Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects

Spring 5-2017

Contested Spaces: Spatial Discourses and the Struggle for Power in the Early Modern English Empire

Emily O'Hara
Syracuse University

Recommended Citation

CONTESTED SPACES: SPATIAL DISCOURSES AND THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER IN
THE EARLY MODERN ENGLISH EMPIRE

A Capstone Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of the Renée Crown University Honors Program at
Syracuse University

Emily O'Hara

Candidate for Bachelor of Arts
and Renée Crown University Honors
Spring 2017

Honors Capstone Project in English and Textual Studies

Capstone Project Advisor: _____
　　　　　　　　　　Patricia Roylance, Professor of English

Capstone Project Reader: _____
Scott Stevens, Professor of Native American Studies

Honors Director: _____
　　　　　　　　　　Chris Johnson, Interim Director

Abstract

This project examines how early modern English spatial discourses can be used to understand power relations at the beginning of American colonization. Through analyzing John Smith's *A True Relation*, Smith's *Generall Historie of Virginia*, Ralph Hamor's *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia*, and William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, I argue that, despite English attempts to highlight their abilities to exert absolute control over peripheral spaces, English writers ultimately reveal within their texts that the English are unable to definitively control spaces throughout the empire. These spaces include peripheral regions far from English centers of imperial control and regions closer to and even within the imperial center of London.

My Introduction explains how early modern English spatial ideologies affect contemporary territorial disputes between Euro-Americans and Native Americans within North America. English spatial discourses, mirroring other conquest rhetoric such as the fifteenth-century Doctrine of Discovery that are still cited in current U.S. court decisions, make confident proclamations about Europeans' immediate and complete control over American territories they "discover." However, by demystifying the perception that Englishmen had absolute power to control peripheral American spaces at the beginning of colonization, readers will better understand the realities of the contested spaces that formed in the seventeenth century, continued for hundreds of years, and remain today.

In Chapter One, I analyze visual and verbal maps in English colonial travel documentation in order to prove that the English did not have definitive control over the Chesapeake space. Representing claims of power in a presumably accurate and authentic form by verbally and visually mapping the geographical features, natural resources, and communities within the Virginia territory, John Smith and Ralph Hamor suggest that autonomous commercial mobility, permanent settlement, and cultural unity can result in definitive English control over the region. However, as I argue, contradicting textual representations of space in these maps actually undermine the writers' claims of authentic, definitive English power within Virginia as the writers tacitly acknowledge a reliance on indigenous spatial knowledge, a dependence on indigenous aid, and indigenous cultural understandings of land use.

In Chapter Two, I analyze William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* as a way to comprehend how early modern English viewers would have understood the power relationships that characterized peripheral spaces at a time of imperial expansion. Prospero, who can tenuously be read as a European ruler in a foreign region, experiences many difficulties obtaining direct control over all island spaces, including the areas both far from and close to his residence. The island space, free from European institutions that enforce traditional power structures and social norms, enables unruly characters on the island to dream about new societies and plot acts that subvert traditional forms of hegemonic power. Anxieties related to the dismantling of traditional power structures and social norms represented within *The Tempest* would have likely echoed anxieties felt by an English audience that faced similar situations of change, fluidity, and instability within London itself. The play's references to and stagings of space suggest that Englishmen could not maintain absolute control over peripheral regions of the empire or the areas occupied closer to home. My analysis of these texts will indicate the fictitious nature of European conquest ideologies and claims of spatial control, showing that their continued use in disenfranchising Native Americans today is misguided and inappropriate.

Executive Summary

In the early seventeenth century, Englishmen traveled to America in order to explore, find profitable natural resources, and settle in the new land. Difficulties arose in the Jamestown settlement as settlers rebelled against colonial officials and confrontations occurred between the English and surrounding indigenous communities. In order to deemphasize the issues settlers were having, English writers attempted to represent spaces in ways that highlighted the English ability to maintain control over American regions that were thousands of miles away from the English nation. By emphasizing English spatial control around Jamestown, the English government could ensure that investors and settlers would continue to show interest in and move to the Virginia region, allowing the colonial developments to continue. In this project, I reflect upon how Englishmen would have comprehended the changing composition of power relations in peripheral and metropolitan spaces at the time when the English empire was beginning to expand.

