society of West Wales Transactions*, Francis Green, ed. 9:1920-23 (Carmarthen: Spurrell, 1923), 23.

⁴⁷² Gwyn Williams, "Welsh Indians: The Madoc Legend and the First Welsh Radicalism," *History Workshop* (1976) 1:151.

of the geographical focusing of rival imperialism.”⁴⁷³ So successful was this initial push that by the late 1680s, the Welsh Quaker population was so large in Pennsylvania that it could be identified as a distinct ethnic grouping, even, claims Hywel M. Davies, as “a nation” in and of itself.⁴⁷⁴

Madoc’s final pull faded, however, under the growing weight of Cotton Mather’s New England Saxonhood, which had already dominated the colonies. Initially, Mather had been openly ambiguous in his writings regarding Penn and the Welsh; later, he was vitriolic. In his *Magnalia*, after oddly granting his model Gildas the Briton Welsh status, Mather appropriates Gildas’s original warning of the British sins, which, for Gildas, caused God’s wrath to let the Saxons overrun the country, as an example for New Englanders to see the errors of Welsh Quakers: “May the English do what must be done [regarding the Christianizing of slaves], that the Welch [sic] may not be destroyed for the lack of knowledge, lest our indisposition to do for their souls bring upon us all those judgments of heaven which Gildas their country-man once told them that they suffered for their disregards unto ours.”⁴⁷⁵ The Welsh, in Mather’s example, are tantamount in status to the black heathens Mather discusses in *Magnalia* that serve as obstacles to racial success—both groups must be converted. Because of this animosity toward the Quakers, Mather was vehemently against Penn’s project from the outset, especially his manipulation of the American Saxonhood myth. Although he accepted the possibility of an earlier exploration and discovery of America—“I know it must be said and proved well, that this new world was known, and partly inhabited by Britains, or by Saxons from England, three or

⁴⁷³ “Mandan” became the accepted name for what were once perceived to be Madoc’s ancestors; Williams, “Welsh Indians,” 151.

⁴⁷⁴ The years 1684-1692 saw the largest growth spurt in the Welsh Tract; *Transatlantic Brethren: Rev. Samuel Jones (1735-1814) and His Friends: Baptists in Wales, Pennsylvania, and Beyond* (Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 1995), 27.

⁴⁷⁵ *MCA* 1:582.

four hundred years before the Spanish came histher [sic]”—the powerful means through which Penn succeeded surely bothered Mather, who knew the Morgan Jones story but did not believe it.⁴⁷⁶ In the *Magnalia*, in fact, he scorns Morgan Jones—whom he refers to as “M.J.,” “a Welch tanner by trade” who stumbled into the ministry—referring to him as an example of a pseudo minister in the colonies.⁴⁷⁷ Mather lumps together Penn’s Welsh, Indians, and even Satan, as the encroaching “Saxon,” while maintaining his own Saxon ideologies of conquest, which, it will be remembered, provided historio-religious support for *any* solutions dealing with racial depravity.⁴⁷⁸ His figuration of this theme—that the Quakers posed multiple threats—severely lessened Penn’s lasting impact on the national mythology, rendering the Madoc myth’s Welsh power virtually impuissant against the New England model. In fact, Mather was so effective in this defense that “the alien Quaker assumed a symbolic significance” in New England,” and New England Protestantism became more justified in its mark as “stock figure” of the newly-developing North American landscape.⁴⁷⁹

THE SAXON MIND OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

Following Penn’s unsuccessful attempt at reviving the Madoc myth for nationalistic purposes, American Saxonhood as an ideological power—from its inception in Elizabethan England to the chivalric creation in Virginia by John Smith and the Virginia Company and, in New England, the

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid., 1:43.

⁴⁷⁷ Ibid., 2:469.

⁴⁷⁸ So great was Mather’s animosity toward Penn and the *Welcome* group that a seemingly endless, perennial hoax exists describing Mather’s involvement in a plot attempt to hire pirates to capture the *Welcome* and sell the passengers, including Penn, into slavery in Barbados. For more on this, see “Would Have Kidnapped Penn: Old Letter Indicates That Cotton Mather Wanted to Sell Quakers as Slaves,” *The New York Times*, September 4, 1907.

⁴⁷⁹ Carla Gardina Pestana, *Quakers and Baptists in Colonial Massachusetts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 149. For instances of Mather’s writings on Quakers, see *Memorable Providences Relating to Witchcrafts and Possessions* (Boston, 1689), app. *Decennium Luctuosum* (Boston, 1699), 162-85. See also Slotkin, *Regeneration Through Violence*, 130.

arguments of Saxon Christendom as witnessed in the writings of the ecclesiastical chroniclers—lay dormant until Thomas Jefferson’s time. The myth of Madoc did likewise, gaining steam only in Wales, not in America. Jefferson, like others of his time, read deeply into the Saxon manuscripts, which were then being published at a rapid rate. He took from Sir Edward Coke and other common lawyers the idea that Saxon right was an inheritance and that America could be the new ground upon which the Saxon race would be revived. America was not the new Israel; it was the New *England*, or, importantly, the *old* England, which became, thought Jefferson, the new land for the Saxon. Significantly, he wanted to restore the Saxon foundation in America that he believed had been previously corrupted by the land tenure system installed by the Virginia Company. In that instance, America’s history equaled British history. However, unlike any of the other Revolutionary forefathers, Jefferson argued two foundational points: that there existed a rightful *place* for renewed Saxon liberty and, even more importantly, a remarkable vision that this consequent revolution should encompass more than land. “Revolution,” for Jefferson, represented more than geography—it registered an ideological mindset. During this time, a growing wave of “Saxonism” emerged from the rising tide of Saxon-based rhetoric in Britain, especially in the growing use of pamphlet material for public issues. Seeing the powerful import of these propagandist claims for their own struggles with independence, the American colonies began adopting these literary practices in their own claims for nationhood. While Saxon allusions permeate the pamphlets of the Revolutionary period, it is in Jefferson that we witness perhaps its most profound public impact and the argument for America’s rightful acceptance of *prisinta libertas* as handed down by the Saxons.

Jefferson pinned hopes for this revolution on reading and language—and in America’s overall education. More than any other previous manifestations, Jefferson’s American

Saxonhood relied heavily on the concept of social circulation of “cultural capital.” In Bourdieu’s sense of the term, “cultural capital” refers to anything that facilitates further appropriation of a culture’s “heritage,” most often through embodied or objectified signs, specifically, the components of this heritage used for “exclusive advantages.”⁴⁸⁰ In this, Jefferson did nothing new. As we have seen, Anglo-Saxon texts had been used to support various types of ideological pronouncements before. However, Jefferson was very much a product of his time, a period that afforded more opportunities for Saxon-based arguments than ever before. In the eighteenth century, complex communications circuits included conversations with newer editions of primary source material. Much of this new material became public property and gained a broader readership.⁴⁸¹ Further, as these newer editions of Anglo-Saxon documents and Old English language texts emerged, primary Anglo-Saxon tracts and histories—the most popular in the colonies were Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation* and Tacitus’s *Germania*—were often accompanied with the ideological bias of the editor or translator. Jefferson’s development of American Saxonhood coincides with this growth, and his reading is very much influenced by it.⁴⁸² Like Smith’s chivalric *romans de Amerique* or Cotton Mather’s “Christianography,” Jefferson’s pastoral Saxon vision presents America with a uniquely new manifestation of the old link to England, one he revises, re-envisions, and reshapes to fit into the American landscape.

We must keep in mind two very important socio-cultural features that inform Jefferson’s historically grounded and geographical construction of American Saxonhood: the new interest in Anglo-Saxonism and the emergence of the “Tory”-“Whig” division. In England following the

⁴⁸⁰ Bourdieu, 2.

⁴⁸¹ Bailyn, *Pamphlets*, 105.

⁴⁸² See Wright, *Literary Culture in Early New England*, esp. Parts One and Two.

Romantic period, Saxon arguments began to dominate the public discourse. With its Norman-Saxon opposition—where the “Norman Yoke” symbolized the strangulation of freedoms inherent in a truly original, democratic society—“Anglo-Saxonism” became a powerful tool of nationally impoverished groups or those existing on the liminal borders of dominant societies. By this definition, however, Anglo-Saxonism was itself the consequence of cultural capital, an imagined and interpretative racial history. It always had been. Since the days of Coke, lawyers and laymen—“medievalists” in the sense that they mined the ancient documents for historical support—carried forward notions from Saxon texts and histories to argue their cause. In its beginnings, the Anglo-Saxon arguments often remained vague due to the paucity of primary source material. The newer eighteenth-century medievalists, however, were those in both England and America who promoted a new brand of imagined community that *directly* related to the texts. Subsequently, these new scholars and editors read more closely into the texts. Whereas in the very early years of Anglo-Saxon scholarship groups used texts to support the Protestant Movement, eighteenth-century commentators looked to them more to define problems of lineage, religion, and law, and, importantly, language. In this way, the continued labor of scholars in sifting through Saxon cultural capital from the English past was of critical importance in maintaining the Anglo-Saxon ideology in England.

In fact, by further solidifying the connection between the English and their Saxon ancestors, eighteenth-century medievalists advanced two fundamental ideas that remained crucial to the growing American Saxonhood imagination as it incorporated this new medievalism. The development of the emergent “Tory”-“Whig” distinctions and the Whig fascination with Teutonism, or “Goth,” as it was later called, was crucial for Jefferson’s American Saxonhood. The Whig line traced its origins directly to the forests of Germany. Sparked by Thomas Gordon’s

vigorously radical Whig interpretation in his edition of Tacitus's *Germania*, eighteenth-century Saxon arguments claimed *princeps in ranks*. Tacitus served as the supporting primary evidence and the principal text to buttress arguments against the "landed gentry" and, historically, to minimize the seemingly ineffaceable effects of the Norman Conquest's success. Following Gordon's success, eighteenth-century America saw the rise of its own production of Saxon arguments in print. Ironically, as they sought to distance themselves from Britain, more Americans adopted British Saxon claims as their own, arguing for an independence based upon an arguably British claim. Jefferson makes these arguments American.

Political contestations between Britain and its colonies provide a platform for various pamphlet materials in both England and America. The Seven Year's War created a disconnect between the two increasingly distinct nations. The British felt that the war was undertaken for primarily colonial purposes and desired some monetary contributions to the depleted imperial treasury, but many Americans felt the draw to independence and their *own* history. During the Seven Year's War period, a number of crises—the Stamp Act, the Townshend Duties (which repealed all duties except the one on tea), and the First Continental Congress meeting in Philadelphia of 1774—highlighted this discord and the array of new policies and struggles that ensued from this initial division. England quickly began to interrogate its role as motherland and started to produce pamphlets that questioned the continued pursuit of colonial operations.⁴⁸³ Tacitus translator Gordon and John Trenchard arguably started the trend with printed tracts named *Cato's Letters* from 1720 to 1723, a series of vitriolic essays that advanced principles of freedom of conscience and freedom of speech. The genre became so popular that between 1763 and 1786, over one thousand pamphlets circulated in England alone. Pamphlets were, in the

⁴⁸³ My discussion of pamphlet material owes a debt to Bailyn's excellent analysis in *Pamphlets*.

main, a vehicle for very far-reaching conceptions of freedom of the press. A quick way to relate pertinent information, pamphlets were cheaply produced, highly flexible, and direct. Exploring salient issues of the day, pamphlets mostly concerned political situations, ranging in length from short squibs to longer tracts. Often, however, pamphlets developed arguments that offered quick rebuttals in regard to developing problems; they were swift, spontaneous, and striking in their attacks, often on each other. British pamphleteers largely detailed critical objections to the uselessness of various attempts to raise revenue in the colonies; in America, pamphlets were the medium of choice to explore the question of Britain and publically examine America's own evolving individualistic ideology. Before the publication of *Cato's Letters*, neither an open public dialogue nor a sustained and critical written dialogue existed in the colonies.

Americans were well aware of their general rights and British history; the increase in radical journalism, however, deeply personalized these connections. The political community became more individually centered largely because of pamphlets and newspapers, which brought about a public awareness whose strength had been previously untapped. Always polemical, the pamphlets of the Revolutionary period struck out against the three main British "attacks" on the colonies: They celebrated the repeal of the Stamp Act, castigated the Townshend Duties, and mounted great waves of printed support for the First Continental Congress. But in the pamphlets we find more than simple musings on public issues. Illuminating for their increasing reliance on the past, these pamphlets put forth arguments to support, most notably, the free and democratic myth of the Anglo-Saxons and common law.⁴⁸⁴ James Otis's pamphlet on the civil rights of the colonists, for example, provides a striking model of an

⁴⁸⁴ For more on the general eighteenth-century influence of the Anglo-Saxons, see H. Trevor Colbourn, *The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1965), 158-84.

ideological pronouncement that spoke for a generation (John Adams would say later that Otis was the most ardent supporter of colonial liberty, as well as the most influential).⁴⁸⁵ “See here the grandeur of the British Constitution!” wrote Otis, “see the wisdom of our ancestors! ... Let the *origin* of government be placed where it may [since] the *end* of it is manifestly the good of *the whole*.”⁴⁸⁶ More and more, this Saxon notion of a democratic unity of individual liberty tied to nation became public property in American colonies; pamphleteers often cited as support the perceived right of the ancient English common law, which took its root in the free and democratic state prior to the Norman invasion.

In one of the early defenses of the colonial attitude toward taxation that provided the framework for the argument later adopted during the revolutionary era, Richard Bland’s 1766 pamphlet spoke of the heroic Saxon freedoms represented by the structure of Anglo-Saxon *witenagemot*, wherein all important matters were settled by a group of “elected”—in the loose sense of the term, citizens. “I conceive we must recur to the civil Constitution of England, and from thence deduce and ascertain the Rights and Privileges of the People at the first Establishment of the Government, and discover the Alterations that have been made in them from Time to Time,” wrote Bland, continuing that “it is from the Laws of the Kingdom ... that we are to show the Obligation every Member of the State is under to pay Obedience to its Institutions [where] every Freeman, that is, every Freeholder, was a member of their

⁴⁸⁵ *The Works of John Adams, Second President of the United States: with a Life of the Author, Notes and Illustrations, by his Grandson Charles Francis Adams* (hereafter *WJA*), 10 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1856) 9:264.

⁴⁸⁶ *The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved* [1764] (University of Missouri Studies, 1929), 79, 52-4, emphasis added.

Wittinagemot [sic], or Parliament.”⁴⁸⁷ Implicit in Bland’s pamphlet is the theoretical use of Saxon freedoms, a vision that would find its fullest fruition in colonial America’s adoption of pamphlet writing.

American Saxonhood soon found a public audience. American Revolutionary writers also included Saxon themes in their own pamphlets, often supporting their claims by symbolically juxtaposing the British-American struggle with that of the Normans and Saxons. In Philadelphia, one of the more powerful American writers, an anonymous pamphleteer known only as “Demophilus,” promoted a radical vision of ancient Saxon democracy that venerated the Anglo-Saxons and excoriated Normans. This democracy joined small land groups into one *de facto* union. Demophilus spoke longingly of this “beautiful system that was invented in the German woods,” one which was comprised of smaller, segmented nation states that, eventually, coalesced into one, organic whole.⁴⁸⁸ “The Saxon’s democratic institutes,” concludes Demophilus, “formed a perfect model of government; where the natural rights of mankind were preserved, in their full exercise, pure and perfect, as far as the nature of society will admit of.”⁴⁸⁹ Demophilus’s ideas were interchangeable with those of nearly every other Whig historian, all of whom promoted the idea of Saxon power and attached the idea of Saxon government to America. In a similar manner did Obadiah Hulme’s *Historical Essay on the English Constitution* (1771) etch Saxon freedoms into the public memory. Ardent Whig historians such as Hulme, whom Jefferson devoured early on in his law career, had as their focus the fundamental belief that Saxons preserved their democratic cultures. Amidst all political upheavals, Saxons, these historians argued, held a

⁴⁸⁷ *An inquiry into the rights of the British colonies, intended as an answer to The regulations lately made concerning the colonies, and the taxes imposed upon them considered. In a letter addressed to the author of that pamphlet* (Virginia, 1766), 6.

⁴⁸⁸ *The Genuine Principles of the Ancient Saxon, or English Constitution* (Philadelphia, 1776), 4.

⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.

general assembly, or *witenagemot*; importantly, they claimed, any land gained by Saxon conquest was vested in the collective *body* of the state, not simply its individuals. In other words, the Saxon land tenure system stressed the many, not the few. This was democracy in its purest form. “Our Saxon forefathers,” writes Demophilus, “revered this principle; for they made their wittenagemot [sic]... entirely subject to the elective power of the people.”⁴⁹⁰ Often, Whig historians concluded as Hulme did: The Norman occupation of England tainted the purity of Saxon law, the intimacy of the “union between prince and the people,” connected by the *witenagemot*, “who represented the whole nation.”⁴⁹¹

There were, however, larger issues than ideological differences with Britain; disunification because of unrest within the colonies themselves was as important a concern. For a democracy to work in the Saxon sense, the land required a certain unity. Alfred and the earliest Saxon state had proved this to be true.⁴⁹² The two most public pieces of pamphlet writing that addressed sectile thought in America were Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* (1776) and John Dickinson’s *Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania* (1768), both in agreement with unification against a Norman-type opposition to liberty.⁴⁹³ Dickinson was one of many caught between Scylla and Charybdis: he was torn between a love for the mother country and the charge that Britain was, in fact, usurping liberties of free Americans. He was greatly influenced by Richard Gordon’s new translation of Tacitus, owning a dog-eared copy of Gordon’s *Germania*, which

⁴⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁹¹ *An Historical Essay on the English Constitution* (London, 1771), 27-9.

⁴⁹² Alfred’s work and history were becoming public knowledge, and he was imagined to be the ruler *par excellence* of the Saxon state. Pamphleteers and other writers knew of Alfred, and, as Simmons observes, the Anglo-Saxon heritage partook of a “celebratory remembrance of King Alfred, under whose leadership the Anglo-Saxon culture had reached its pinnacle”; *Reversing the Conquest*, 34.

⁴⁹³ The primary scribe behind the major documents of the Revolutionary Period, from the Congressional Resolution against the Stamp Act in 1765 to the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation, Dickinson became best known for his *Letters*, which were later included with Arthur Lee’s *The Monitor’s Letters* in a pamphlet entitled *The Farmer’s and Monitor’s Letters* in 1769.

had made a major contribution to his views on history and liberty (perhaps, as a result of Tacitus, he was the first of any pamphleteers to adopt an agrarian guise, a model borrowed from Englishman Edmund Spenser). Dickinson vehemently argued for liberty, proposing, however, that this could be attained via a certain moderation and claiming that the “cause of liberty” should be tempered with “dignity.”⁴⁹⁴ Though he consciously strove for unity through readership, Dickson gained few lasting followers, largely due to the success and remarkable popularity of Paine’s *Common Sense*.

Paine was enormously successful, and his *Common Sense* eclipsed Dickinson’s *Letters* in both readership and scope. Paine achieved a *coup de maître* in manipulating the growing spirit of the mob, cultivating the hatred and anger into a zealous flame that sought out gallant retribution and promoting irenic gains of Saxon liberties *over* strife—the peaceable attainment of democratic ends. Quickly flourishing in America—Trish Loughran claims it was “disseminated along the North American post road without Paine’s overt involvement”—*Common Sense* attained a massive readership almost instantly.⁴⁹⁵ Between 120,000 and 150,000 copies circulated within its first year of publication alone. Arguing to a largely agricultural audience, Paine demanded a stronger nation and promoted the idea of a common identity. In *Common Sense*, he envisions “natural society” as a natural order of social life that differed from that of the governmental structure. Paine writes, “society is produced by our wants and government by our wickedness,” delineating the natural idea of society and the means by which a rational and democratic group could flourish. This also served as a model for government. “Society in every

⁴⁹⁴ John Dickinson, “Letter III,” *Letter from a Farmer in Pennsylvania, to the Inhabitants of the British Colonies* (New York: Outlook Company, 1903), 29-30. For more on Gordon’s influence on Dickinson, see H. Trevor Colbourn, “John Dickinson, Historical Revolutionary,” *Pennsylvania Magazine* (1959), 271.

⁴⁹⁵ *The Republic in Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. Nation Building, 1770-1870* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 82.

state is a blessing,” Paine continues, “but Government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst state, an intolerable one.”⁴⁹⁶ Thus did Paine supply the developing Saxon argument in the colonies with a forceful power of cohesion and an abstract reasoning process, which was, importantly, undergirded by two salient features: Government should be for the people and, if it were not, Paine contends, it is quantifiably “right” to dismiss it; second, the “true” English (i.e., Saxon) government serves as the best example of this. Finally, anger was legitimate, and anyone who could not see that America’s was a just cause was simply wrong—they were against the “right” of the group and the rightful heirs to natural freedoms. Thus, the best government for the colonies, an idea that had been becoming increasingly more identified with the Anglo-Saxon democratic state, became, through Paine, a desirable and reachable goal. In that sense, *Common Sense* spoke to America. By linking America to the *promise* of national greatness, the pamphlet’s celebrated message speaks of a failed state from which the English migrated to the presumed glory of a unified power. The only task left was to create it.

Given the nature of the time, the pre-Norman Anglo-Saxon period loomed large as a favorable model for nation building. Thus, when, in the eighteenth century, scholars became once again fascinated with Anglo-Saxon primitivism as a source of their own democratic roots, America adopted these roots as its own. As was the case in sixteenth-century England, when the argument for common law and Anglo-Saxonism bolstered Protestant claims for religious superiority, scholars turned to legal texts and laws to discern ideas concerning the upheavals of the time. The common law, or “Ancient Constitution” as it was often called, became more than an idea for the growing Whig movement in England and America. Common law served as the

⁴⁹⁶ Thomas Paine: *Common Sense and Other Political Writings*, Nelson F. Adkins, ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1953), 4.

Cartesian starting point; Whigs claimed it remained undisturbed in essence throughout the Norman-Saxon struggles. An anonymous author in Edward Cave's *Gentleman's Magazine* puts the matter of the common law thus: "Tho' our eld Saxon Constitution hath undergone many violent Convulsions since the Conquest, I think the whole series of our History is one continued Proof that the Foundations of it were never intirely overturn'd [sic]."⁴⁹⁷ Common law survived unhindered, simply altered a touch from the original. As such, "aristocracy" was a foreign idea encumbering true Saxons since the invasion; brought from elsewhere, aristocracy too much enforced the success of a Norman takeover. Earlier, tracts such as John Hare's *Anti-Normanisme* (1647) had found a new audience. Men like Hare had earlier wanted the "Conqueror" title stripped from William and laws returned to Edward the Confessor. During the eighteenth century, "Saxon" and "Norman" grew to signify more than simply nations: Normanized common law restricted the actions of the "common man" and symbolized obstruction of rational Saxon democracy for individuals as well as for the state. In the colonies, the most valuable part of an English birthright, as Bland had argued, was an American's relation to the ancient constitution.

In order to understand fully Jefferson's addition to this growing Saxon tide, we first must delve into Jefferson's early career as a law student to see why and how land became such an important part of his argument for American Saxonhood. First, these common law contestations directly influenced Jefferson. However, unlike his Elizabethan models, such as Coke, who refashioned the Saxon myth from his own reading to form mythic arguments for Protestant superiority where textual evidence was inconclusive, Jefferson read deeply into the texts for a specifically American argument on land tenure and rightful conquest. "Has not every restitution of the antient [sic] Saxon laws had happy effects?" he claimed in 1776, with a vested interest in

⁴⁹⁷ *The Gentleman's Magazine; or Monthly Intelligencer* 5 (London, 1735), 275.

land rights.⁴⁹⁸ Eased into the Saxon milieu through the pamphlet material's ideology, Jefferson's first entrance into the problem of Britain and America arguably came when, as a law student, he witnessed Patrick Henry's passionate speech against the Stamp Act. In 1769, Jefferson became a member of the House of Burgess, and, soon, he was one of the primary soldiers crusading for Virginia's rights against the actions of British government. A good student of the common law, he passionately argued for the law as it pertained to the commoner concerning land. At the House of Burgess, Jefferson combined the common cause of the pamphleteers—the battle for originary notions of liberty found in past English writings—with land tenure issues in his association with the freeholders of Albemarle County. Albemarle delegates had declared American rights and Virginia's readiness to become involved in a “common cause” against any “unlawful power” excised by “the British empire in general” for the purposes of designating private land holdings.⁴⁹⁹ The people of Virginia were only subject to British laws, the claim ran, because they had mistakenly adopted them in Virginia's founding. Jefferson began drafting a resolution. In August 1774, his declarations were published as *A Summary View of the Rights of British America*.⁵⁰⁰

The Albemarle incident stressed the importance of land tenure issues in the colonies. For Jefferson, who had drafted the resolution, these issues of land tenure stemmed directly from the Virginia Company settlement at Jamestown. Realizing this to be more than a regional matter for concern, Jefferson adopted Coke's common law designations for “the law of the land,” which

⁴⁹⁸ Jefferson to Edmund Pendleton, August 13, 1776, in *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 36 vols. Julian P. Boyd et al., eds. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950-) 1:492 [Hereafter *PTJ*].

⁴⁹⁹ “Resolutions of the Freeholders of Abermarle County,” 26 July 1774, in *PTJ* 1:117-18.

⁵⁰⁰ Trevor Colbourn has argued that “Summary View” is more representative of Jefferson's thought in terms of nation building than the *Declaration of Independence*, writing, “[‘Summary’] is a more personal expression of Jefferson's concept of Anglo-American relations ... the first graphic illustration of the political use Jefferson made of his careful reading of the past”; *Lamp of Experience*, 161-62.

later served as a foundation for his evolution of American Saxonhood.⁵⁰¹ In “law of the land,” Coke simply meant the common law of England. Law of the land, Coke had argued, prohibited *any* monopoly, and by this he meant the British monopoly on religion. Jefferson, however, concluded that Saxon “law of the land” rooted itself in immemorial time as the common law, an unwritten ancient constitution of the Saxons upon which American conquest, settlement, and expansion should have based itself from the beginning. Jefferson saw the Norman-Saxon divisions in the Tory-Whig split of America and Britain. America could *revolutionize* the Saxon ideal—literally and metaphorically—in its rebirth as a Saxon-based nation; the only way to do this was to split from Britain. The British had Normanized the land in their Virginia Company enterprise. Jefferson wrote English Whig John Cartwright that “it has ever appeared to me, that the difference between the whig and the tory of England is, that the whig deduces his rights from the Anglo-Saxon source, and the tory from the Norman.”⁵⁰² As Jefferson makes clear here, many Whigs, including himself, found it hard to believe that a Norman tyrant could have so easily vanquished the Saxons. Indeed, the Saxon *ideal* was not vanquished; it simply required a revision, which notion is what rapidly propelled Jefferson through Anglo-Saxon texts, histories, and rudimentary language instruction books.

JEFFERSON’S LANGUAGE OF AMERICAN SAXONHOOD

Jefferson’s own study of Anglo-Saxon texts further infused his arguments for Saxon rights, providing him with a scholarly understanding of the material and a deeper insight into the language, both of which helped to shape his later ideological claims. Early in his law career, both

⁵⁰¹ Edward Coke, *The Second Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England* (London: E. & R. Brooke, 1797), 45.

⁵⁰² Letter to Cartwright, June 5, 1824, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Bergh, eds., 20 vols. (Washington D.C.: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907) 16:42.

John Adams and Jefferson's mentor George Wythe had directed him toward Coke's writings. Jefferson's first law text, prescribed by Wythe, was Coke's *Commentary Upon Littleton*, the first of four parts of Coke's massive *Institutes of the Laws of England*. As many commentators have observed, the influence of Coke's writings is evident in much of Jefferson's work, particularly his manuscript bill for crimes and punishments.⁵⁰³ What Jefferson learned from Coke was twofold. First, he acquired a taste for primary Anglo-Saxon texts and learned copious note-taking skills and comparison techniques through his marginalia on them. Second, Jefferson began to dig more deeply into the texts themselves for ideas *behind* the words. Following Coke, he read the letters as purely symbolic forms of historical transmission, mining old Saxon texts for more abstract and theoretical treasures—the cultural capital of the Anglo-Saxons.

His fascination with Saxon history began with his reading of Paul de Rapin-Thoyras's four-volume *History of England* (1726-31), a series of texts which provided young Jefferson with his early vision of the myth of the democratic Saxons who conquered and populated England. Rapin's Alfred served as a model for the construction of Jefferson's own historical vision.⁵⁰⁴ The Saxons succeeded, according to Rapin, because of strong leadership. Not only did Rapin connect the Saxons to the ancient Germans—in this, he, as other eighteenth-century readers, accepted Tacitus's *Germania* as historical fact for his claims—he served as the most important historian securing King Alfred's place in the nation-building narrative of England.

⁵⁰³ This influence can be seen in two compilations: Dumas Malone, *Jefferson in His Time*, 6 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1948-81) 1:56-58 and David N. Mayer, *The Constitutional Thought of Thomas Jefferson* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1994), 6-10.

⁵⁰⁴ *The History of England, as well Ecclesiastical as Civil I* (London, 1728), Preface. As has been noted, the turn of the eighteenth century saw the beginnings of a new interest in "Alfredism," made all the more possible with the newly-discovered "Alfred Jewel" found in 1693 at North Pemberton in Somerset. With this physical evidence of Alfred, his character became a source of historical inspiration, not simply mythical fantasy: Alfred was authentic. Part of the glory of Alfred was his unification of England through education. In his own lionization of Alfred, Rapin elaborated upon the origins of the English Constitution and, in doing that, promoted the close study of Anglo-Saxon history.

Other popular works in Jefferson's library included John Jacob Mascou's *History of the Ancient Germans* (translated by Thomas Lediard, 1737, as *The History of Our Great Ancestors*) and Tacitus.⁵⁰⁵

As has been noted, Jefferson's historic conception of the Saxon race comes from his reading of Tacitus, which was transmitted in the eighteenth century by Gordon in his interpretation and translation of *Germania*, published in 1728 and 1731. Gordon did not simply translate Tacitus; he created a mythological Whig vision of Saxon rule, wherein the freedom-loving Germanic ancestors he portrayed became an ideal in the eyes of a radical Whig. In a sense, he rewrote history—or he at least reinterpreted Tacitus for a community craving rebellion. In another sense, however, he translated an archetypal text of rebellion, for Tacitus himself thought his history could serve future generations as a useful tool for intimidating tyrants. So, too, did Gordon.⁵⁰⁶ He divides the edition into two parts—the actual translation and his own largely ideological discourses upon the work. In his translation, Gordon makes free use of definitions, often embellishing meanings—or even, at times, simply substituting words—to emphasize patterns evoking democratic liberty in the *Germania*. Over and above these additions of loaded terms, Gordon heavily promotes the Whig view of a Saxon history that *ought* to be, not necessarily one that *was*. He emphasizes Tacitus's notion of the pure and unmixed race of *Germani*, a breed of man that could forge his identity in the wilderness, as the archetype of pure Saxon lineage, the racially superior tribes of democratic and freedom-loving people from whom the British were descended. In Gordon's version, even Tacitus, whom he calls an “upright Patriot,” a reformer “zealous for publick Liberty ... who adores Liberty and Truth,” assumes a

⁵⁰⁵ *PTJ* 13:189.

⁵⁰⁶ Ronald Mellor, *The Roman Historians*, (London: Routledge, 1999), 76.

refashioned position as the ethnologist of history, a good Saxon ancient.⁵⁰⁷ Gordon concludes that people desire a natural right of liberty, and most Whigs, including Jefferson, agreed—a Saxon constitution was, historically, instinctive. That was the nature of English democracy.

Thus did the influence of Tacitus, Rapin, and Coke provide Jefferson with a uniquely synoptical vision of the Saxon argument as it ran in the eighteenth century. Most importantly, however, these readings spurred him to read in the original Saxon dialect; having studied the history, Jefferson needed to see the building blocks from which all Saxon laws were comprised. He fervently believed in the *deterioration* of a language as much as he did in its growth; for him, the rise and fall of language paralleled that of a nation. Having a wide range of new scholarship with which to work, Jefferson, in the eighteenth century, was favorably equipped to learn the language. His first foray into Old English was through Elizabeth Elstob's *Rudiments of Grammar for the English Saxon Tongue* (1715). Elstob's legendary grammar had improved upon William Hickes's *Institutiones Grammaticae Anglo-Saxonicae* (1689), and it may be arguably considered the first comprehensive grammar of the Anglo-Saxon language.⁵⁰⁸ Following Elstob, Jefferson then moved on to Edward Thwaites's (1677-1711) text, *Grammatica Anglo-Saxonica*, another abridged version of Hickes's work.⁵⁰⁹ Working backwards, Jefferson finally graduated to George Hickes's work, wishing to see the original from which all other editions had sprung. Jefferson

⁵⁰⁷ Thomas Gordon, "Discourse II: Upon Tacitus and His Writings, Sect. I. The Character of Tacitus," *The Works of Tacitus. In Four Volumes. To which are prefixed Political Discourses upon that Author. The Second Edition, corrected* (London: T. Woodward and J. Peele, 1737).

⁵⁰⁸ Elizabeth Elstob (1683-1756) and her brother William Elstob (1673-1715) were related to Hickes; the two men believed Elizabeth could teach Anglo-Saxon to women. Because both helped Hickes with his project, they were free to expand upon its contents.

⁵⁰⁹ Thwaites was Hickes's student, and the latter authorized the former for the printing of the great thesaurus, as well as other manuscript issues. Thwaites had earlier worked with Thomas Marshall (1621–1685), an English rector and early student of Anglo-Saxon language and history, and published his *Observations on Anglo-Saxon and Gothic versions of the gospel* in 1665. Marshall was especially interested in languages, separating Anglo-Saxon into various tongues, including Teutonic. See Michael Murphy, "Edward Thwaites, Pioneer Teacher of Old English," *Durham University Journal* 7 (1981), 153-9.

treated originary sources as gospel, so for him, Hickes represented the ultimate in an Anglo-Saxon scholar, since he had earlier provided a “method” for learning Old English: the student would first learn the alphabet and the grammar, then move to translations of the Gospels and Psalms. It was a guided approach and difficult; hence, Jefferson needed to build up to it. Further, Hickes’s *Thesaurus* contained a grammar and noted antiquarian Humfrey Wanley’s massive catalogue of original Anglo-Saxon material, along with Hickes’s own scholarly ideas, wherein he considers “three periods” of Old English.⁵¹⁰ Focused largely on the relation of historical periods with languages, these three periods, Hickes argued, portrayed the rise of language with its complementary historical outcome.⁵¹¹ Historically speaking, a nation and its language performed symbiotic functions, whereby each “fed” into the other the “mood” of a nation. Jefferson became fascinated with this idea.

As his reading expanded, so did Jefferson’s Anglo-Saxon library. His book orders from the period show he often ordered a great amount, providing the most specific instructions with the Anglo-Saxon titles, such “Alfred’s Anglo-Saxon version of Orosius. 8vo. 6/.,” which, Jefferson added, “if this is sold send any one of Nos. 523. 518. 522. 520.”⁵¹² As was necessary, Jefferson ordered books directly from Paine in England—“be so good as to exert yourself to complete my Saxon collection”—and he was very particular about textual quality, requesting “when I name a particular edition of a book, send me that edition and no other.”⁵¹³ Jefferson was more meticulous

⁵¹⁰ Humfrey Wanley (1672-1726) was a noted Anglo-Saxon scholar best known for his unsuccessful attempts to catalogue the entire corpus of Anglo-Saxon material during his time.

⁵¹¹ For Hickes, “Period One” was the Danish invasion, or the “British Saxon” period (the writings of which included Caedmon, Bede, the gospels, all of which were stored in Robert Cotton’s library); “Period Two” was the period to the Norman Conquest, or the “Dani-Saxon” period, during which the language degenerated from “pure Saxon”; finally, “Period Three” was the time to the reign of Henry II, or the “Semi-Saxon” period, wherein Hickes saw a corruption of the “pure” Saxon tongue by Danish influences, which, ultimately, produced modern English.

⁵¹² Orders for Books to John Stockdale, July 1, 1787, in *PTJ* 11:523.

⁵¹³ Letter to Paine, October 2, 1788, *PTJ* 13:651-52; letter to Paine, Jan. 28. 1789, in *PTJ* 14:512.

here than elsewhere, keeping a close track of all his Anglo-Saxon book orders—"Spelman's life of Alfred, Saxon, with Wilbur's translation, Boethius, Anglo-Saxonicé Aelfridi regis. Oxon. 1698, Thwaites' Saxon heptateuch, Spelman's Saxon psalms, Mareshall's Saxon gospels, Saxon homilies"—for he had planned to use them as he compiled his own Saxon grammar and dictionary.⁵¹⁴ Eventually, his library would grow to include an impressive range of both Anglo-Saxon scholarship and primary texts: ten volumes of Anglo-Saxon prose and poetry, two Alfredian texts as well as Asser's *Life of Alfred*, a homily of Ælfric, a copy of *Domesday Book*, two copies of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and various dictionaries and thesauri.

In the summer of 1798, Jefferson would compose his first and only formal tract focused solely on Anglo-Saxon matters, "An Essay Towards Facilitating Instruction in the Anglo-Saxon and Modern Dialects of the English Language," which provides an excellent insight into Jefferson's emerging vision of American Saxonhood at the time. Here, we find the best representation of his ideas of Saxon liberty used to justify the break from Britain because, for Jefferson, language remained analogous to the Saxon notion of freedom. Discovering wholly Saxon elements in the orthography of the common law, in "Essay" he posits what he calls a "third revolution" in historical time. According to this idea, Jefferson envisions a common unity of Anglo-Saxon democratic vision to American geographical movement, wherein both systems of nation had "rights" to conquest. Thus, Jefferson's principal purpose in "Essay" is twofold: "to manifest the identity" of the Anglo-Saxon language and to trace its relation, social and historic,

⁵¹⁴ He never completed these plans. More on Jefferson and early Anglo-Saxon studies in the South can be found in John B. Henneman, "Two Pioneers in the Historical Study of English—Thomas Jefferson and Louis Klipstein," *PMLA* 8 (1893) xliii-xlix; Henneman, *The South and the Building of a Nation, Volume Seven: History of the Intellectual Life* (Richmond: The Southern Historical Publication Society, 1909), 115-34; and Stanley R. Hauer, "Thomas Jefferson and the Anglo-Saxon Language," *PMLA* 98:5 (1983), 879-898. Sir John Spelman (1594-1643) was the son of the historian Sir Henry Spelman. The Spelman name had found some earlier acclaim in America with the Virginia Company; see Chapter Two.

to modern English.⁵¹⁵ When he discovers a passage in Old English that renders the Biblical phrase “the earth was without form and void” to “the earth was *idle* and *empty*,” he begins systematically to compare the historical growth of Old, Middle, and modern day English, noting, like Hickes, various revolutions in the language. Following his impressive source reading, Jefferson offers this conclusion about Anglo-Saxon and Modern English: “The Anglo-Saxon writings, in this familiar form, are nothing but old English [and] as we are possessed in America of the printed editions of Anglo-Saxon writings, they furnish a fit occasion for this country to make some return to the ‘science’ of the Anglo-Saxon language, the ‘old English.’”⁵¹⁶

Comparing his task to Hickes’s, Jefferson wishes to connect Anglo-Saxon roots to American character, for that connection represents a shift from the Norman corruption of the ancient English freedoms. Unlike Hickes, however, who simply *documents* the change, Jefferson means as much to document it as he does to *cause* it: “It is my hope ... that it may prove a revolution” that would “recruit and renovate the vigor of the English language, too much impaired by the neglect of its ancient constitution and dialects.”⁵¹⁷ Thus, Jefferson sought to show how language naturally precipitated a new revolution in the unfolding narrative of the Anglo-Saxons through the ties to the North American landscape.

To relate Old English historically to other examples, Jefferson takes for his model Hickes’s idea of the “three periods” of Old English, arguing that unlike English, Greco-Roman languages changed to suit the developing systems of government. He notes that Attic Greek and Latin had been “gradually worn down to their present forms by time, and changes of modes and

⁵¹⁵ *An Essay Towards Facilitating Instruction in the Anglo-Saxon and Modern Dialects of the English Language for the Use of the University of Virginia* (New York: John Trow, 1851), 19.