One way in which the English could assert claims of power over colonial spaces was by mapping the Chesapeake region. Two colonial writers, Ralph Hamor and John Smith, depict the Virginia landscape verbally and visually by portraying geographic features, English settlements, indigenous settlements, and natural resources in their cartographic map and verbal mapping passages found in travel documentation. John Smith's visual map, "A Map of Virginia," clearly emphasizes the English ability to discover the vast areas of the Chesapeake space. Writing the information in this form, Smith conveys the idea that Englishmen were able to easily move through the space in order to explore and gain knowledge. The depiction of Jamestown on Smith's visual map also indicates that the English were able to establish permanent settlements in the region without any trouble. Contrastingly, indigenous settlements are depicted as being

small and fragmented, suggesting that indigenous communities could not threaten colonial

projects occurring in the large area that was under English control. Coming in the form of maps,

the two writers' observations appear authentic, accurate and objective, allowing potential English

investors and settlers to believe that the English could maintain absolute power over peripheral

spaces.

In the beginning of the seventeenth century, global influences were also starting to impact

the lives of Englishmen at the center of the empire in London. Anxieties about maintaining pure

English lifestyles at home and abroad increased as boundaries between peripheral and central

spaces of the expanding empire faded. Not only did Englishmen move to peripheral spaces far

from London, but people from foreign regions also moved into the center of the empire. London

became an increasingly disorienting space as traditional English power structures and social

norms became harder to maintain in a city that was influenced by goods and people from foreign

regions. Such anxieties could be relieved through plays such as William Shakespeare's *The

Tempest* at the Blackfriars Theater in London. While the European character, Prospero, has

trouble maintaining social order and traditional power structures in spaces far from and close to

his satellite center of European control on the island, he is ultimately able to foil the plots of

unruly characters who attempt to frustrate the status quo. An early seventeenth-century

performance of *The Tempest* might have assured audiences that power could be definitively

maintained throughout an empire.

These works suggest that the English had the power needed to definitively control all

regions throughout an empire, including spaces in England and in peripheral spaces, such as

America. As a result of English texts that promoted this perception, there was, and still is, a

notion that Englishmen had the right to conquer and control American lands. The texts suggest

that this absolute right to rule was automatically fulfilled. As soon as the English arrived on American soil, they were able to overcome obstacles, claim lands, and conquer indigenous people. These perceptions play a role in contemporary perceptions about space and control in the United States.

European conquest ideologies impact spatial disputes that occur today between the United States and Native American governments. U.S. courts have continuously demonstrated a tendency to rely on conquest ideologies when ruling on such spatial disputes by citing ancient European doctrines that ascribe to these ideals. These contemporary decisions, relying on outdated perceptions of absolute European power, have contributed to the ongoing denial of Native American rights to control their sovereign spaces.

As this project will discuss, European expressions of spatial control were always limited by the awareness of their fictionality. English power was not definitively established during the time of colonization. The problem with this perception is that by identifying English and indigenous spaces and power relations as already fixed and controlled by the English at the beginning of colonization, readers are unable to understand the complexities of indigenous and English spaces and cultural dynamics within Virginia in the early seventeenth century. The struggle for power within America continued for hundreds of years and still continues today, as the concepts of space and power are still incredibly relevant to debates over reservations and territorial sovereignty.

Writers at the beginning of English colonization may have emphasized and projected ideas of grand English power and control. Yet the kind of territorial claims writers made were always fictitious. Spatial representations found in maps and performances that asserted claims of absolute English control represented desires rather than realities. Power relations in American

spaces were much more complex than is suggested in colonial discourses, and the English were not able to control or live in foreign spaces free of difficulty. Although not clearly emphasized, these English struggles are often intimated in early modern texts and performances that reference contestations over space and power. In the two chapters of this project, I argue that John Smith's *A True Relation*, Smith's *Generall Historie of Virginia*, Ralph Hamor's *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia*, and William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, attempt to reduce English anxieties about imperial expansion, emphasize the benefits of colonization, and highlight the English ability to definitively control regions on the edges of the empire. Yet, in these texts, there are also instances in which the writers highlight the English inability to control both peripheral spaces far from English centers of imperial control and even spaces closer to the empire's center, ultimately suggesting that imperial spaces can never be controlled in absolute terms.