⁵¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 20. Jefferson often conflates the terms “Anglo-Saxon” and “Old English” when referring to the language. I will here use “Old English” as an indicator of language used by the Anglo-Saxons.

⁵¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 24.

circumstances,” but that English had essentially not.⁵¹⁸ Like the common law, language had remained, in a sense, timeless in meaning. Other romance languages contain dialects that show a fragmentation so great, Jefferson argues, that it would be nearly impossible to extract the genuine. Conversely, in Old English, fundamental Saxon themes in *la langue*, and, by extension, the language user’s *parole*, never altered, though certain language representations did. These, Jefferson points out, exist mainly in the alphabet—and within the alphabet power exists.

The example in *Essay* provides proof of this unique claim. William’s takeover of Saxon England marked a change of power *and* language. In English, the shift to the “black letter”—the ornate Gothic minuscule script used by scribes from roughly 1200 to the end of the Middle Ages—represented the Norman takeover of Anglo-Saxon England. “The black letter script,” Jefferson observes, was “introduced by William the Conqueror” for his law codes. However, he insists, *meaning* never changes, only *representations* of meaning. Just as he earlier professes about Rome, Norman law codes, symbolically represented by the black letter, “did not make the language of Alfred a different one from that of Piers Ploughman, of Chaucer, Douglas, Spenser and Shakespeare, any more than the second revolution, which substituted the Roman for the English black letter.”⁵¹⁹ Since, by this example, language can gauge the rise and fall of nations, Jefferson believed its chief power lay in its relation to the speakers. He points to an even deeper meaning. Metaphorically speaking, individuals symbolically represent alphabetic “building blocks” of nations. Looking at it from the point of Saussurean linguistics, we see that Jefferson is claiming that from within this complex and ancient English language system (in Saussure, *la langue*) there exists a uniquely Saxon external manifestation (*parole*), which finds, in its original

⁵¹⁸ Ibid., 12.

⁵¹⁹ Ibid., 9.

base, its own definition of freedom via the language itself.⁵²⁰ This is a striking claim. Language powers a nation's ideology, argues Jefferson, in much the same way an invader might make its presence known in a subjected city or nation state. Languages, in a sense, *occupy* countries. In this view, language *serves* civilization because a language and its people have a symbiotic relationship, and thus, in historical language systems, Jefferson argues, we see *la langue* and *parole* operating in the same way.

Thus did language symbolize, for Jefferson, the Saxon's ultimate achievement: it has the ideological power to unite nations, and its dynamism extends across time. Old English in its first revolution—the period of Alfred and the first Anglo-Saxon writing phase—was a pure form of writing. “Pure Anglo-Saxon constitutes at this day the basis of our language,” Jefferson asserts, and the “power of the letters [is] generally the same in Anglo-Saxon as now in English.”⁵²¹ Anglo-Saxon contains the very characteristics of the best parts of Greek. It is stable, democratic (in this it has never wavered) *and* plastic, able to adapt to the situation or needs of a nation. Despite slight additions and embellishments from Latin, Jefferson argues, Anglo-Saxon language, like its culture, has remained pure. For support, he once again provides a cultural analogy: the Romans achieved military victory in Britain but did not mix with the Saxon lineage. Most of all, however, Anglo-Saxon's greatness comes from its ability to remain foundationally the same as a whole in its *langue* while altering to the needs of its speakers. He sees the alphabet as the natural and unchanging base: “the expression of the same sounds by a different character did not change these sounds, nor did the language which they constituted.”⁵²² Even though, Jefferson observes, there are as many as twenty definitions for the word “many” in Old English,

⁵²⁰ Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, Wade Baskin, trans. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1976), 13-14.

⁵²¹ *An Essay*; 8, 12.

⁵²² *Ibid.*, 9.

since Old English words create open-ended definitions and seemingly endless multiple variants, Anglo-Saxon authors create their own modes of meaning. This “promiscuous use of words,” as Jefferson calls it, opens the language up to unlimited possibilities. The power of the language was its plasticity to give a linguistic shape to salient ideas or, as Jefferson writes, “the latitude it allowed of combining primitive words so as to produce any modification of idea desired.”

Jefferson concludes, then, that “we are surely at liberty to adopt any mode of which, establishing uniformity, may be more consonant with the power of the letters,” and can make manifest the order of letters and words in a manner that is provident to the nation.⁵²³ By definition, Saxons altered language as necessary; so should, Jefferson believes, America. This is an impressive and bold claim. What Jefferson is proposing, in essence, is that Saxon is at one time both strong and plastic: it endures forever, adapting timelessly to changes, and should be used by historic right.

The power of Anglo-Saxon language is best represented, Jefferson argues, within the wide range of Anglo-Saxon writings. He observes that these varied texts— “the actual fact of the books they have left us in the various branches of history, geography, religion, law, and poetry”—illustrate how Old English’s plasticity provides it with the capability to explain anything in a multitude of ways.⁵²⁴ But the laws are the most striking of all, since they comprise the best of both worlds of the Anglo-Saxon: they are foundational and unchanging in *theme* but the language affords them the malleability to be “amended” to adapt to any situation which deems Anglo-Saxon democratic ideals necessary—important for Jefferson’s unique interpretations of Saxon ideas. “I highly esteem the old Saxon Laws in General,” Jefferson claims, “but cannot Suppose them wholly unalterable for the better after an experience of so

⁵²³ Ibid., 11-12.

⁵²⁴ Ibid., 8.

many Centuries.”⁵²⁵ Their plasticity should embolden “the growth of ... a Countrey,” he continues, and “it may be wisdom not to draw the Chords too close or refine too much, but to relax in some matters in order to secure those of greater moment.”⁵²⁶ In other words, like the Saxon language, the general tenor of the laws had not wavered. The task of a great leader, Jefferson claims, was to advance the consistency of language—which stood, as he argued in *An Essay*, for its culture—and to promote the transference of this language into law, its highest unaltered form.

Here, we can see why Alfred’s *Pastoral* remained important to Jefferson—for two important reasons. Portraying the Saxon King Alfred as its archetypal national hero, *Pastoral* depicts the literary representation of a unified nation and extols the virtues of education. The Saxon state under Alfred had coalesced education and political power into written texts. “[Alfred] had for his guide his own ideas only of the power of the letters,” Jefferson argues, “unpractical and indistinct as they might be.”⁵²⁷ Out of Alfred’s idealism comes the most powerful nation-state in ancient England, an historical prophecy Jefferson envisions for his own time. Alfred had established a code of laws that promoted more civil rights and land tenure for freemen, and he established an educational system based upon the language. Vigorously promoting language, Alfred wanted to make education available to all freeborn men. Jefferson desired the same, especially in his promotion of the University of Virginia, and, more

⁵²⁵ Letter to Edmund Pendleton, August 26 1776, in *PTJ* 1:507.

⁵²⁶ *Ibid.*, 1:508. In his correspondence over the crimes and punishments bill to Wythe, Jefferson employs various forms of linguistic comparison: “By the side of the text I have written the notes I made, as I went along, for the benefit of my own memory. They may serve to draw your attention to questions to which the expressions or the omissions of the text may give rise. The extracts from the Anglo-Saxon laws, the sources of the Common law, I wrote in their original for my own satisfaction; but I have added Latin, or literal English translations. From the time of Canute to that of the Magna Charta, you know, the text of our statutes is preserved to us in Latin only, and some old French.” November 1, 1778, in *PTJ* 2:230.

⁵²⁷ *An Essay*, 9.

specifically, with his proposition to include Anglo-Saxon studies in the curriculum. “Education and free discussion,” he wrote, “are the antidotes” for ignorance and the foundations of a strong national heritage.⁵²⁸ Jefferson’s writings strongly suggest that an educated populace would be the driving force for successful nation building, and his source was grounded in the success of Alfred’s Saxon England. To know the Saxon past, according to Jefferson, was to know the history of the American people, and so the study of Old English language in American universities started in the South, largely at his insistence. In his argument for education at the University of Virginia, Jefferson held that the study of *America in America* was better for Americans than the typical practice of going abroad, as was the study of the native tongue as opposed to that of more traditional languages, such as Greek and Latin (especially for reasons noted above). Thus, for Jefferson, starting Anglo-Saxon studies at Virginia was not an academic act so much as it was a political one.⁵²⁹ The history of America was in its land and language. In “Essay,” Jefferson argues that the proper study of the English language would promote a fuller study of its usage and, by relation, promote national pride, unity, and growth.⁵³⁰ The University of Virginia would educate new generations of men who would know and understand their Saxon heritage, and, following the successful break with England, America would reach that imagined historical Saxon zenith.

Jefferson portrays his vision of America as a Saxon Arcadia in *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1781), which carries forward notions of land tenureship and national geography. In composing *Notes*, Jefferson had two manuscripts in mind: Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation* and Alfred’s *Pastoral*. Just as Alfred represented the ultimate ruler, Bede

⁵²⁸ Jefferson to John Adams, Monticello, 1 August 1816, in *WJA*, 10: 223.

⁵²⁹ J.R. Hall, “Mid-Nineteenth Century American Anglo-Saxonism: The Question of Language,” in Frantzen and Niles, 133-56.

⁵³⁰ Roy J. Honeywell, *The Educational Work of Thomas Jefferson* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), 161-2.

represented, for Jefferson, the great promoter of ideology, the author of a nation. Bede had famously written that his aim in writing the national ecclesiastical history of Britain was *generalis bonum*, or, simply, a devotion to the good of the people; Bede's other *entente* was to create the *vera lex historia*, or the true law of national history. In these foci, Jefferson follows Bede. Completed after his governorship, *Notes* presents readers with a dizzying array of material— science mixed with ethnography, all interspersed with political commentary— virtually, the full range of materials Jefferson argued English was capable of. Gathering much-needed data, Jefferson claims, “I was led to procure ... whatever related to the duties of those in the high concerns of the nation” so that the evidence would vindicate the “American statesman.”⁵³¹ (Later, Jefferson's scientific objects would include evidence for existing relatives of Madoc in the Corps of Discovery mission.) For this reason, I would like to suggest that *Notes* exemplifies a more “medieval” transition from Smith's *Matière d'Amérique*, or romance of the New World, to the secularly polemic justification for the geographical destination of Virginia. In Jefferson, as in Bede before him, a certain “lay of the land” had been drawn in such a way as to delineate imaginative boundaries of nationhood in an intimate manner: the “true” American story was the Saxon narrative, a link across ages.

In the *vera lex historiae* narrative, however, facts are often deduced at the mercy of the messenger. Thus when in Bede we read that the Anglo-Saxon kingdom's conversion to Christianity in the seventh century provides them a common faith, we understand this assertion represents the revolution of the tribes into what Bede called the “Englisc.” In Jefferson, when we read the Virginia Company represents the Norman feudal system imposed upon the unknowing Captain Smith and company, we can see just how good a reader of Bede Jefferson

⁵³¹ *PTJ* 14:191-92.

was. *Notes*' main arguments for the installation of a Norman system on a democratic Saxon landscape are especially innovative and, at times, damning. In essence, Jefferson sees the history of America as a mirror of the Saxon-Norman conflict: because American lands had been founded on Norman land tenure principles, they had been perverted from what they *could* have been, or the true Saxon land arrangement. He claims that while a largely democratic and Saxon lineage initially came forth to begin a new land, something went wrong with the enterprise—the monarchy became involved. For Jefferson, as for other revolutionary forefathers, monarchy symbolized the Norman ideal. Thus, like its early Saxon pastoral predecessors, the subtext of *Notes* encourages change: America should vest any lands gained through conquest in the *body* of the state, not simply its individuals. “Normanization” symbolizes individuality and, by extension, monarchical power.

Since individuals installed a “Norman” land tenure system in Virginia, Jefferson seeks to “right” the “wrongs” whereby aristocracy interfered with the Saxon communal *folcland*. The Virginia project began with good intentions, Jefferson writes, “yet in every of these points was this convention violated by subsequent kings and parliaments, and other infractions of their constitution, equally dangerous, committed.”⁵³² There was too much of an individual interest; thus a “Normanization” occurs almost from the outset and continues to his own day. Even after Virginia settled upon an acceptable law of the land, it was, in essence, Norman: The “elective despotism” was a “constitution ... formed when we were new and unexperienced in the science of government ... [it] was not the government we fought for.”⁵³³ Jefferson claims that early on in the Virginia project—the allusion here is to the Smith regime—something went very wrong

⁵³² *Notes on the State of Virginia* (London, 1787), 224-25, 189.

⁵³³ *Ibid.*, 195.

regarding property rights and land ownership in America and therefore should have been changed. The Virginia Company installed a Norman land tenure system whereby notable individuals, such as Smith, were simply made to serve as soldiers who enforced this power.

Thus, the Saxon “argument” in *Notes* holds that America had been surreptitiously “Normanized,” beginning with the Virginia Company’s manipulation of its own romantic hero Smith, who along with Sir Walter Raleigh, Jefferson claims, “may be considered as the founder of our colony.”⁵³⁴ Even though Jefferson paints a favorable portrait of Smith—he argues for Smith’s positive influence on Virginia history from 1607 to 1624, noting that Smith was a founding member of the council in good stead, president of the colony, and historian—he critiques Smith’s actions. “[Smith’s] efforts principally may be ascribed as its support against the opposition of the natives,” Jefferson argues, subsequently strengthening the Virginia Company’s “Normanized” plans of land tenureship.⁵³⁵ So, although Jefferson gives Smith credit for being honest, sensible, and “well informed” (that is, a good historian), he argues that Smith simply failed in wresting Norman control of the Virginia Company land tenure system, which held the lands in absolute dominion. Early Virginia adventurers held their lands by conquest as did their ancestors, the Angles and the Saxons, and, more importantly, they held them allodially, as free and democratic peoples with no allegiance to a monarch. The Virginia Company, however, had continued the Norman system. Land tenures in Britain had been corrupted in a similar way: “[The common law] was introduced by the Saxons on their settlement in England [but] altered from time to time by proper legislative authority from that to the date of the Magna Charta which terminates the period of the common law”—and thus they, like the Virginia system, had become

⁵³⁴ Ibid., 293.

⁵³⁵ Ibid., 224.

outdated.⁵³⁶ In America, early Virginia adventurers such as Smith, Jefferson claims in *Summary View*, were duped into believing “the fictitious principle that all lands belong originally to the king ... and accordingly took grants of their own lands from the crown.”⁵³⁷

Not only does Jefferson seek to amend the Norman issue for the Saxon American, he claims an inherent right for expansion based upon a Saxon notion of *folcright*, or the right to “public” land or land with due ties to lineage. Since, as Jefferson argues, English adventurers were right in their “conquest” of the New World, he admits that they inherited a right to expand. However, the period in American history from its Virginia founding in 1607 to 1661 neglects its recognition of Saxon structure; the national narrative had been perverted. Fabricated in concert with the English land system installed by the Virginia Company, a *myth* of free America existed where there was none. The problem with Smith’s regime is that it began the long trajectory of Norman tenureship when it actually had Saxon conquest rights. While, as Jefferson observes, “[the Virginia Company] also sometimes, though very rarely, granted lands, independently of the general assembly,” which complies with a notion of *folcland*, he notes the eventual departure from this point. “As the colony increased,” Jefferson asserts, these lands were taken by the British at an alarming rate, tenure applications that multiplied so fast, he writes, that “it was found to give too much occupation to the general assembly to enquire into and execute the grant in every special case.”⁵³⁸ A good reader of English history, Jefferson knew well the importance of Saxon assemblies, but he saw this as another opportunity that early Virginia adventurers let slip away. There existed *some* kind of Virginia assembly to deal with land expansions—though not a formal meeting in the “official” sense—but it provided service to the Crown, instituting only one

⁵³⁶ *The Commonplace Book of Thomas Jefferson: A Repertory of His Ideas on Government*, Gilbert Chinard, ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1926), 354.

⁵³⁷ *A Summary View of the Rights of British America* (Williamsburg, 1774), 28.

⁵³⁸ *Notes*, 224-25.

overarching rule of thumb for land grants, which resulted in the perverted land laws. Jefferson saw these as no different from the so-called “forest laws” of William, which were simply amended from time to time by the British as necessary to improve stock. According to the Virginia Company’s early tenure laws, when a person wanted a piece of land, it was granted with the expectation that the grantee would improve upon it within a certain length of time. There was no other requirement.

Jefferson’s history becomes disturbingly one sided, however. In a stunning moment of subterfuge, Jefferson adapts this legal omission to his own day. “From these regulations [in early Jamestown land tenure laws],” Jefferson is careful to point out, “there resulted to the state a sole and exclusive power of taking conveyances of the Indian right of soil: since,”—and here Jefferson is at his worst, *inserting* a historical measure into the American narrative that he initially used *against* his Norman targets—“according to them, an Indian conveyance alone could give no right to an individual, which the laws would acknowledge.”⁵³⁹ Thus, although he castigates the temporary land laws of Smith’s regime, these actually inform his own ideological will to conquest and buttress the expansion westward through the Corps of Discovery project. Here, Jefferson has finally spelled it out. In line with the Saxon notion of *folcright*, there exists no *written proof* for the Indians, so the land is free for conquest. The state, or the Crown thereafter, made general “purchases” of Indian lands from time to time, which the governor parceled out by special grants; in no case do these appear as illegal holdings (even though there were no clear titles). Indeed, the laws remain clouded here even under Jefferson’s Saxon bias. Ultimately, in *Notes*, the question of conquest remains pertinent only to the Saxon nation—this is precisely

⁵³⁹ Ibid., 225.

where Jefferson's notions of the plasticity of language, as witnessed in "Essay," arises—and the definition of whose lands were conquered remains important.

However, this plasticity of language invades Jefferson's own writing, which itself becomes a remarkable example of Saxon language use. Altering his earlier view of North American conquest, Jefferson now amends his argument, here claiming there *was* no conquest—"that the lands of this country were taken from them by conquest, is not so general a truth as is supposed"—arguing instead that the process has been in line with legal rights all along.⁵⁴⁰ This was a claim from which he never swayed. Following traditional Saxon codes made for acquiring lands, Jefferson claims that American ancestors were simply good followers of the system they inherited from the Saxons. The Indians, in this sense, were essentially the ancient Britons, only there existed no damning moral ineptitude, as in the writings of Gildas or the portents of Mather; Indians simply lacked Saxon qualities. They weren't conquerors. Laws of conquer served Virginia, Jefferson claimed, because land tenure, by right, goes to the victor. The Indians were the ancient Britons, the foil to the conquerors, and "by petition to the general assembly [so that] if the lands prayed for were already cleared of the Indian title, and the assembly thought the prayer reasonable ... passed the property by their vote to the petitioner."⁵⁴¹ However, had the lands not yet been ceded by the Indians, which, in most cases, they had not, "it was necessary

⁵⁴⁰ Ibid., 153.

⁵⁴¹ Ibid. St. George Tucker echoed this idea in his 1803 edition of Blackstone's *Commentaries*: "How the lands thus granted by the authority of the government of England were acquired, no authentic documents, that the editor has had access to, ascertain. But Mr. Jefferson assures us, 'that the lands in this country were taken from the Indians by conquest, is not so generally a truth as is supposed. I find in our historians and records, repeated proofs of purchase, which cover a considerable part of the lower country; and many more would doubtless be found, on further search. The upper country we know has been acquired altogether by purchases made in the most unexceptionable form.'" Jefferson, Tucker points out, argues that the state claimed an exclusive power to take conveyances of the Indian right of soil, since according to these regulations an Indian conveyance alone could give no right to an individual. See also *Blackstone's Commentaries with notes of reference to The Constitution and Laws of the Federal Government of the United States and of the Commonwealth of Virginia*, 5 vols. (South Hackensack: Rothman Reprints, 1969) 3:2 Appendix, note A, "Concerning the Tenure of Lands in Virginia and the mode of acquiring them under the former and present Government," 4-5.

that the petitioner should previously purchase their right.” The assembly verified the purchase, and, upon acknowledgement that it met the strictures of fairness and reasonableness, and it was within codes, approval was then granted.

The “conquest” was not merely a reversal of land tenure to the English; it was a *revolution* in the historical vein of time. Whereas Bede situates certain events in a reconstruction of Germanus’s triumph over the Saxons, creating sharp distinctions between Saxons and Britons, Jefferson positions “Americans” as the culmination of English and Saxon. For Bede, the Saxons were chosen by God’s providence to remedy the failure of the Britons, who were sinful in their refusal, or failure, to preach to the Saxons; for Jefferson, it is the *Americans* who become the new Saxons. As with all nationalistic writing, Jefferson’s language-based originary myth reflects an agenda. Americans had rightfully taken the land for their own purposes, and for providence’s sake, a continuation of true Saxon lineage. Where for Bede one people came forth and coalesced, under Alfred, into *gens Anglorum*, for Jefferson, there exists a New Saxon—*gens Americanum*. Bede’s unification developed a European consciousness and united one people into “English” and inserted them into the historical narrative; Jefferson advances the emergence of the American Saxon and its movement westward, a process that rightfully assumes its *reentrance* into history.

The population increase in the eighteenth century had need for extension of these principles, Jefferson holds, and with expansion comes the necessary right to more land, if “land” be looked at from an allodial perspective whereby a Saxon holdings system provides each person with individual land dominion. What Jefferson is in fact arguing for is the future—the American Dream or, equally, the Saxon Nightmare. For each person to have his own land required a *folcscaru* (where *scearu* remains equal to a share or portion), or an individual *right* of land, and

the Crown must release the lands for this equation to function properly; these lands are tantamount to Saxon spoils of war. In either case, conquest must occur: “if they are allotted in neither of these ways, each individual of the society may appropriate to himself such lands as he finds vacant, and occupancy will give him title.”⁵⁴² Jefferson writes, “From the nature and purpose of civil institutions, all the lands within the limits which any particular society has circumscribed around itself, are assumed by that society, and subject to their allotment only.”⁵⁴³ All of this leads to a systematically darker system of land conquest (which becomes evident later with the launch of the Corps of Discovery and the powerful westward push precipitated by its mission). Ultimately, by seeking to sweep away old land tenure systems brought forward from the Norman Conquest, Jefferson strove to rewrite history. In enacting extensive legislative change in Virginia’s laws of landowning, inheritance, religion, and administration, Jefferson helped design a new representative republican government that would, for the first time since the ancient Saxons, invoke, first and foremost, the people as participants; his revision of laws followed this guiding principle.⁵⁴⁴ This Saxon ideology naturally lent itself to western expansion.

Eventually, the problem of land tenureship and the feudal Norman tenure laws became an overarching theme of the British-American argument, culminating in the formal grievance to King George. “America was conquered, and her settlements made and firmly established,” Jefferson pointedly argues, “at the expense of *individuals*, and not of the British *public*. Their own blood was spilt in acquiring lands for their settlement, their own fortunes expended in making that settlement effectual. For themselves they fought, for themselves they conquered, and

⁵⁴² Ibid.

⁵⁴³ *Summary View*, 28.

⁵⁴⁴ Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic*, 120-24. For Jefferson’s ideas on these reforms, see *Notes on Virginia*, William Peden, ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 130-49. A general discussion of these legal reforms can also be found in *PTJ* 2:305-24.

for themselves alone they have right to hold.”⁵⁴⁵ This argument became a powerful vehicle for the relinquishment of North American lands and served as a cautionary tale—a historical narrative linking Saxon lands to American right. Other American writers followed suit. Though essentially anti-feudalist in tenor, John Adams’s position was nowhere near Jefferson’s in scope. In his *Dissertation*, Adams did admit to a feudal corruption in England and noted its implications for American colonists; however, he blamed feudal and canon law for what he considered the erroneous notion that colonial lands belonged to England. The motherland *was* different because of its canon and feudal laws; “The canon and feudal systems, though greatly mutilated,” Adams writes, “are not yet destroyed.”⁵⁴⁶ Jefferson, however, thought otherwise. The Saxon system necessitated revolution to reemerge. He maintained a belief in its power as an ideological force, one that should not, unless under the most dire circumstances, be tampered with. However, in *Notes* we also see Jefferson’s own worst fears of geographical conquest that contain an odd caution. While Jefferson argues that Saxon migration is deemed “good” and constitutes a successful movement, he claims the opposite is untrue—America should *not* be the place within which yet another revolution occurs. In other words, Jefferson wants the conquest of North America to end with him. Further immigration will weaken the state. “[Immigrants] will bring with them the principles of the governments they leave, imbibed in their early youth,” Jefferson warns in Gildas fashion, and, “if able to throw them off, it will be in exchange for an unbounded licentiousness, passing, as is usual, from one extreme to another.”⁵⁴⁷

⁵⁴⁵ *Summary View*, 14.

⁵⁴⁶ *WJA* 3:455. By “feudal law” Adams means any lands a king conquers are his; by “canon law,” the Pope claims authority over all Christendom. With this right, the pope can take or give lands and evict as necessary. Claiming religious and secular rulership, Henry VIII transferred *both* rights to himself.

⁵⁴⁷ *Notes*, 141.

Extremes, for Jefferson, are only useful *within* the narrative of the *folcland*. Drawing on the characters Bede romanticized in *Ecclesiastical History*, Jefferson had publicized his fascination with Hengist and Horsa—the Saxon brother-soldiers who arrived in Briton in the guise of protectors for this very reason—in *Summary View* because good Saxon models revolutionize the heroic value of the story. In an attempt to appropriate their history for his own American ideals, he wrote, “[our American] ancestors ... possessed a right, which nature has given to all men, of departing from the country in which chance, not choice, has placed them, of going in quest of new habitations, and of there establishing new societies.”⁵⁴⁸ Thus, quite unlike the Saxon Bede, or even Virginian Smith or New Englander Mather before him, Jefferson provides proof that rightful migration precedes a necessary conquest for future extension of these lands, forging an American Saxonhood argument for westward expansion. That the Normans did the same to the Saxons seems to him irrelevant. Jefferson’s Saxon leads its future citizens *to* the light *away* from the dark. But it was *to* the dark the analogy ultimately went. Fascinated by Hengist and Horsa as national archetypes, Jefferson had requested to have them put on the Great Seal of the United States. Writing Adams, Jefferson claimed, “Hengist and Horsa, the Saxon chiefs from whom we claim the honor of being descended and political principles and forms of government we have assumed” should serve as models for the nation.⁵⁴⁹ Jefferson’s desire to have Saxon chiefs on the American seal highlighted the fact that his earlier interest in Anglo-Saxon studies and his push to include it in the University of Virginia curriculum were more ideological than literary, that land conquest was an issue worth writing into the national narrative. As political currency, the proposed seal represented a disturbing emblem of

⁵⁴⁸ *Summary View*, 13.

⁵⁴⁹ This comes from a letter from John Adams to his wife on August, 10, 1776, in *PTJ* 2:494-95.

conquest.⁵⁵⁰ The Saxon brothers, together on a national seal with the Old Testament symbolic pillar and fire, represent the conquest embodied by American Saxonhood and brought to life—and to the west—in the Corps of Discovery mission, not an amicable martial mission. The original migration myth offered hope that by remembering the past, the present could be maintained and provided a common identity; but it also held great repercussions for the future. Jefferson’s Saxon frame of reference shifted to conquer and expand, which distorted the more insular original myth into a fable of nationhood, damning the land’s original inhabitants.

* * * * *

In the eighteenth century, along with newer terms to denote Saxon, such as “Goth” and “Teuton,” there arose a new moniker that enveloped minor racial categorizations of “Scottish,” “Welsh,” and “Irish”—Celtic. This symbolic shift highlights the agricultural changes and industrial revolution that reshaped the land interests in Britain and its American territories following the American Revolution. More American elites—speaking in terms of landed gentry, largely those who had *some* Welsh roots—began tracing their lineage to often mythic, aristocratic lineages. As Britain continued to absorb lands in Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, these claims increased, sparking, in a sense, a rhetoric of Celtic nationalism that directed itself against the conquest of encroaching rule and the subjugation of those lands to outside rulers.⁵⁵¹

However, it was *Madoc*, Southey’s poem, which best represented the upsurge of this Welsh push, perhaps the pinnacle of interest in the American Indian, and that publically revealed

⁵⁵⁰ Frantzen, *Desire for Origins*, 19.

⁵⁵¹ Katie Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 31.

the contradiction that unsettled the Welsh-English question. Southey began the poem in 1789 and continued writing, off and on, until its publication in 1805. He intended the poem to be a combination of Homer and the old Saxon epics; it was to become the new Anglo-epic. *Madoc* paid tribute to the growing Welsh revival. Southey's poem, greatly influenced by his 1799 visit to Wales to collect original source material and images, depicts a band of freedom-loving Welshmen, Indians, the American discovery and the unified glory of national pride. Southey's dream vision *Madoc* would "sing how colonizing should be done the British way."⁵⁵² The poem, however, from the start, was meant to be primarily about America. Upon conquering the Aztecs, Madoc sings,

We won your city, Azteca;
By force we will maintain it: ... to [your] king
Repeat my saying ... to this goodly land
Your fathers came for an abiding place,
Strangers like we, but not like us, in peace.
They conquered and destroyed.⁵⁵³

In Southey's version, the Aztecs rear up and gather an even mightier army to defend against the Welsh that defeated them and to inhibit further Spanish plundering. But the gods intervene so that only by becoming imperial conquerors themselves can the Welsh Indians share in their destruction of Azteca. In a similar way, it is only through extermination that the American Welsh Indians can be "found."⁵⁵⁴ It is a damning narrative of rightful reconquest of the Americas—or, at least, a questioning of this subjugating practice of land tenure as "rightful." In its depiction of the

⁵⁵² Ernest Bernhardt-Kabisch, *Robert Southey* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1977), 111.

⁵⁵³ Robert Southey, *Madoc* (London, 1807), 56.

⁵⁵⁴ Rebecca Cole Heinowitz, *Spanish America and British Romanticism, 1777-1826: Rewriting Conquest* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 120.

noble savage whose very absence represents success of the conqueror, Southey's *Madoc* portrays the conundrum of the American Indian during the Jeffersonian period. Coinciding, as it did, with the Lewis and Clark expedition, Southey's *Madoc* portrays the tensions involved in an heroic movement to originary sources. In Southey's version, Madoc realizes that the "violence and bloody zeal" he desired to escape are, in fact, part of his own settlement.

Jefferson feared emulation of his own land conquering by either Europe or the very Indians from whom he was taking lands. As early as 1783, he expressed concerns that his suspicions about the European colonization of lands west of the Mississippi might be true; Jefferson thought that Britain was planning to send out survey parties to the upper Northwest. In a letter from Annapolis on December 4, 1783, he wrote Clark:

[Some British capitalists] have substantiated a large sum of money from England for exploring the country from the Mississippi to California. They pretend it is only to promote knolege [sic]. I am afraid they have thoughts of colonizing into that quarter. Some of us have been talking here in a feeble way of making the attempt to search that country. But I doubt whether we have enough of that kind of spirit to raise the money. How would you like to lead such a party?⁵⁵⁵

In his marginalia, Jefferson wrote a small note alongside this paragraph: "The English design of exploring to the Pacific." But, it wasn't only the English. France, too, was eager to explore and set up colonies for trade. In 1785, following the Treaty of Paris (1783), Jefferson sat in Paris as minister to France and learned of Louis XVI's plans to send admiral Jean-François de Galaup on a scientific mission to the Pacific Northwest. That, coupled with Alexander Mackenzie's famous

⁵⁵⁵ Jefferson, Letter to Clark (1783); Draper Manuscripts: George Rogers Clark Papers, 52 J 93-95, Wisconsin Historical Society, document number AJ-140:1.

crossing in 1793-94 which provided Britain with its claim to the Northwest Territories, sufficiently alarmed Jefferson. He needed to retaliate or face losing the Saxon upper hand—his was a fear of being conquered.

Some twenty years following his initial letter to Clark, Jefferson's dream became a realization. On January 18, 1803, Jefferson secretly requested that Congress appropriate funds for an expedition to be led by future secretary of state Meriwether Lewis and fellow Virginian William Clark, who were hand chosen for the task:

The interests of commerce place the principal object within the constitutional powers and care of Congress, and that it should incidentally advance the geographical knowledge of our own continent, cannot be but an additional gratification. *The nation claiming the territory, regarding this as a literary pursuit, which is in the habit of permitting within its dominions,* would not be disposed to view it with jealousy, even if the expiring state of its interests there did not render it a matter of indifference.⁵⁵⁶

Spain, however, which controlled the territory, had not given its permission for the exploration. By calling it a “literary pursuit,” Jefferson essentially couches an espionage mission—it was, for all intents and purposes, trespassing—in aesthetic terms, especially since “literary pursuit” implies something more innocuous than a scientific journey. Jefferson's idea of what constituted a “literary pursuit” remains something of a mystery. It does, however, fit in with his Saxon narrative, for an attempt to develop a narrative of the country through this westward expansion might justify it in writing. Congress swiftly approved the 2500 dollars for the Voyage of Discovery, the Corps' mission. The route had never been explored by an American, but, in 1795,

⁵⁵⁶ Jefferson's “Message to Congress, January 18, 1803” in *PTJ* 9:433-34, emphasis added.

Welshman John Evans had traveled with Scotsman James MacKay who led that expedition; the group traversed the region looking for the lost colony of Madoc. It was, in fact, MacKay's map that Lewis and Clark used, given them by Jefferson—a map that had been given to *him* by Evans.⁵⁵⁷

Jefferson came to the Welsh Indian tale almost by accident. As has been noted, Welsh pride had been growing as had interest in the veracity of some of the earlier Celtic legends having to do with America's discovery. Scottish poet and Edinburgh professor James Macpherson translated an edition of Ossian, Celtic bard and magisterial poetic curiosity. Macpherson's translation sparked an international interest in Celtic poetry; Jefferson himself became quite caught up in the fray. After asking Macpherson to copy him the source material for the poems of Ossian, however, Jefferson was politely turned down (Macpherson didn't believe that original sources should be in the "wrong hands").⁵⁵⁸ Partly due to his high stature in the field of letters, Macpherson's edition and insistence upon Ossian as a historical figure lent a certain scholarly credence to the reemerging story of Madoc in America. Shortly afterward and amidst the growing Celtic furor, the Madoc myth resurfaced in the pages of *Gentlemen's Magazine*, where poet/antiquarian and Welsh Jacobin Edward Williams, under the Celtic name "Iolo Morganwg," had claimed there existed an offshoot of Madoc's people in lands far west of the Mississippi River. Blue-eyed and blond, these "Indians," Williams's argument ran, spoke a language unheard of before in America—it was the rude forerunner of a dialect of Welsh.

But there was more. Williams was a poet of formidable reach; he was, in the eyes of the English Church, a noxious dissenter. William Blake, among others, became enamored with his

⁵⁵⁷ MacKay has been discovered only recently to have been the author of the 1797 Indian Office Map; see Thomas C. Danisi and W. Raymond Woods, Lewis and Clark's Route Map: James MacKay's Map of the Missouri River," *The Western Historical Quarterly* 35:1 (2004): 53-72.

⁵⁵⁸ Gilbert Chinard, "Jefferson and Ossian," *Modern Language Notes* 38:4 (1923), 201-2.

volume of poetry, *Poems, Lyrical and Pastoral* (1794). His readership in the Americas expanded, which, in turn, greatly buttressed the idea that there could be a historical Madoc. Since Williams's claim reached a wide public readership in both Britain and America, the narrative prompted once again the question: Was there a historical Celtic claim to North America? In truth, there had been some Jacobin interest in planting a Welsh community in the west around this time. Because of their proximity to native speaking Indians, the Welsh would, it was said, have a naturally open trade line. This became a matter of international intrigue with the onset of the "Nootka Crisis," which originally revolved around the issue of land ownership in northwestern America between Spain and America and the protection of Britain's international trading interests. Having learned of the Madoc myth, the Spanish had become terrified of its power; they had intended to send John Evans on behalf of Spain to explore the region for "trading purposes." The Welsh, for their part, hoped for an extension of lands to reconnect with their "lost" relatives. Captain John Drummond, serving in the West Indies and a supporter of Williams's claim, was anxious to provide any information that would alert authorities to Spain's schemes for North America. He surreptitiously provided Evans with a cache of documents, including copies of his letters to Thomas, 2nd baron Walsingham, in 1789, relating to French schemes in the West Indies and America, as well as a letter allegedly penned by Sir Walter Raleigh that had reportedly been in Welsh possession for the sole purposes of establishing rightful claims on North America. In this letter, Raleigh supposedly had written,

I, Sir Walter Raleigh, commander and chief by land and sea ... had discovered for us on the behalf of the most Excellent, high, and Renowned Prince, Owen Guyeneth ... discoveries and conquests first made in the year of our Redemption and Salvation 1164 (or thereabout) by the great and valliant Prince Madock [who

had] made notable discovery and settlements of all Parts of the said Great
Continent of America and of all the islands round that Mighty tract of land...⁵⁵⁹

Raleigh appeared to be rehashing the kind of arguments Dee had made one hundred years earlier; however, what was missing was physical proof. Since, following this Welsh claim, plans had already been made by the London-Welsh financial supporters to send their own chosen explorer, they chose Evans. His mission was to tap the region for possibilities of settling. The larger goal of the entire plan, however, was to find evidence to support Raleigh's claim that North America was founded on Madoc's initial arrival, and the Welsh Indians served as the key evidence. Evans had already been tapped by Spain to explore; but he used the money and, on his own, ventured forth to the Northwest Territory. The Indians existed; of that there was no doubt in the London-Welsh group's mind. The Raleigh letter contained in Drummond's belongings and recovered by Evans suggested this to be the actual case. However, although everyone thought they knew this fact, no one could prove it.

Evans played both sides. In fact, Jefferson mysteriously acquired *his* map from Evans, who, with Spanish backing, had completed the venture on his own in 1795.⁵⁶⁰ When, on January 13, 1804, Jefferson dispatched a letter containing a map of the Upper Missouri Valley to another Welsh-American, Lewis, his protégé and former secretary of state, the source was again Evans. Jefferson wrote Lewis nine days following this transaction to clarify the mission: "On the 13th I inclosed you the map of a Mr. Evans, a Welshman, employed by the Spanish government for that purpose, but whose original object I believe had been to go in search of the Welsh Indians said to be up the Missouri. On this subject a Mr. Rees of the same nation established in the Western part

⁵⁵⁹ Gwyn A. Williams, "Welsh Indians: The Madoc Legend and the First Welsh Radicalism," 140. See also National Library of Wales MS. 6687D.

⁵⁶⁰ David William, "John Evans' Strange Journey: Part I. The Welsh Indians," *The American Historical Review* 54: 2 (1949), 277-295.

of Pennsylvania will write you.”⁵⁶¹ Thus, when the Lewis and Clark party stumbled upon the Salish in 1805, they believed that they had accomplished the president’s goal. As Sergeant Ordway, one of the four members whose accounts exist, wrote in his journal, it was a success: “We suppose that they are the welch Indians if their is any such from the language.”⁵⁶² They had, they believed, found the lost tribes of Madoc.

Only they hadn’t. The Indians spoke no more of Welsh connections—at least that the travelers could recognize in the scant communication between the two groups—and no further news from Washington arrived. Following Lewis and Clark’s evacuation of Bitterroot Valley, Montana, and the move to Idaho, the matter was dropped, but a problem still remained. Jefferson had no “rights” to the land, regardless of the Louisiana Purchase; it was all technically Indian land. The “sale” of a Madoc connection to the northwest Indians, however, could provide a familial link to the Northwest Territory where none existed. Indians were prime republicans. Unlike blacks, whom Jefferson characterized as weak and undependable, Indians had more Saxon qualities. Countering then-current theories of French naturalist Count de Buffon, who had argued Indians were cold and weak people with no souls, Jefferson contended Indians were brave, dutiful, and courageous. “We shall probably find,” he argues, “that [American Indians] are formed in mind as well as in body, on the same module with the ‘Homo sapiens Europaeus.’”⁵⁶³ In fact, because of his alleged “connection” to the Welsh Mandans, Jefferson tries very hard to envision an historic place for the American Indians in the national, and interhistorical, narrative:

Were we to compare them in their present state with the Europeans North of the Alps, when the Roman arms and arts first crossed those mountains, the

⁵⁶¹ Thwaites 7:292.

⁵⁶² Ibid., 7:149.

⁵⁶³ *Notes*, 103.

comparison would be unequal, because, at that time, those parts of Europe were swarming with numbers; ... How many good poets, how many able mathematicians, how many great inventors in arts or sciences, had [they] then produced?⁵⁶⁴

To assimilate Indians under “American” would prove a smoother transition into the northwestern lands that Jefferson knew had no wholly American titles. He intended his eventual greeting to the Mandan chiefs in 1806 to create publicly a sense of family in both white and Indian hearts:

My friends & children ... We are descended from the old nations which live beyond the great water: but we & our forefathers have been so long here that we seem like you to have grown out of this land: we consider ourselves no longer as of the old nations beyond the great water, but as united in one family with our red brethren here ... you are all my children, and I wish you to live in peace & friendship with one another as brethren of the same family ought to do. How much better is it for neighbors to help than to hurt one another ... My children, I have long desired to see you. I have now opened my heart to you; let my words sink into your hearts & never be forgotten.⁵⁶⁵

A good student of Anglo-Saxon history and reader of Bede, Jefferson knew that an outright battle for lands—a *non*-rightful conquest—would prove unsettling to a new nation, especially one that had just defeated its mother country. Again, the Saxon notion of *folcrist* through lineage might have worked had there been a tie to the Salish; yet, at least, this patriarchal approach avowed genuine familial concern and common values.

⁵⁶⁴ Ibid., 106.

⁵⁶⁵ *Letters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition with Related Documents 1783-1854*, Donald Jackson, ed. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978) 1:281.

Ultimately, the Salish did not prove anything beyond the fact that there existed a tribe of northwestern Indians that helped the Corps of Discovery find the Northwest Passage and America extend its boundaries (their name was soon afterward changed to “Mandan”). The speech given the Mandan chiefs in 1806 on their arrival in Washington became Jefferson’s stock Indian speech. For every tribe that visited the White House, he offered the same publicly patriarchal display of familial feeling. In his attempt to link Indians to the English, however, Jefferson—either wittingly or unwittingly—placed the categories of “savage” and “uncivilized” upon them, descriptions that created an unfortunately artificial quality for the Indians.⁵⁶⁶ Claims to *folcricht* were not necessary (even had they been, they were never proved), and by explaining cultural differences in the grand sweep of his American pastoral, *Notes*, Jefferson writes away the Indians, leaving them open to the inexorable march of civilization. The Madoc myth spelled doom for the Mandans, then, and Jefferson’s attempt to connect them to the American narrative failed in the end. The Mandans’ fate was finally sealed when, in 1833, Secretary of War William Cass failed to provide smallpox vaccinations for the Mandan tribe that had so graciously helped the Corps of Discovery some thirty-five years earlier; in the epidemic of 1837, they were eradicated. The Saxons’ conquering of America was in full swing.

⁵⁶⁶ As Bross argues, the figure of the “praying Indian” became a central feature of early American discourse; *Dry Bones*, 3. Jefferson extends this symbolism into the eighteenth century.

EPILOGUE

AMERICAN SAXONHOOD AND THE “AMERICAN YOKE”

What happened to American Saxonhood following Thomas Jefferson? The use of the ideology for national claims weakened as sectarian strife emerged in America and issues of racial and genetic minority rose to the fore. Broadly speaking, nineteenth-century American Saxonhood underwent a series of sizable changes that eventually led to its attrition, though not its permanent annihilation. It is important to note that following Jefferson’s successful institution of Saxon ideas during the American Revolutionary period, Anglo-Saxonism as a general ideology attracted other nations. As Scandinavian, German, and English scholarship increased in the mid- to late-nineteenth century, more and more Anglo-Saxon primary texts were unearthed, edited, and translated; “Anglo-Saxon” soon began generically to represent a struggle of forces and was adopted by conquering regimes as justification for national eminence. More nations envisioned the Saxon claim—an imagined right to trace their roots, government, and people to a superior and noble breed of humans—as their own. Since the myth spoke loosely of a regional golden age wherein Anglo-Saxons had enjoyed freedoms and liberties unknown since the Norman invasion, it offered a binary formula through which the powerful could remain in control (or, later, the oppressed could buttress arguments for equality). Partly due to the revolutionary upheavals in America and France, the tenor of Anglo-Saxonism spread internationally. Scholarship and nationalism began to feed off each other. England, Germany, and Scandinavia fought to fit Anglo-Saxonism’s underlying theme—that there existed a superior race of people who rightfully emerged as the grand inheritor of a certain respective geography—

into their nation-building plans, thus increasing the amount of scholarly work in the field and broadening Anglo-Saxonism to include *any* nation. Papers were presented, tracts were published, and racial theories were advanced; from the British Saxonists to German Romantics, race arguments favoring Saxon blood flooded the literature. The Saxon-Norman divisions continued as various national histories captured the Norman Yoke issue in descriptive narratives, especially as each nation claimed a part of “Saxonhood” for themselves.

In England, where most of the primary editing and collating was done, the increased historical awareness of ancient texts led to an acutely more stringent validation process by which these texts were examined, which, in turn, resulted in the growth of nineteenth-century academic philology. Because of this emergent branch of learning, England *au fond* publicized Anglo-Saxonism to the world. Two of the greatest eighteenth-century Anglo-Saxon editors were English: William Percy and Thomas Wharton. Both Percy and Wharton had earlier made older English texts available for the first time, thus creating an increase in the growing public consciousness; stories were first inserted into imaginative literature, which soon after was followed by a large increase in scholarship *and* readership.⁵⁶⁷ Philological work fast became an inextricable part of the English nation-building process as these texts grafted themselves onto the ideological currencies of the day; the ancient arguments for Anglo-Saxon rights soon diffused into mainstream culture. Claiming Saxon blood as solely its own, England quickly became territorial. English writers began to view the American usage of Saxon ideology put forth best by

⁵⁶⁷ Thomas Percy discovered a tattered book of verses the maids were using to light the fire with—this turned into his “Percy Folio,” or *The Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (first appearing in 1765). Until Thomas Wharton’s *History of English Poetry* a decade later, Percy’s notes and editions served as a comprehensive literary history of English poesy. Wharton’s *History of English Poetry* (1774) was second only to Percy’s *Reliques* in popularity, eventually becoming the standard study of late medieval and early modern literature. Wharton’s work popularized the notion of a feudal vision in the Middle Ages, thus supporting new Magna Carta visions, and portrayed romances as real reflections of life.

Jefferson as a false front. Thomas Carlyle famously compared the American governmental system—in its essence, a kind of “formless” Saxon tribal order—to a joint stock company. Disparaging Americans, Carlyle claimed that Saxons did indeed benefit from a greater sense of Norman order for the national structure and growth of England.

Other nations vied for a claim to the Germanic myth. Sharing England’s emerging antiquarian impulse and in the wake of Napoleon’s expansionism in the north, Scandinavian territories—Norway, Sweden, and Denmark—all pushed for a more unified nationalism, or the greater glorification of the homeland, reaching back to the Germanic forests for their source. Northern European philologists painted their translations of ancient heroic texts with nationalistic brushes. Scandinavian scholars were quick to translate sagas and Eddic material in order to uncover cultural nationalism from the original German in old tales, folklore, and heroic poems.⁵⁶⁸ Norwegians, seeking especially to break free from the circle of other Scandinavian countries and to regain an independence they had not enjoyed for more than four hundred years, looked back to the Old Norse sagas. As the appeal of nationalism discovered in ancient texts continued to grow, Scandinavian scholars equated the *Edda* and *Beowulf* with the ancient classics; culturally and ideologically, they considered them analogous to Greece’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

Stories of the Saxons continued to fascinate the world as an even deeper awareness of factual Anglo-Saxon history was also brought forward through Sharon Turner’s wildly popular historical writings and, later, Sir Walter Scott’s imaginative medieval romances, both of which garnered an international audience. Europeans and Americans alike became enamored with

⁵⁶⁸ Eddic material had been translated since the late-eighteenth century, starting with Jacob Schimmelman’s 1777 work; later, in 1812, Friedrich Ruse published a translation, which was then followed by the work of the brothers Grimm in 1815.

Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, which was so successful that after its first printing, which spanned the years 1799-1805, a second edition appeared in 1807, followed by four consecutive editions extending into the middle of the century. Until his history appeared, most of the actual Germanic writing lay dormant, save a few authors' interpretations; there were literally no Anglo-Saxon texts publically available. Further, unlike any previous history of England, Turner's included snippets of primary texts, source material that supported his historical conclusions and offered the public a rare glimpse into this arcane world. Turner depicted his England as rightful heirs to the Saxons, a new power that, starting in the Reformation, was chosen to act as leader of the world; since it was chosen by Providence, England should demonstrate its imperial power. Turner thought, as most nationalistic historians did, that his nation's Saxon destiny could be reached *a posse ad esse*, and thus deduced in his history England's possible future essence from its ancestry. A Romantic in spirit (having been notably associated with Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey, the latter of whom employed him), Turner viewed the Anglo-Saxon government differently than had Thomas Cartwright, who adamantly argued that the king was president-like, and so argued for hereditary kingship. He also refuted the former view of Saxons as barbarous, instead portraying them as noble savages, the primary originary race of the English, emphasizing the proximity of their racial heritage to the English.⁵⁶⁹

Influenced greatly by Turner, Scott helped bring the medieval world to the fore with his fantastic depictions of both Saxons and Normans represented in his historical romances. He portrayed Saxon and Norman history so vividly and attractively that many readers took his work

⁵⁶⁹ A good number of imaginative works by Victorian authors used Turner as a source; *Ivanhoe*, in fact, was based almost solely on Turner's history. Turner later influenced several works, including Palgrave's *The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth—Anglo-Saxon Period*, 1832, Johann Martin Lappenberg's *The History of England under the Anglo-Saxon Kings* (1832, translated by Thorpe in 1845), and Kemble's *The Saxons in England* (1849).

for valid historical truth rather than imaginative fiction.⁵⁷⁰ This was especially true in America, where Scott's novels *were* history. Thus began the Saxon *démarche* in early nineteenth-century North America: Americans came to see the historical Norman-Saxon equation naturally transferring onto their own landscape, and geographical regions began adopting these historical roles. Both the northern and southern states "borrowed" freely from the formula, loosely adopting characteristics of "Saxon" and "Norman" for their own growing regional identities. Scott's novels provided this foundational base. The ideological message—that there existed freedom-loving Saxons who stood as protagonists against the encroaching Normans—offered the American public a highly romanticized model for their understanding of Norman and Saxon history as it related to the present. In defense of its feudal structure, the American South promoted a cavalier Norman vision, and Scott's work tempted southerners with applicable ideas about their own Anglo-Saxon heritage. Beginning in 1814 with the publication of *Waverley*, Scott's influence spread far among the southern plantation owners, and his notion of "Southron," or ancient gentry, quickly became an endearing and nationalistic term for southerners.⁵⁷¹ At the same time, the rapid expansion of industrialism in the American North began to make the southern feudal system seem archaic; thus, since southerners had few models upon which they might pattern themselves and their culture, Scott's chivalric ideals seemed a way to connect them to an heroic past.

Recently, critics have shown an interest in these southern ideological issues and the intellectual culture that led to and evolved out of these differences. The American South's

⁵⁷⁰ Alice Chandler, *A Dream of Order: The Medieval Ideal in Nineteenth-Century English Literature* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970), 12.

⁵⁷¹ Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny*, 160-61. Horsman also notes that so great was Scott's impact that hotels, steamboats, and other inanimate objects were named after his characters, and one library on a Mississippi steamboat was devoted solely to Scott's works.

identification with Norman values has provoked stimulating research, providing a certain historical validation for southern views in antebellum America. As Gregory Van Hoosier-Cary suggests, “the analogy between plantation culture and feudalism validated southern culture by suggesting to southerners that their values and institutions had historical precedent.”⁵⁷² In this way, plantation owners could justify their existence as civilized conquerors of lands and barbarians. The Norman argument in this reading symbolizes a feudal arrangement in America: since slavery was a form of serfdom, which had inherently helped form the European culture, southerners could argue that it was a rightful tradition. It was, Van Hoosier-Cary observes, “a way of life that promised to enlighten those of African descent and to provide a social structure to prevent them from slipping back into savagery.”⁵⁷³ Following the lead of earlier groundbreaking southern ideological studies, such as those done by W.J. Cash in *The Mind of the South* (1941) and David Hackett Fischer’s *Albion’s Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (1989), Ritchie Devon Watson’s recent project, entitled *Normans and Saxons: Southern Race Mythology and the Intellectual History of the Civil War* (2008) more deeply explores these racial ideologies evident in the Civil War. Watson’s study traces the rise of this American “Normanism” in the South from the 1850s to the years following the war, arguing that southerners, feeling defensive about slavery, clung to feudal institutions and ideologies in Norman history. He claims that with this extended antagonism between the perceived historical Normans (or southern aristocratic cavaliers) and the northern states arose a fundamentally distinct southern race mythology that was part of the fabric of southern nationalism *en toto*.

⁵⁷² Gregory A. Van Hoosier-Cary, “Byrhtnoth in Dixie: The Emergence of Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Postbellum South,” Frantzen and Niles, 162.

⁵⁷³ Ibid., 162. However, defeat in the Civil War turned them from conqueror to conquered instantaneously, a position that dampened some of the spark.

Tantalizing as these studies are in terms of southern racial ideology and the Norman question, they have largely omitted the *entire* Norman-Saxon equation, never fully exploring the power of Cotton Mather's far reach into the nineteenth century and New England's drive for Saxon cultural dominance. In the nineteenth-century American North, the concept of American Saxonhood was most notably translated into transcendental writings. Adopting a wholesome, Saxon stance, New England writers created a fictitious image of New England as the grand Saxon state. In the nineteenth century, too, as a greater number of texts became available, more New England authors simply became interested in the growing Anglo-Saxon claims for genetic purity. Authors from Walt Whitman (who attempted only briefly to study the language) to Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow all explored the Saxon vision, freely adapting it to suit their own ideological ends.⁵⁷⁴

Although all were self-taught in Anglo-Saxon language, texts, and history (probably mostly picking these up from older editions and translations by Turner and noted Anglo-Saxon scholar John Josias Conybeare [1779–1824]), it was Longfellow who served as the scholarly promoter of these texts.⁵⁷⁵ Eager for sources for his creative material, Longfellow dug deeply into heroic Anglo-Saxon material, scouring all the recent translations—and some texts that weren't even translated—for poetic inspiration.⁵⁷⁶ Importantly, he knew Saxonist Joseph Bosworth

⁵⁷⁴ John E. Bernbrock, *Walt Whitman and "Anglo-Saxonism"* (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1961), 66-121. During this time, Longfellow became equally enamored with Scandinavian literature. Chair of Modern Languages at Harvard, Longfellow was the first reputable literary figure to take a strong interest in Northern Scandinavian history and culture and perhaps *the* primary scholar of Scandinavia in America (though scholars generally agree his knowledge was rather thin and superficial). This point is made by Andrew Hilen in *Longfellow and Scandinavia. A Study of the Poet's Relationship with the Northern Languages and Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947), 28.

⁵⁷⁵ See Bernbrock for an account of the reading activities of Thoreau, Emerson, and Whitman.

⁵⁷⁶ Longfellow checked out numerous Anglo-Saxon texts from the Harvard College Library at various points in his life until the late 1840s. Among the most notable are *Beowulf*, Thomas Percy's translations, Benjamin Thorpe's translation of Caedmon, *The Saxon Chronicle* (multiple times), as well as Turner's *History* (multiple times); see

personally. In fact, Bosworth's *Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language*, which first appeared in 1838, was given high favor by Longfellow, who visited with Bosworth prior to its publication in 1835 to consult on Anglo-Saxon matters.⁵⁷⁷ Like Jefferson, Longfellow promoted the value of Anglo-Saxon literature, hailing the promise of Bosworth's dictionary as a useful study aid. In his public essay on the subject, entitled "Anglo-Saxon Literature," which was first published in the *North American Review*, Longfellow introduced the idea that Anglo-Saxon poetry was artistic and literary, and he sought to promote its study and reading to the American public—along with Bosworth's *Dictionary*.⁵⁷⁸ While he revered the poetic quality of the language as a relic of art, Longfellow mostly favored the linguistic element and the socio-historical import of literature, believing, like Jefferson, that an understanding of Anglo-Saxon texts was essential to the knowledge of contemporary literature. Yet, while Longfellow did strive to widen the readership of Anglo-Saxon literature and language with his essays, partial translations, and public endorsements, he advanced no real ideological agenda; a creative writer, he was genuinely interested simply in the aesthetic value of texts, and his writing offered a subtly "American" reinterpretation of heroic Saxon themes, often displacing themes onto the American landscape

Kenneth Walter Cameron, *Longfellow's Reading in Libraries: The Charging Records of a Learned Poet* (Hartford: Transcendental Books, 1973).

⁵⁷⁷ R. M. Liuzza points this out in "Lost in Translation: Some Versions of *Beowulf* in the Nineteenth Century." *English Studies* 4 (2002), 288.

⁵⁷⁸ In fact, Longfellow was in contact with the Englishman Bosworth throughout the late 1830s and early 1840s, most likely wishing to keep abreast of the newest translations and Anglo-Saxon scholarship in England. In 1838, Longfellow reviewed Bosworth's dictionary, and he received advanced copies of it for distribution in the States. Charles C. Calhoun, *Longfellow: A Rediscovered Life* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004), 80. In his relationship with Bosworth and his work, it seems Longfellow sought to act as a liaison between the continents in that he desperately sought to promote Bosworth's project and he wanted to increase American reading of Anglo-Saxon literature. In 1842, Longfellow wrote Bosworth: "Have you published the new edition of your dictionary yet? Within the last few years, I have not heard of many new publications in Anglo-Saxon. What are Mr. Thorpe and Mr. Kemble [two prominent Anglo-Saxon scholars] doing?"; *Letters*, no. 709. *The Letters of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*, ed. Andrew Hilen (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), no. 455.

and within American history (Longfellow's long epic *Hiawatha*, which touches loosely on Norman-Saxon struggles of conquest and power, is one example).⁵⁷⁹

Emerson, on the other hand, *did* have an ideological agenda, and not only did he publish his thoughts on the literature, he incorporated it into his most prominent essays. In 1837, Emerson checked out Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons* three separate times from the Boston Athenæum.⁵⁸⁰ Undoubtedly inspired by what he read, Emerson infused Anglo-Saxon ideals in his early essays. Following Turner's notion of an evolving Saxon greatness, he wrote, "American character is only the English character exaggerated," claiming that "America is a kind of transplanted England, and the inhabitants of the United States, especially the northern portion, are descended from the people of England and have inherited the traits of their national character."⁵⁸¹ Like Jefferson, Emerson wanted to trace Americans—in this case, *Northern* Americans, and, most particularly, New Englanders—back to the mythical race of Hengist and Horsa. With the publication of *English Traits* and his other writings on Anglo-Saxon literature and history, Emerson began an unsystematic inquiry into the roots of New England as he saw it connected with the heroic past of the Anglo-Saxons. In fact, Emerson became so caught up in the

⁵⁷⁹ Ultimately, the Old English epic *Beowulf* seemed to influence American writers in their own aesthetics and writing. Indeed, some of Longfellow's own poetical ideas were likely drawn from his meek understanding of the poem, and even Whitman's poetic meter can be seen as borrowing from the Anglo-Saxon. There are a few instances in which Longfellow might seem to emulate Anglo-Saxon poetry or use it as a base, as Whitman possibly did (see Bernbrock), but there exists little corresponding evidence. For example, Newton Arvin notes that like *Beowulf*, *Hiawatha* must perform an undersea battle, but unlike *Beowulf* (and more like Arthur), *Hiawatha* leaves the land in his birch canoe (Newton Arvin, *Longfellow: His Life and Works* [Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1963], 162-63). Longfellow, famously comparing *Beowulf* to a piece of old English armor, a relic that was rusty but strong, long maintained an odd scholarly distance from Anglo-Saxon texts but seemed to have lost interest in them after 1850, preferring instead to translate Scandinavian and Norse material. See Bernbrock, 80-95.

⁵⁸⁰ On January 6 and 27, Emerson checked out volumes one and two respectively; on December 14, he checked out both volumes; see Kenneth Cameron, *Ralph Waldo Emerson's Reading*, New York: Haskell House, 1966, p. 23.

⁵⁸¹ *The Early Lectures of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Edited by Stephen E. Whicher, Robert E. Spiller, and Wallace E. Williams. 3 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959-72) 1:233.

theme of the superiority of Anglo-Saxon heritage and New England's role as descendants that his whole idea of history began to revolve around it.⁵⁸²

Emerson's portrait of the Saxon man was multi-dimensional. Not confined to any particular "race" or region, Emerson's Saxon existed outside of time and space, an incarnate in variant figures—the staunch Englishman (of whom Milton served as prime example), the worldly philosophical wayfarer (such as Montaigne), and, more locally, the American man of action (like Webster or Thoreau).⁵⁸⁴ Although Emerson's Saxon *could* be found anywhere, it was in England that he was most abundant. In *English Traits*, Emerson sings the praises of the Saxon, father of the English and thus grandfather of America. If the human race had thoroughbreds, he claimed, they would be English. In terms of physique, character and virtue, the rugged Saxon, in Emerson's mind, epitomized genetic perfection. Emerson's Saxon worked hard, thrived on self-reliance, and cherished freedom. The theme of America's inheritance of the hardy Saxon stock served Emerson historically *and* ideologically in that Saxon characteristics best represented the force underlying such Emersonian concepts as self-reliance, individuality, and collective national progress. The Saxon's American progeny had the capacity to take the new country to the heights the Saxon had taken Old England, to continue the lineage Alfred started that peaked with men like Shakespeare and Milton. Saxons persevered—the Saxon's corporeal strength transferred to spirit—and Emerson maintained that Saxon traits easily adapted to American soil, a region ripe for maturation.

However, Emerson claimed nothing that English Gothicists had not already taught New Englanders to believe. The terms "Anglo-Saxon" and "Goth" were interchangeable as Jefferson

⁵⁸² Bernbrock, 87.

⁵⁸⁴ Phillip L. Nicoloff, *Emerson on Race and History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961) makes these points; 159-61. Nicoloff's chapter entitled "The 'Saxon' Man" (158-74) provides a good deal of my source material here.

and Emerson were using them, and, like Jefferson, Emerson equated “American” with Saxon. Immersed as he was in the growing tide of international scholarship on ancient texts, however, Emerson also acknowledged the true power of the Norse conquerors, and he began to shape these new doctrines of nationality to his own needs, as well as to New England’s, arguing, much as the Scandinavian scholars had, that the Norse sagas were analogous to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, each a glorious recantation of great imperial vision.⁵⁸⁵ He looked for the literary proof of American Saxonhood (for Emerson, the American national saga had yet to be written, but he would see this hope in what he envisioned as the heroic “Saxon” verse of Whitman). Importantly, like his predecessor Mather, Emerson hammered these ideas into the public consciousness as a religious analogy: he stressed and employed the equation of the Norsemen to the Saxon as the political Norman despotism of Catholicism against the Teutonic, or liberty-loving, Protestant Saxon. For Emerson, it was in New England that the stalwart Saxons clustered—it was their destined *terra*—and Emerson’s American Saxonhood arguments illustrated the continuation of Mather’s claims that the entire nation should model itself after the values of New England.

Out of the ravages of expansionism and the expected turbulence of a new nation, America again needed to unite around one ideology, to take a hold of some vision of the past for future growth and indivisibility. Benjamin Dwight, writing in 1859, claimed that “in this country especially, our people, language and institutions have been borne through such an unsettled pioneer experience, that a strange unscholarly, if not indeed almost universal, indifference prevails among even our educated men, to exactness and elegance in the niceties of language.” Dwight maintains that the “noble Old English tongue has assumed [...] a distinct American

⁵⁸⁵ Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny*, 177-78.

type,” though, he argues, “that not for the better but for the worse.”⁵⁸⁶ Hence, in order to achieve nationhood, part of the claim was that America would need to rediscover—or invent—a national heritage, dating itself back to the Anglo-Saxon line, and thus rescuing America from “the worse.” Nina Baym explains the idea of New England as a national model so succinctly that it is worth quoting in full. Baym claims that after the war,

the Whig project of installing New England as the original site of the American nation had been designed to unify the unformed and scattered American people under the aegis of New England by creating a national history anchored in that region. Conservative New England leaders knew all too well that the nation was an artifice and that no single national characteristic undergirded it. And they insisted passionately that peace and progress called for a commonality that, if it did not exist, had at once to be invented. By originating American history in New England and proclaiming the carefully edited New England Puritan as the national type, they hoped to create such a commonality, installing in all citizens those traits that they thought necessary for the future: self-reliance, self-control, and acceptance of hierarchy.⁵⁸⁷

The move to continue distinguishing the New England Puritan from the Southern Aristocrat was Saxon in nature. After all, a unique part of the American political-territorial identity found its source in the Anglo-Saxons, and, as we have seen, American Saxonhood’s fundamental drive was the need to imagine the territory as a continuation of the *ethnie*: the dominant group had the historic need to preserve the national future of the ancestral lineage.

⁵⁸⁶ *Modern Philology: Its Discoveries, History, and Influence* (New York: A.S. Barnes and Burr, 1860), 141.

⁵⁸⁷ “Early Histories of American Literature: A Chapter in the Institution of New England, *American Literary History* 1:3 (1989): 460.

The trajectory of America's Saxon identity and its destiny has been discussed in some detail, mostly with emphasis placed on the expansion westward following the Corps of Discovery's trail to the Pacific. Henry Nash Smith's groundbreaking study *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth* (1950) broke the field open to more critical views of literature and history, especially with its focus on myth and symbol in the ideology of westward expansion. Continuing in this area, Richard Slotkin's seminal work on America's westward movement, *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860* (1973), provides an insightful commentary on characteristics of "whiteness" that remain as America becomes "civilized" in the movement west. Studies such as these, which explore ideologies of American expansion and its relation to the national character, opened the door for more extensive discussions of nineteenth-century American movement as it relates to national land consumption and ideological control. However, there still remains interesting work to be done, especially concerning African American writers and nineteenth-century American questions of race as it figures into this equation.

A brief look at Frederick Douglass provides a bit more insight into this notion. To an eighteenth-century rational mind, race would be a category that would defy classification, but in the nineteenth century, race became a fossilized and stagnant atrocity carried forward from a troubled ideology. A close reading of Douglass highlights the troubling effect of race in American Saxonhood. Seeing Jefferson's and Emerson's "Saxon" and the "Norman" antithesis as a misrepresentation of actual human relations, Douglass addressed both the issue of liberty and the meaning of power as he saw them handed down in the American Saxonhood line of reasoning, vehemently asserting that race as a category could not be used for a one-sided argument. In short, Douglass appealed to the very rational thought that promoted American

Saxonhood. Emphatically reviving the old “Norman Yoke” argument in his defense, he developed it into a purely American idea. By claiming black slavery was tantamount to the Norman Yoke, Douglass’s assertion that slavery represented an “American Yoke” was a powerful blow to the American Saxonhood claims of power and control.⁵⁸⁸

Power, Douglass observed—here he envisions power as a mobilizing force, specifically the key to human liberty—was at the heart of every American Saxonhood claim: “the love of power is one of the strongest traits in the Anglo-Saxon race.”⁵⁸⁹ In an address delivered in Canandaigua, New York, on August 2, 1847, Douglass reflects on the binaries of power: “Who were the fathers of our present haughty oppressors in this land? They were, until the last four centuries, the miserable slaves, the degraded serfs, of their Norman oppressors ... regarded as an inferior race.”⁵⁹⁰ The Saxons, Douglass dramatically and somewhat mistakenly asserts, simply had nothing at all—no possessions or rights. Among other things, he claims, the Saxons were not allowed to walk on the same roads as Normans, could not marry without consent of their owners, and had to ask permission to go anywhere. Thus, claims Douglass, under the Normans, they existed in utter subjugation. “The proud Anglo-Saxons,” Douglass argues, “overpowered in war, had their property confiscated by their haughty Norman superiors, and [were] enslaved upon their own sacred soil.”⁵⁹¹ His historical analogy creates a powerful public image of a unique group: the black Saxons. Douglass concludes that, like American black slaves, “[the Saxons] could not hold any property” and “they could not testify in courts of law.”⁵⁹² For Douglass,

⁵⁸⁸ The term is mine, not Douglass’s.

⁵⁸⁹ *The Frederick Douglass Papers, Series One: Speeches, Debates, and Interviews*, 5 vols. John W. Blassingame, ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979) 5:360 (hereafter *FDP*).

⁵⁹⁰ *FDP* 2:73.

⁵⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹² *Ibid.*

American blacks drew a stronger parallel to Saxons, in this case *post* Conquest Saxons, than white Americans did.

In a shocking twist of narrative, Douglass further imagines white Americans as slaves. In his “Lessons of the Hour” in 1894, Douglass claims that the Anglo-Saxons, once slaves of Normans, might even serve as a positive example of a successful struggle for moral and cultural development.⁵⁹³ These were connections Douglass began to make in his public lectures. Following one, an anonymous reviewer wrote that Douglass “reminded us of the degradation of the Anglo-Saxon race in England; under their Norman conquerors; yes of that very race, which boasts itself of superiority to all others.”⁵⁹⁴ Jefferson’s rationalization of American Saxonhood made no sense to Douglass. “This is its logic,” he asserts: “the weak are unable to defend their liberty, therefore their liberty may be taken from them.” Ultimately, Douglass cloaks the Saxon figure in black: “the Normans [were once] superior to the Saxons, and now the Anglo-Saxon is boasting his superiority to the negro and the Irishman.”⁵⁹⁵ Importantly, the “Irishman” here alludes to yet another minority, and Douglass acknowledges the power of the American Saxon argument to subjugate *any* Other, not simply black Americans.

Yet, however much Douglass argues for the parallels of the Anglo-Saxon and black America, there existed something even more sinister to the white population in his rhetoric; this was the frightening bogeyman that haunted Jefferson in his worst racial fears. In an 1849 debate at the American Colonization Society over whether the Constitution was pro-slavery, Douglass inserts himself into the Saxon slot, asking, “Did our Fathers think of holding onto the union with the British? Did they look for theories or precedents to ascertain what were their rights? No!

⁵⁹³ Ibid., 5:640.

⁵⁹⁴ Ibid., 2:131.

⁵⁹⁵ Ibid., 2:488.

They laid down the doctrines of equality, consent, and that resistance to tyrants is obedience to God!”⁵⁹⁶ What Douglass goes on to describe here is a plan to develop a uniquely black Saxon model; there is, he seems to argue, a “Saxon” for *every* race desiring a free and democratic life. Thus, in his counterattack on the *white* Saxon model, Douglass invokes the American heroic strain, which emerged in the years following the Revolution:

Talk to me of the love of liberty of your Washingtons, Jeffersons, Henrys. They were strangers to any just ideas of liberty ... they wrote of Justice and Liberty in the Declaration of Independence with one hand while the other clutched their brother by the throat! ... these are the men who formed the Union! Give me NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS! I wish to dissolve the union of these states, and do it in a direct way.⁵⁹⁷

What Douglass evokes here runs directly against the American Colonization Society’s proposals. In fact, Douglass argues for the opposite: that black Americans should settle on American lands as had the Saxons in Britain, or, more locally, as had the white English in America, could be deemed rightful—and it *should* be so.

Thus did Douglass markedly influence and change the color of American Saxonhood forever, and while Saxon mythology still provided fervent proslavery groups with a vehicle for racist expression, American authors began to gain entry into the ideology’s narrative by defamiliarizing, demystifying, and reenacting these historical sequences in fiction, often in “true” representations, allegories, and sublime uses of the dichotomous categories. Instead of glorifying

⁵⁹⁶ The American Colonization Society was a society established in 1816 by Robert Finley as an attempt to transport free blacks from the United States and settle them in Africa. The society’s aims and goals were far more popular in the North than the South, where southern plantation owners felt they would lose workers. Douglass’s line “resistance to tyrants is obedience to God!” is actually a borrowing of Franklin’s “Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God,” which was published in the *Pennsylvania Evening Post* on December 14, 1775; *FDP* 2:222.

⁵⁹⁷ *FDP* 2:488.

the “Saxon”-“Norman” markers as had Scott, these later American writers disrupted them. Douglass’s scenario—that the blacks have a right to conquer North America as did white Americans—plays out fictively in Lydia Maria Child’s short story “The Black Saxons,” loaded as it is with implications of cultural lineage, problematizing the white reader engaged in the Saxon-Norman debate. Like Douglass, who envisions whites as slaves, Child’s narrative reverses the argument of American Saxonhood. In his reading of the Saxon past, Child’s Duncan character portrays the clash between Norman and Saxon values and the tension involved in historical conquerings. Child’s idea parallels Douglass’s: a satisfactory answer to the question of *who* rightfully settles American lands remains unanswerable.

The use of American Saxonhood in the shaping of American literary culture was evident, then, from the inception of the very “seed” of the Anglo-Saxon germ on North American lands as first put forth in the writings of John Smith and prominent backers of the Virginia Company and its later variant manifestations. Furthered by the New England ecclesiastical chroniclers, the imagined community of American Saxons fought, often successfully, to maintain the purity of the American Saxon. As the ideology became more and more xenophobic, the social construction of American ideology bowed to the mandate of the dominant culture. In terms of race *and* ethnicity, American Saxonhood served as shorthand for membership inclusion in the dominant ethnic group; later, those migrating to the United States in the *fin de siècle* period were exempted from this national mapping as were blacks in America. Douglass was simply archetypal of many later innovative firebrands. Similarly, by infusing “The Black Saxons” with a symbolically disruptive and open frame tale, Child creates, in Umberto Eco’s sense of the term, an “open text,” wherein satisfactory closure does not exist. Other American authors follow Child’s formula into the twentieth century and beyond. As was the case in the nineteenth

century, themes of power struggles between *ethnies*, imagined communities of conqueror and conquered, remain, albeit in variant literary formulas. As nineteenth-century historical texts employed Saxon-Norman dichotomies for nationalistically-driven purposes, twentieth-century authors began to analyze, critique, and disrupt the underlying themes supplanting these formulaic conventions with more exigent and local representations. As such, this literary play figures as a critical referent in modern American texts and, without a doubt, work of nineteenth- and twentieth-century immigrants, as well as those of other minority writers into the twenty-first century. A deeper examination of these, however, is the work of another study yet to come.

LIST OF REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

Adams, John. *The Works of John Adams, Second President of the United States: with a Life of the Author, Notes and Illustrations, by his Grandson Charles Francis Adams*, 10 vols.

Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1856.

Alfred the Great. *The Legal Codes of Alfred the Great*. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1893.

---. "Preface to the Pastoral Care." *A Guide to Old English*. Eds. Bruce Mitchell and Fred C. Robinson. 5th ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Asser's 'Life of King Alfred' and Other Contemporary Sources. Trans. Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge. London: Penguin Classics, 1983.

Bacon, Francis. *The Two Bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the Proficiencie and Advancement of learning, divine and humane*. London, 1605.

Baxter, Richard. *Gildas Salvianus: the first part, ie The reformed pastor; shewing the nature of the pastoral work, especially in private instruction and catechizing*. London, 1656.

Bede. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Trans. Bertram Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

---. *The Historia Regum Britannie of Geoffrey of Monmouth: II. The First Variant Version (A Critical Edition)*. Trans. Neil Wright. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Beowulf. Ed. Friedrich Klaeber. *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*. 3rd edition. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1950.

Best, George. *A true discourse of the late voyages of discoverie for the finding of a passage to Cathaya by the north-weast under the conduct of Martin Frobisher, Generall*. London, 1578.

Blackstone's Commentaries with notes of reference to The Constitution and Laws of the Federal

- Government of the United States and of the Commonwealth of Virginia*. 5 Vols. South Hackensack: Rothman Reprints, 1969.
- Bland, Richard. *An inquiry into the rights of the British colonies, intended as an answer to The regulations lately made concerning the colonies, and the taxes imposed upon them considered. In a letter addressed to the author of that pamphlet*. Virginia, 1766.
- Bradford, William. *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1647*. Ed. Samuel Eliot Morison. New York: Knopf, 1952.
- . *William Bradford: The Collected Verse*. Ed. Michael Runyan. St. Paul: John Colet Press, 1974.
- The Cambrian Journal*. Tenby: R. Mason, 1861.
- Caradoc of Llancarvan. *Historie of Cambria, now called Wales: A Part of the Most Famous Yland of Brytaine, Written in the Brytish Language Above Two Hundreth Yeares Past*. Trans. H. Lloyd. London, 1584.
- Child, Lydia Marie. "The Black Saxons." *A Lydia Maria Child Reader*. Ed. Carolyn L. Karcher. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997. 182-91.
- Clark, George Rogers. George Rogers Papers. Draper Manuscripts. Wisconsin Historical Society. 52 J 93-95.
- Coke, Edward. *The Second Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England*. London: E. & R. Brooke, 1797.
- Day, John. *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*. London, 1566.
- Dee, John. *Diaries of John Dee*. Ed. Edward Fenton. Oxfordshire: Day Books, 2000.
- . *General and rare memorials pertayning to the perfect arte of navigation*. Bodleian Library Oxford, MS Ashmole 1789, fos. 61–115.

---. *General and rare memorials pertayning to the perfect arte of navigation: annexed to the paradoxall cumpas, in playne: now first published: 24 yeres, after the first invention thereof*. Pollard and Redgrave, Short title catalogue. 2nd ed. 6459.

---. *Of famous and rich discoveries*. British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius C.VII, fos. 26–269.

---. *Brytanici Imperii Limites*. British Library, MS Add. 59681.

---. *Thallatokratia Brettaniki*. British Library, MS Harley 249, fos. 95–105.

Demophilus. *The Genuine Principles of the Ancient Saxon, or English Constitution*.

Philadelphia, 1776.

Dickinson, John. *Letter from a Farmer in Pennsylvania, to the Inhabitants of the British Colonies*. “Letter III.” Ed. R.T.H. Housely. New York: Outlook Company, 1903.

Douglass, Frederick. *The Frederick Douglass Papers, Series One: Speeches, Debates, and Interviews*. 5 Vols. Ed. John W. Blassingame. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson: 1824-1838*. 16 Vols. Ed. Ralph H. Orth. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.

The Ferrar Papers. Ed. Bernard Blackstone. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.

The Gentleman’s Magazine; or Monthly Intelligencer 5. London, 1735.

Gildas. *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*. *Gildas: The Ruin of Britain and Other Works*.

Trans. M. Winterbottom. *History from the Sources* 7. Old Woking 1978.

---. *The epistle of Gildas, the most ancient British author who flourished in the yeere of our Lord, 546. And who by his great erudition, sanctitie, and wisdom, acquired the name of sapiens. Faithfully translated out of the originall Latine*. London: T. Cotes, 1638.

---. *Gildas: De Excidio Brittonum*. Trans. John Allan Giles. *Six Old English Chronicles, of which*

two are now first translated from the monkish Latin originals. London, George Bell and Sons, 1891.

Gordon, Thomas. "Discourse II: Upon Tacitus and His Writings, Sect. I. The Character of Tacitus." *The Works of Tacitus. In Four Volumes. To which are prefixed Political Discourses upon that Author. The Second Edition, Corrected.* London: T. Woodward and J. Peele, 1737.

Hakluyt, Richard. *Divers Voyages Touching the Discoverie of America and the Ilands Adjacent unto the Same, Made First of all by our Englishmen and Afterwards by the Frenchmen and Britons.* London, 1582.

---. *Principal Navigations, voyages, traffiques and discoveries of the English nation.* 12 vols. Glasgow: Hakluyt Society, 1903-5.

Hall, Joseph. *The discovery of a new world (Mundus alter et idem).* Trans. John Healey. Ed. Huntington Brown. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937.

Hariot, Thomas. *A brief and true report of the new found land of Virginia: of the Commodities and of the Nature and Manners of the Naturall Inhabitants: Discovered by the English Colony There Seated by Sir Richard Greinuile Knight In the yeere 1585: Which Remained Vnder the Gouvernment of Twelue Monethes, At the Speciall Charge and Direction of the Honourable Sir Walter Raleigh Knight Lord Warden of the Stanneries Who therein Hath Beene Fauoured and Authorised by Her Maiestie and Her Letters Patents.* London, 1590.

Hening's Statutes at Large Being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia from the First Session of the Legislature, in the Year 1619 [to 1791]. 13 Vols. Philadelphia: William Brown, 1823.

Hickes, George. *Linguarum Vett.* Ed. R.C. Alston. Reprint. *English Linguistics 1500–1800*

- London: Menston, 1970.
- Hulme, T.E. *An Historical Essay on the English Constitution*. London, 1771.
- Jefferson, Thomas. *An Essay Towards Facilitating Instruction in the Anglo-Saxon and Modern Dialects of the English Language for the Use of the University of Virginia*. John Trow: New York, 1851.
- . *Notes on the State of Virginia*. London, 1787.
- . *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 36 vols. Eds. Julian P. Boyd et al. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950-.
- . *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*. Eds. Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Bergh. 20 vols. Washington D.C.: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907.
- Letters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition with Related Documents 1783-1854*. Ed. Donald Jackson. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978.
- Lloyd, David. Lloyd, *Legend of Jones*. London. London, 1659.
- Mather, Cotton. *Magnalia Christi Americana; or, The Ecclesiastical History of New England* [1701]. 2 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.
- . *Decennium luctuosum: An history of remarkable occurrences, in the long war, which New-England hath had with the Indian salvages, from the year, 1688. To the year 1698 [Observable Things]*. Boston, 1699.
- . *Eleutheria, or, An idea of the Reformation in England, and a history of non-conformity in and since that Reformation with predictions of a more glorious reformation and revolution at hand, written in the year 1696*. London, 1698.
- . *Manuductio ad ministerium: Directions for a candidate of the ministry : wherein, first, a*

right foundation is laid for his future improvements, and, then, rules are offered for such a management of his academical & preparatory studies, and thereupon for such a conduct after his appearance in the world as may render a skilful and useful minister of the Gospel. Boston, 1726.

---. *Memorable Providences Relating to Witchcrafts and Possessions.* Boston, 1689.

---. *The Negro Christianized: An Essay to Excite and Assist that Good Work, the Instruction of Negro-Servants in Christianity.* Boston, 1706.

---. *Things for a Distress'd People to Think upon.* Boston: B. Green & J. Allen, 1696.

---. *Three letters from New-England, relating to the controversy of the present time by Cotton Mather.* Boston, 1721.

Mather, Increase. *An Earnest Exhortation to the inhabitants of New-England, to hearken to the voice of God in his late and present dispensations as ever they desire to escape another judgement, seven times greater than any thing which as yet hath been.* Boston, 1676.

---. *A sermon wherein is shewed that the church of God is sometimes a subject of great persecution; preached on a publick fast at Boston in New-England: occasioned by the tidings of a great persecution raised against the Protestants in France.* Boston, 1682.

Morley, Henry. *Ideal commonwealths: Plutarch's Lycurgus, More's Utopia, Bacon's New Atlantis, Campanella's City of the sun and a fragment of Hall's Mundus alter et idem.* London, 1885.

Original Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, 1804-1806. Ed. Ruben G. Thwaites. 8 Vols. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1904.

Otis, James. *The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved* (1764). Columbia: University of Missouri Studies, 1929.

- Pagitt, Ephraim. *Christianography, or Discription of the multitude and sundry sorts of Christians in the World, not subject to the Pope*. London, 1674.
- Paine, Thomas. *Thomas Paine: Common Sense and Other Political Writings*. Ed. Nelson F. Adkins. New York: Macmillan, 1953.
- Pamphlets of the American Revolution, 1750-1776*. Vol. I. Ed. Bernard Bailyn. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Penn, William. *The Select Works of William Penn: To which is Prefixed A Journal of His Life*. 8 vols. London, 1835.
- . *Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania; Lately Granted under the Great Seal of England to William Penn, etc. Together with Privileges and powers necessary to the well-governing thereof*. London, 1681.
- . *The Papers of William Penn*. Eds. Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn. 5 vols. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981-87.
- Purchas, Samuel. *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas his Pilgrimes, contayning a History of the World in Sea Voyages and Lande Travells, by Englishmen and others*. London, 1625.
- . *Purchas His Pilgrimage, Or Relations of the World and the Religions Obserued in Al Ages and Places Discouered from the Creation to the Present* (1613). 3rd ed. London: William Stansby for Henry Fetherstone, 1617.
- Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, 1628 – 1686*. 5 Vols in 6. Ed. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff. Boston, 1853.
- Records of the Virginia Company*. 4 Vols. Ed. Susan Myra Kingsbury. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1906-35.
- The Roanoke Voyages, 1584–1590; Documents to Illustrate the English Voyages to North*

- America under the Patent Granted to Walter Raleigh in 1584*. 2 Vols. Ed. David B. Quinn. London: Hakluyt Society, 1955.
- Smith, John. *The Complete Works of Captain John Smith*. 3 vols. Ed. Philip L. Barbour. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.
- . *Travels and Works of Captain John Smith VI: President of Virginia, and Admiral of New England 1580-1631*. Eds. Edward Arber and AG Bradley. 2 vols. Edinburgh: John Grant, 1910.
- Southey, Robert. *Madoc: A Poem in Two Parts*. London, 1807.
- Spelman, Henry. *Henry Spelman Correspondence*. Survey Report no. 345. British Museum. Ms. 34599, f. 29.
- William Strachey, *A Declaration of the State of the Colonie and Affaires in Virginia With the Names of Adventurors, and Summes adventured in that Action By his Majesties Counseil for Virginia*. London, 1620.
- . *Historie of Travell into Virginia Britannia*. London, 1612.
- Tacitus, Cornelius. *The Germania of Tacitus*. Ed. Duane Reed Stuart. New York: Macmillan, 1916.
- Textus Roffensis*. Rochester, Cathedral Library, A. 3. 5.
- Thoyras, de Rapin. *The History of England, as well Ecclesiastical as Civil I*. London, 1728.
- Thwaites, Edward. *Heptateuchus, Liber Job et Evangelium Nicodemi Anglo-Saxonicae*. Oxon.: 1698.
- . *Observations on Anglo-Saxon and Gothic versions of the gospel*. London, 1665.
- Vergil, Polydore. *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil, A.D. 1485-1537*. Trans. Denys Hay. Office of the Royal Historical Society, London, 1950.

- West, Thomas, et al. *A True and Sincere Declaration of the Purpose and Ends of the Plantation Begun in Virginia: of the degrees which it hath receiued; and meanes by which it hath beene aduanced: and the resolution and conclusion of his Maiesties council of that colony, for the constant and patient prosecution thereof, vntill by the mercies of God it shall retribute a fruitful haruest to the kingdome of heauen, and this common-wealth. Sett forth by the authority of the gouernors and councillors established for that plantation.* London, 1610.
- Williams, Roger. *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams.* 7 Vols. Ed. Perry Miller. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963.
- Winthrop, John. *The Journal of John Winthrop, 1630-1649.* Eds. Richard S. Dunn and Laetitia Yeandle. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- . "A Modell of Christian Charity" (1630). *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society.* 3rd series. Vol. 7. Boston, 1838.
- . *Winthrop Papers.* Eds. Allyn B. Forbes et al. 5 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1968.
- "Would Have Kidnapped Penn: Old Letter Indicates That Cotton Mather Wanted to Sell Quakers as Slaves." *The New York Times.* September 4, 1907.
- Virginia Company of London. *Good Newes From Virginia.* London, 1613.
- . *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, 1628 – 1686.* 5 Vols. Ed. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff. Boston, 1853.
- . *The Records of the Virginia Company of London.* 4 Vols. Ed. Susan M. Kingbury. United States: Government Printing Office, 1935.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abrams, Ann Uhry. "The Pocahontas Paradox: Southern Pride, Yankee Voyeurism, Ethnic Identity, or Feminine Heroics." Delivered at the annual meeting of the American Studies Association, Miami, Florida. October 1988.
- Adams, Arlin M. et al., eds. *Nation Dedicated to Religious Liberty: The Constitutional Heritage of the Religion Clauses*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.
- Adams, Eleanor M. *Old English Scholarship in England from 1566-1800. Yale Studies in English*. Vol. 55. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917.
- Alford, Stephen. *Burghley: William Cecil at the Court of Elizabeth I*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Alsop, James D. "Sir Samuel Argall's Family, 1560-1620." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 90.4 (1982): 472-484.
- Ambrose, Stephen E. *Undaunted Courage: Meriwether Lewis, Thomas Jefferson, and the Opening of the American West*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Anderson, Douglas. *William Bradford's Books: Of Plimmoth Plantation and the Printed Word*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
- Andrews, Kenneth R. *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480-1630*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Arch, Stephen. *Authorizing the Past: The Rhetoric of History in Seventeenth-Century New England*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1994.
- Armitage, David. "Making the Empire British: Scotland in the Atlantic World 1542-1707." *Past*

- and Present* 155 (1997): 35-63.
- . "Protestantism and Empire: Hakluyt, Purchas, and Property." *Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Vol. 59. *Ideas in Context*. Ed. Quentin Skinner et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 61-99.
- Aron, Stephen. *American Confluence: The Missouri Frontier from Borderland to Border State*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Bailyn, Bernard. *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1992.
- . *The Peopling of British North America: An Introduction*. New York: Knopf, 1986.
- Balibar, Étienne. "The Nation Form: History and Ideology." *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. Eds. Étienne Balibar and Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein. New York: Verso, 1991. 86-106.
- Bangs, Jeremy D. *Pilgrims in the Netherlands—Recent Research Papers Presented at a Symposium held by The Leiden Pilgrim Documents Center and The Sir Thomas Browne Institute*. Leiden: Leiden Pilgrim Documents Center, 1998.
- Barbour, Philip L. *The Three Worlds of Captain John Smith*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1964.
- Barczewski, Stephanie L. *Myth and National Identity in Nineteenth-Century Britain: The Legends of King Arthur and Robin Hood*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Barthes, Roland. "Myth Today." *A Barthes Reader*. Ed. Susan Sontag. New York: Hill and Wang, 1975.
- Bassett, J.S. "The Relation between the Virginia Planters and the London Merchants." *American Historical Association Report* 1 (1901): 551-75.

- Baucom, Ian. *Out of Place: Englishness, Empire and the Locations of Identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Beatty, Edward Corbyn. *William Penn as Social Philosopher*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1939.
- Bellah, Robert. *The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial*. New York: Seabury, 1975.
- Benson, Larry D. *Malory's Morte Darthur*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The Rites of Assent: Transformations in the Symbolic Construction of America*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Berkhout, Carl T. and Milton McGatch, eds. *Anglo-Saxon Scholarship: The First Three Centuries*. Boston: D.S. Brewer, 1982.
- Berkowitz, David Sandler. *John Selden's Formative Years: Politics and Society in Early Seventeenth-Century England*. Washington: Folger Books, 1988.
- Bernhardt-Kabisch, Ernest. *Robert Southey*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1977.
- Black, Jeremy. *Maps and History: Images of the Past*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Blevins Faery, Rebecca. *Cartographies of Desire: Captivity, Race, and Sex in the Shaping of an American Nation*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.
- Borjas, G.J. "Economic Theory and International Migration." *International Migration Review* 23.3 (1987): 457-85.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Trans. Richard Nice. London: Routledge, 1984.
- . "The Forms of Capital." *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, Ed. John Richardson. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986. 241-58.

- Bowen, Benjamin Franklin. *America Discovered by the Welsh in 1170 A.D.* Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1876.
- Bremer, Francis J. and Lynn A. Botelho, eds. *The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England, 1588-1649.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005.
- Brennan, Gillian E. *Patriotism, Power, and Print: National Consciousness in Tudor England.* Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2003.
- Bross, Kristina. *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons: Praying Indians in Colonial America.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Brown, Alexander. *The Genesis of the United States: A Narrative of the Movement in England.* 2 Vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1890.
- . *English Politics in Early Virginia History.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1901.
- Buck, Janet T. "Pre-Feudal Women." *Journal of Rutgers University Library* 34 (1971) 46-51.
- Bull, Hedley. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics.* New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- Burnham, Michelle. *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861.* Hanover: University Press of New England, 1997.
- Burt, Alvah Walford. *Cushman Genealogy and General History; Including The Descendants of the Fayette County, Pennsylvania, and Monongalia County, Virginia, Families.* Cincinnati, 1942.
- Cannadine, David. "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition,' c. 1820–1977." *The Invention of Tradition.* Eds. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. 101-64.

- Carley, James. "Polydore Vergil and John Leland on King Arthur: The Battle of the Books." *King Arthur: A Casebook*. Ed. Edward Donald Kennedy. New York: Garland, 1996. 185-204.
- Cave, Albert A. "Richard Hakluyt's Savages: The Influence of 16th Century Travel Narratives on English Indian Policy in North America." *International Social Science Review* 60.1 (1985): 3-24.
- Chandler, Alice. *A Dream of Order: The Medieval Ideal in Nineteenth-Century English Literature*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.
- Chaney, William A. "Aethelberht's Code and the King's Number." *American Journal of Legal History* 6 (1962): 161-77.
- Chinard, Gilbert, ed. *The Commonplace Book of Thomas Jefferson: A Repertory of His Ideas on Government*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1926.
- . "Jefferson and Ossian." *Modern Language Notes* 38.4 (1923): 201-5.
- Clement, Richard. "Verstegan's Reinvention of Anglo-Saxon England." *Reinventing the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Constructions of the Medieval and Early Modern Period*. Ed. William F. Gentrup. Brepols: ACMRS, 1998.
- Clulee, Nicholas H. *John Dee's Natural Philosophy: Between Science and Religion*. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Cohen, Matt. "Morton's Maypole and the Indians: Publishing in Early New England." *Book History* 5 (2002): 1-18.
- Colbourn, H. Trevor. "John Dickinson, Historical Revolutionary." *Pennsylvania Magazine* 83.3 (1959): 271-292.
- . *The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American*

- Revolution*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1965.
- Collingwood, R.G. *The Idea of History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Collinson, Patrick. "William Camden and the Anti-Myth of Elizabeth: Setting the Mould?" *The Myth of Elizabeth*. Eds. Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003. 88-92.
- Conforti, Joseph. *Imagining New England: Explorations of Regional Identity from the Pilgrims to the Mid-Twentieth Century*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Connor, Walker. "Beyond Reason: The Nature of the Ethnonational Bond." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16.3 (1993): 374-389.
- . "Homelands in a World of States." *Understanding Nationalism*. Eds. Montserrat Guibernau and John Hutchinson. London: Polity Press, 2001. 53-73.
- Cooper, Harold. "John Donne and Virginia in 1610." *Modern Language Notes* 57 (1942): 661-663.
- Cooper, Helen. "M is for Merlin: The Case of the Winchester Manuscript." *Medieval Heritage: Essays in Honor of Tadahiro Ikegame*. Eds. M. Kanno et al. Tokyo: Yushodo Press, 1997. 93-107.
- Craven, Frank Wesley. *Virginia Company of London, 1606-24*. Williamsburg: Williamsburg 350th Anniversary Celebration Corp., 1957.
- Culliford, S.J. *William Strachey, 1572-1621*. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1965.
- Cummins, John. *Francis Drake: The Lives of a Hero*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Curtis, L.P. *Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of Anti Irish Prejudice in Victorian England*.

- Bridgeport: Conference on British Studies, 1968.
- Dalrymple, Roger, ed. *Middle English Literature: A Guide to Criticism*. Malden: Blackwell, 2004.
- Danisi, Thomas C. and W. Raymond Woods. "Lewis and Clark's Route Map: James MacKay's Map of the Missouri River." *The Western Historical Quarterly* 35.1 (2004): 53-72.
- Davies, Hywel M. *Transatlantic Brethren: Rev. Samuel Jones (1735-1814) and His Friends: Baptists in Wales, Pennsylvania, and Beyond*. Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 1995.
- Deacon, Richard. *Madoc and the Discovery of America: Some New Light on an Old Controversy*. London: Cox & Wyman, 1966.
- Deane, Charles, ed. *A True Relation of Virginia, by Captain John Smith*. Boston, 1866.
- Dekker, Kees. "Pentecost and Linguistic Self-Consciousness in Anglo-Saxon England: Bede and Ælfric." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 104.3 (2005): 345-372.
- Delbanco, Andrew. *The Puritan Ordeal*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- De Prosopo, R.C. "The Patronage of Medievalism in Modern American Historiography." *Medievalism in American Culture: Special Studies*. Eds. Bernard Rosenthal and Paul E. Szarmach. Binghamton: SUNY Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1984. 1-15.
- Dexter, Henry Martyn and Morton Dexter, eds. *The England and Holland of the Pilgrims*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1906.
- Douglass, David. *The Norman Conquest and British Historians*. Glasgow: Jackson & Son, 1946.
- Doyle, Laura. *Freedom's Empire: Race and the Rise of the Novel in Atlantic Modernity, 1640-1940*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.
- Drinker Bowen, Catherine. "Historians Courageous." *Proceedings of the American*

- Philosophical Society* 101.3 (1957): 249-254.
- Dunn, Richard S. "William Penn and the Selling of Pennsylvania, 1681-1685." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 127.5 (1983): 322-29.
- Eckhardt, Caroline D. "Prophecy and Nostalgia: Arthurian Symbolism at the Close of the English Middle Ages." *The Arthurian Tradition*. Eds. Mary Flowers Braswell and John Bugge. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1988. 109-26.
- Éliade, Mircea. *Patterns in Comparative Religions*. Trans. Rosemary Sheed. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1963.
- . *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. Orlando: Harcourt, 1957.
- Escobedo, Andrew. *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Ezell, Margaret J. *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Fischer, David Hackett. *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Fitzmaurice, Andrew. "The Commercial Ideology of Colonization in Jacobean England: Robert Johnson, Giovanni Botero, and the Pursuit of Greatness." *William and Mary Quarterly* 64 (2007): 791–820.
- Foot, Sarah. "The Making of Angelcynn: English Identity before the Norman Conquest." *Old English literature: Critical Essays*. Ed. R.M. Liuzza. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001. 51-78.
- Ford, Worthington Chauncey. *Proceedings*. Massachusetts Historical Society 58 (1924-25): 245-47.

- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1. Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1981.
- Franklin, Caroline. "The Welsh American Dream: Iolo Morganwg, Robert Southey and the Madoc Legend." *English Romanticism and the Celtic World*. Eds. Gerard Carruthers and Alan Rawes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Frantzen, Allen J. *Alfred*. Boston: Twayne, 1986.
- . *Desire for Origins: New Language, Old English, and Teaching the Tradition*. Camden: Rutgers University Press, 1990.
- Frantzen, Allen J. and John D. Niles, eds. *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of National Identity*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1997.
- French, Peter J. *John Dee: The World of an Elizabethan Magus*. London: Routledge & Kegan, 1972.
- Frye, Northrop. *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romances*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*. 10 Vols. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1883.
- Gay, Peter. *A Loss of Mastery: Puritan Historians in Colonial America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Geerken, John H. "Pocock and Machiavelli: Structuralist Explanations in History." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 17 (1979): 309–318.
- Genovese, Elizabeth Fox and Eugene D. Genovese. *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholders' Worldview*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Goodman, Jennifer Robin. *Chivalry and Exploration, 1298–1630*. Cambridge: Boydell and

- Brewer, 1998.
- . "The Captain's Self-Portrait: John Smith as Chivalric Biographer." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 89.1 (1981): 27-38.
- Gosling, William Gilbert. *The Life of Sir Humphrey Gilbert: England's First Empire Builder*. London: Constable, 1911.
- Gould, Philip. "Catharine Sedgwick's 'Recital' of the Pequot War." *American Literature* 66 (1994): 641-62.
- Graham, Timothy, ed. *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2000.
- . "William L'Isle's letters to Sir Robert Cotton." *Early Medieval Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*. Eds. Elaine Traherne and Susan Rosser. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002. 353-80.
- Gransden, Antonia. *Historical Writing in England: c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century*. London: Routledge and Kegan, 1982.
- . *Legends, Traditions, and History in Medieval England*. London: Hamblen Press, 1992.
- Graves, Michael A.R. "Burghley." *Profiles in Power*. Ed. Keith Robbins. New York: Longman, 1998.
- Greenberg, J.H., C.G. Turner II, and S.L. Zegura. "The Settlement of the Americas: A Comparison of the Linguistic, Dental and Genetic Evidence." *Current Anthropology* 27 (1986): 477-497.
- Greene, Jack P. "Obstacles to Enforcing Imperial Policy." *Great Britain and the American Colonies, 1606-1763*. Ed. Jack P. Greene. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970.

- Greenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Greenfield, Stanley B. and Daniel C. Calder, eds. *A New Critical History of Old English Literature*. New York: New York University Press, 1996.
- Gross, Theodore L. *The Heroic Ideal in American Literature*. New York: Free Press, 1971.
- Gunn, Vicky. *Bede's Historia: Genre, Rhetoric and the Construction of the Anglo-Saxon Church History*. Rochester: Boydell and Brewer, 2009.
- Hall, David. D. "On Common Ground: The Coherence of American Puritan Studies." *The William and Mary Quarterly*. Third Series 44.2 (1987): 193-229.
- Hall, J.R. "Mid-Nineteenth Century American Anglo-Saxonism: The Question of Language." *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of Social Identity*. Eds. Allen J. Frantzen and John D. Niles. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1997. 133-56.
- Hanning, Robert W. *Vision of History in Early Britain: From Gildas to Geoffrey of Monmouth*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.
- Harland, Paul W. "Donne and Virginia: The Ideology of Conquest." *John Donne Journal* 18 (1999): 127-52.
- Harris, Stephen J. "The Alfredian 'World History' and Anglo-Saxon Identity." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 100.4 (2001): 482- 510.
- . *Race and Ethnicity in Anglo-Saxon Literature*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Hauer, Stanley R. "Thomas Jefferson and the Anglo-Saxon Language." *PMLA* 98.5 (1983): 879-898.
- Hawes, Clement. *The British Eighteenth Century and Global Critique*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

- Haynes, Alan. *The Elizabethan Secret Services, 1570-1603*. Phoenix Mill: Alan Sutton, 1992.
- Heinowitz, Rebecca Cole. *Spanish America and British Romanticism, 1777-1826: Rewriting Conquest*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Helgerson, Richard. *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992.
- Henneman, John B. *The South and the Building of a Nation*. Vol. 7. Richmond: The Southern Historical Publication Society, 1909. 115-34.
- . "Two Pioneers in the Historical Study of English—Thomas Jefferson and Louis Klipstein," *PMLA* 8 (1893): xliii-xlix.
- Henry, William Wirt. "The First Legislative Assembly in America." *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 2 (1893): 301-16.
- Herrin, Judith. *The Formation of Christendom*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Higham, N.J. *The English Conquest: Gildas and Britain in the Fifth Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.
- Hill, Christopher. *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century*. 2nd ed. New York: St. Martins, 1997.
- Hirschfeld, Heather A. *Joint Enterprises: Collaborative Drama and the Institutionalization of the English Renaissance Theater*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2004.
- Hodgkins, Christopher. *Reforming Empire: Protestant Colonialism and Conscience in British Literature*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002.
- Honeywell, Roy J. *The Educational Work of Thomas Jefferson*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964.
- Hopkins, David Moody. *The Bering Land Bridge*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1967.

- Horsman, Reginald. "Liberty and the Anglo-Saxons." *Race and U.S. Foreign Policy from Colonial Times Through the Age of Jackson*. Vol. 1. *Race and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Colonial Period to the Present: A Collection of Essays*. Ed. E. Nathaniel Gates. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998. 99-120.
- . *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Howard, Alan B. "Art and History in Bradford's *Of Plymouth Plantation*." *The William and Mary Quarterly*. 3rd Series. 28.2 (1971): 237-266.
- Howe, Nicholas. *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Howlett, D.R. *British Books in Biblical Style*. Dublin: Four Courts, 1997.
- Hughes, Richard T. *Myths America Lives By*. Urbana: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Huston, Charles. *An Essay on the History and Nature of Original Titles to Land in the Province and State of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: T. & J.W. Johnson, 1849.
- Ingham, Patricia Clare. "From Kinship to Kingship: Mourning, Gender, and Anglo-Saxon Community." *Grief and Gender: 700–1700*. Eds. Jennifer C. Vaught and Lynne Dickson Bruckner. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003. 17-32.
- Innes, Stephen. *Creating the Commonwealth: The Economic Culture of Puritan New England*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1995.
- Johnson, Stanley. "John Donne and the Virginia Company." *English Literary History* 14.2 (1947): 127-38.
- Jones, J.R. "A Representative of the Alternative Society of Restoration England?" *The World of William Penn*. Eds. R.S. Dunn and M. Maples Dunn. Philadelphia: University of

- Pennsylvania Press, 1986.
- Jordan, John W. *A History of Delaware County, Pennsylvania, and its People*. 2 Vols. New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1914.
- Kawashima, Yasu. "Origins of Indian Reservations in Massachusetts," *Race Relations in British North America, 1607-1783*. Eds. Bruce A. Glasrud and Alan M. Smith. Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1982.
- Kemp, John. *Governor William Bradford's Letter Book*. Bedford: Applewood, 2002.
- Kendall, Calvin B. *Bede: On Genesis*. Translated Texts for Historians. Vol. 48. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008.
- Keynes, Simon. "Royal Government and the Written Word in late Anglo-Saxon England." *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe*. Ed. Rosimond McKitterick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 226-57.
- Knight, Stephen. *Arthurian Literature and Society*. London: Macmillan, 1983.
- Kolodny, Annette. *The Land Before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers, 1630-1860*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Krenn, Michael L. *Colonial Times Through the Age of Jackson*. Garland: New York, 1998.
- Kumar, Krishan. *The Making of English National Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Kupperman, Karen Ordahl. *Roanoke: The Abandoned Colony*. Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield, 1984.
- Laurence, Anne. "The Cradle to the Grave: English Observations of Irish Social Customs in the Seventeenth. Century." *Seventeenth Century* 3.1 (1988): 63-84.
- Lemay, Leo. *Did Pocahontas Save Captain John Smith?* Athens: The University of Georgia

- Press, 1992.
- Levin, David. *Cotton Mather: The Young Life of the Lord's Remembrancer 1663-1703*.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Levine, Joseph M. *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern Historiography*. Ithaca: Cornell
University Press, 1987.
- Levy, Barry. *Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware Valley,
1650-1780*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Lewis, Bernard. *History: Remembered, Recovered, Invented*. Princeton: Princeton University
Press, 1975.
- Lincoln, Bruce. *Theorizing Myth: Narrative, Ideology, and Scholarship*. Chicago: University of
Chicago Press, 1999.
- Linderski, Jerzy. "Alfred the Great and the Tradition of Ancient Geography." *Speculum* 39.3
(1964): 434-439.
- Loades, David. *The Cecils: Privilege and Power Behind the Throne*. Kew: National Archives,
2007.
- . "The Press under the Early Tudors." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*.
4 (1964-68): 29-50.
- Lockyer, Roger. *Tudor and Stuart Britain 1485-1714*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh Gate: Longman, 2005.
- Lorant, Stefan, ed. *The New World: The First Pictures of America*. New York: Duell, Sloan &
Pearce, 1946.
- Loughran, Trish. *The Republic in Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. Nation Building, 1770-
1870*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Luecke, Janemarie. "'Wulf and Eadwacer': Hints for Reading from *Beowulf* and

- Anthropology.” *The Old English Elegies: New Essays in Criticism and Research*. Ed. Martin Green. London: Rutherford, 1983. 190-203.
- Lutz, Angelika. “The Study of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in the Seventeenth Century and the Establishment of Old English Studies in Universities.” *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Ed. Timothy Graham. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2000. 1-82.
- MacDougall, Hugh A. *Racial Myth in English History: Trojans, Teutons, and Anglo-Saxons*. Montreal: Harvest House, 1982.
- MacIntyre, Alisdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1984.
- . *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* London: Duckworth, 1988.
- Malcolm, Noel. “Hobbes, Sandys, and the Virginia Company.” *Aspects of Hobbes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002. 53-79.
- Malone, Dumas. *Jefferson in His Time*. 6 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, 1948-81.
- Mancall, Peter. *Hakluyt’s Promise: An Elizabethan’s Obsession for an English America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Mansfield, Harvey C. “Reply to Pocock.” *Political Theory* 3.4 (1975): 402-405.
- Marcus, G.J. *A Naval History of England: Volume 1, The Formative Centuries*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1961.
- Mardsen, George M. “Perry Miller’s Rehabilitation of the Puritans: A Critique.” *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 39:0101 (1970): 91-105.
- Masten, Jeffrey. “Pressing Subjects; Or, the Secret Lives of Shakespeare’s Compositors.”

- Language Machines: Technologies of Literary and Cultural Production*. Eds. Jeffrey Masten, Peter Stallybrass, and Nancy J. Vickers. New York: Routledge, 1997. 75–106.
- Mayer, David N. *The Constitutional Thought of Thomas Jefferson*. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1994.
- McGiffert, Michael. “Grace and Works: The Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism.” *Harvard Theological Review* 75.4 (1982): 463-502.
- McKisack, Mary. *Medieval History in the Tudor Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Mackenthun, Gesa. “Books for Empire: The Colonial Program of Richard Hakluyt,” *Metaphors of Dispossession: American Beginnings and the Translation of Empire, 1492-1637*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997. 22-70.
- Mead, Sidney. *The Nation with the Soul of a Church*. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.
- Meinecke, Friedrich. *Historicism: The Rise of a New Historical Outlook*. Trans. J. E. Anderson. London: Herder and Herder, 1972.
- Mellor, Ronald. *The Roman Historians*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Middlekauff, Robert. *The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596-1728*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Miller, Perry. *Errand into the Wilderness*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- . *Nature's Nation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- . *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts, 1630-1650*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933.
- . *The Price of Redemption: The Spiritual Economy of Puritan New England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- Moore, James. “A Comment on Pocock.” *Theories of Property: Aristotle to the Present*.

- Eds. Anthony Parel and Thomas Flanagan. Waterloo: Ontario, 1979.
- Moorish, Jennifer. "Dated and Datable Manuscripts Copied in England during the Ninth Century: A Preliminary List." *Mediaeval Studies* 50 (1988): 512-38.
- Moreland, Kim. *The Medievalist Impulse in American Literature: Twain, Adams, Fitzgerald, and Hemingway*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1996.
- Morgan, Edmund S. *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1958.
- Morison, Samuel Eliot, ed. *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1447*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.
- Morris, John. *The Age of Arthur*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1973.
- Murdock, Kenneth. *Literature and Theology in Colonial New England*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Murphy, Michael. "Edward Thwaites, Pioneer Teacher of Old English." *Durham University Journal* 7 (1981):153-59.
- Myers, Albert Cook. *William Penn's Own Account of the Lenni Lenape or Delaware Indians*. Somerset: Middle Atlantic Press, 1970.
- Nelson, Dana D. *Black and White: Reading "Race" in American Literature, 1638-1867*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- O'Brien, Michael. *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810-1860*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- O' Sullivan, Thomas D. *The De Excidio of Gildas: Its Authenticity and Date*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Olsen, Viggo Nørskov. *John Foxe and the Elizabethan Church*. Berkeley: University of

- California Press, 1973.
- Parks, G. B. *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages*. 2nd ed. New York: Ungar, 1961.
- Parrington, Vernon L. *Main Currents in American Thought, vol. 1: The Colonial Mind, 1620-1800*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1927.
- Parry, Graham. *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Parry, John Horace. *The Age of Reconnaissance: Discovery, Exploration and Settlement, 1450-1650*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Pearce, Roy Harvey. *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965.
- Pestana, Carla Gardina. *Quakers and Baptists in Colonial Massachusetts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Peterson, Mark A. *The Price of Redemption: The Spiritual Economy of Puritan New England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Plomer, H.R. "The Eliot's Court Printing House, 1584-1674." *The Library* 1921 s4-II (3): 175-184.
- Plooij, Daniel. *The Pilgrim Fathers from a Dutch Point of View*. New York: The New York University Press, 1932.
- Pochoda, Elizabeth T. *Arthurian Propaganda Le Morte Darthur as an Historical Ideal of Life*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1971.
- Pocock, J.G.A. *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- . *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican*

- Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- Powicke, F. J. Levy. "The Making of Camden's *Brittania*." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 26 (1964): 70-98.
- Quinn, David B. *England and the Discovery of America, 1481-1620, from the Bristol Voyages of the Fifteenth Century to the Pilgrim Settlement at Plymouth: The Exploration, Exploitation, and Trial-and-Error Colonization of North America by the English*. New York: Knopf, 1974.
- . *Set Fair for Roanoke: Voyages and Colonies, 1584-1606*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.
- Quinn, David B. and Alison M. Quinn, eds. *The English New England Voyages, 1602-1608*. London: Hakluyt Society, 1983.
- Rawson, Elizabeth. *The Spartan Tradition in European Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Ray, Roger. "Historiography." *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*. Eds. Frank Anthony Carl Mantello and A. G. Rigg. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996. 639-49.
- Read, David. *New World, Known World: Shaping Knowledge in Early Anglo-American Writing*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005.
- Reynolds, Susan. "What Do We Mean by 'Anglo-Saxon' and Anglo-Saxons'?" *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985): 395-414.
- Richardson, John, ed. "The Forms of Capital," *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.
- Richardson, Kimball G. Everingham. *Magna Charta Ancestry: A Study in Colonial and*

- Medieval Families*, Genealogical Publishing Co., 2005.
- Rives, J.B. *Tacitus' Germania*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Rokkan, Elizabeth. "America as Idea and Reality in the Context of Welsh Settlement." *American Studies in Scandinavia* 19 (1987): 85-91.
- Rollason, David. *Northumbria, 500–1100: Creation and Destruction of a Kingdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Ronda, James P. *Lewis and Clark among the Indians*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.
- Roper, L.H. *The English Empire in America, 1602-1658: Beyond Jamestown*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009.
- Rountree, Helen C. *Pocahontas's People: The Powhatan Indians of Virginia through Four Centuries*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990.
- Rowse, Alfred Leslie. *The England of Elizabeth*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950.
- Rutman, Darrett B. "The Pilgrims and Their Harbor." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser. 17.2 (1960): 164-182.
- Salmon, David. "The Quakers of Pembrokeshire." *Historical Society of West Wales Transactions* 9 Ed. Francis Green. Carmarthen: Spurrell, 1923. 1-32.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Trans. Wade Baskin. New York: McGraw Hill, 1976.
- Sawyer, P.H. *From Roman Britain to Norman England*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1979.
- Schrader, Richard J. *God's Handiwork: Images of Women in Early Germanic Literature*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1983.
- Schwytzer, Philip. *Literature, Nationalism and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales*.

- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Seton-Watson, Hugh. *Nations and States*. London: Methuen, 1977.
- Shalhope, Robert E. "Toward a Republican Synthesis: The Emergence of an Understanding of Republicanism in American Historiography." *William and Mary Quarterly* 29.1 (1972): 49-80.
- Sheavyn, Phoebe. *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969.
- Sheppard, Alice. *Families of the King: Writing Identity in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Sherman, William Howard. *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995.
- Silverman, Kenneth. *The Life and Times of Cotton Mather*. New York: Harper and Row, 1984.
- Simmons, Clare A. *Reversing the Conquest: History and Myth in Nineteenth-Century British Literature*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990.
- Sisam, Kenneth. "Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 39 (1953): 287-348.
- Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration Through Violence: the Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*. Wesleyan University Press, 1973.
- Smith, A.D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- . *The Ethnic Revival in the Modern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- . *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- . *Theories of Nationalism*. London: Duckworth and Company, Ltd., 1971.

- Smith, Bradford. *Captain John Smith: His Life and Legend*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1953.
- Stafford, Pauline. *Queen Emma and Queen Edith: Queenship and Women's Power in Eleventh-Century England*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
- Stannard, David. *American Holocaust: Conquest of the Americas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Stephens, Thomas. *Madoc: An Essay on the Discovery of America by Madoc Ap Owen Gwynedd in the Twelfth Century*. 3rd ed. London: Longman, 1983.
- Stevens, Laura M. *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Stievermann, Jan. "Writing 'To Conquer All Things': Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana* and the Quandary of Copia." *Early American Literature* 39:2 (2004): 263-97.
- Stringer, Keith. "Social and Political Communities in European History: Some Reflections on Recent Studies," *Nations, Nationalism, and Patriotism in the European Past*. Copenhagen: Academic Press, 1994. 1-24.
- Strong, Pauline Turner. *Captive Selves Captivating Others: The Politics And Poetics Of Colonial American Captivity Narratives*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1999.
- Stymeist, David. "'Strange Wives': Pocahontas in Early Modern Colonial Advertisement." *Mosaic* 35 (2002): 109-25.
- Tarleton, Charles D. "Historicity, Meaning, and Revisionism in the Study of Political Thought." *History and Theory* XII (1973): 307-28.
- Taylor, Alan. *American Colonies: The Settling of North America*. New York: Penguin Putnam, 2002.
- Trevelyan, Raleigh. *Sir Walter Raleigh*. London: Allen Lane, 2002.

- Trumpener, Katie. *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- VanDerBeets, Richard, ed. *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642-1836*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1973.
- Vaughan, Alden T. "John Smith Satirized: The Legend of Captaine Iones." *The William and Mary Quarterly*. 3rd Series, 45.4 (1988): 712-732.
- . *Transatlantic Encounters: American Indians in Britain, 1500-1776*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Voigt, Lisa. *Writing Captivity in the Early Modern Atlantic: Circulation of Knowledge and Authority in the Iberian and English Imperial Worlds*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.
- Wallace, Anthony. F. C. *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Walters, H.B. *The English Antiquaries of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries*. Primrose Hill: London, 1934.
- Watson, Ritchie Devon. *Normans and Saxons: Southern Race Mythology and the Intellectual History of the American Civil War*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008.
- . *Yeoman Versus Cavalier: The Old Southwest's Fictional Road to Rebellion*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993.
- White, Dana D. *The Word in Black and White: Reading "Race" in American Literature, 1638-1867*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- William, David. "John Evans' Strange Journey: Part I. The Welsh Indians." *The American Historical Review* 54.2 (1949): 277-295.

- Williams, Gwyn. *Madoc: The Making of a Myth*. London: Methuen, 1979.
- . *The Search for Beulah Land: The Welsh and the Atlantic Revolution*. London: Croom Helm Ltd., 1980.
- . "Welsh Indians: The Madoc Legend and the First Welsh Radicalism Welsh Indians: The Madoc Legend and the First Welsh Radicalism." *History Workshop* 1.1 (1976): 136-54.
- Williams, Selma R. *Kings, Commoners and Colonists: Puritan Politics in Old New England, 1603-1660*. New York: Atheneum, 1974.
- Winn, Neil. *Neo-Medievalism and Civil Wars*. London: World Bank, 1998.
- Wood, Gordon. *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969.
- Wormald, Patrick. "'inter cetera bona ... genti suai': Law Making and peace Keeping in the Earliest English Kingdoms." *Settimane de studio del centro italiano de studi sull'alto medioevo* 42 (1995): 963-93.
- . "Lex Scripta and Verbum Regis: Legislation and German Kingship, from Euric to Cnut." *Early Medieval Kingship*. Eds. P.H. Sawyer and I.N. Wood. Leeds: The School of History, 1977.
- Woudhuysen, H.R. *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Wright, C.D. "'Insulae Gentium': Biblical Influence on Old English Poetic Vocabulary." *Magister Regis: Studies in Honor of R. E. Kaske*. Eds. Arthur Groos, et al. New York: Fordham University Press, 1986.
- Wright, Thomas Goddard. *Literary Culture in Early New England, 1620-1730*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1920.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *The Shaping of Southern Culture Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1880s*.

Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Yates, Frances A. *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*. London: Routledge,

1975.

Young, Robert. *The Idea of English Ethnicity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

VITA

Michael Modarelli holds a bachelors degree in English from The University of Akron and a masters degree in English from Kent State University. He completed his Ph.D. in English at The University of Tennessee in 2011 and is currently Visiting Assistant Professor of English at Walsh University in North Canton, Ohio.