In my first chapter, I argue that the early modern English writers John Smith and Ralph Hamor use mapping strategies in an attempt to claim English power within Virginia. Provided in a map form, the information within these texts is presumed to be authentic, as maps are considered to be accurate portrayals of specific spaces. By verbally and visually mapping the geographical features, natural resources, and communities within the Virginia territory, Smith and Hamor attempt to portray the colonial space in ways that suggest that autonomous commercial mobility, permanent settlement, and cultural unity can result in definitive English control over the region. Yet colonial spatial discourses found in Smith and Hamor's mapping passages reveal contradictory textual representations of space that appear to actually undermine the writers' claims of authentic, definitive English power within Virginia, as the writers tacitly

acknowledge a reliance on indigenous spatial knowledge, a dependence on indigenous aid, and indigenous cultural understandings of land use.

In my second chapter, I analyze the spatial discourses found within Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and the staging of the play at the Blackfriars Theater in order to understand how an English audience's anxieties about space and power would have been heightened and relieved as the European character Prospero attempts to control unruly characters on the island. In a peripheral space free from institutions that enforce social norms and traditional power structures, mutinous plots against leaders and dreams of new societies are able to form. As a result of his inability to monitor the boundaries between his residence and other parts of the island, Prospero has trouble not only controlling regions far from his home but also the area directly surrounding his cell. Sitting in a London playhouse, an audience would have likely related the concepts of space and power presented in the play to issues regarding space and power prevalent in discourses of the expanding imperial nation in the early seventeenth century. The play's references to and stagings of social disorder in the island space mirror incidences of social disorder that were occurring in peripheral and central spaces of the English empire. Such representations would likely suggest to an early modern English audience that English power is difficult to definitively maintain not only in regions far from established institutions that enforce European rules, but also within those spaces in which European norms and traditional power structures supposedly reside.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank the Renée Crown University Honors Program for giving me the opportunity to grow and develop as an intellectual. Creating this project has allowed me to learn so much about myself, and I am grateful that I have been able to do extensive independent research on a topic of my choice as an undergraduate here at Syracuse University. I am extremely proud of the work and progress that I have completed, and I couldn't have done any of it without the opportunities afforded to me by the Honors Program. Thank you.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Stevens who advised me as I developed the first chapter of this project. I thoroughly enjoyed our weekly Wednesday morning meetings where we would chat about my project and life in general. His expertise, insight and guidance helped me to challenge myself and my thoughts in order to create a strong thesis. His genuine support enabled me to believe in myself even when I felt discouraged. I am extremely grateful for his encouragement.

I would like to thank Professor Roylance. Not only has she been my Capstone advisor for the past two years, but she has also been my English and Textual Studies academic advisor since I declared my major as a sophomore. I am so grateful that she has provided me with academic, professional, and Capstone-related advice. As my Capstone advisor, she has devoted large portions of her time to helping me develop and perfect my ideas. I could not have asked for a better mentor to support and inspire me throughout this process. Her knowledge, insight, and encouragement have allowed me to become a better researcher, writer, and critical thinker. I have greatly enjoyed being a student in her classes and having my thoughts and writings challenged in order for them to be the best they could be. She has helped me to create a work that I will be proud of for many years to come, and for that, I cannot thank her enough.

Lastly, I would like to thank my loved ones, my family and friends, who have supported me throughout this crazy journey. Thank you for sticking by my side even when I barricaded myself in my room for hours at a time to complete research and writing. You always believed in me and my ability to create and finish this project, even when I had my doubts. For that, I am truly grateful. I love you all, and I could not ask for a better support system to help me balance my rigorous academic workload and social life.

Advice to Future Honors Students

  I was sitting with my mom on campus a week ago when she came to visit, and we started talking about the progress I had made on my Capstone project. When it came up in conversation, she asked me, "If you had to go back and do it all over again, would you still choose to do it, knowing what you know now?" I took a minute to think before responding. I thought about the long hours of researching, the disheartening writing blocks, and the frustrating moments of uncertainty. I also thought about the light at the end of the tunnel. I could see it. I was so close to finishing this project that I was so proud of. 27,838 words, 92 pages, two years, one Capstone. I looked at my mom after a moment of contemplation, and I told her, "Yes." If I had to do it all over again, I would.

  My advice to future honors student is this: keep going. There will be times when you want to quit. There will be times when your ideas are not fully developed. You will think you don't know what you are doing. Use these times to research and explore your options. Keep going.

  Ask for advice. Your advisor is there to challenge your thoughts, help you make intellectual progress, and support you when you are feeling discouraged. Don't be afraid to reach out for help.

  Remember that this project is yours alone. Be bold. Don't be afraid to research more, further your ideas, or revise your thesis. Stay true to yourself, and be assertive. Come graduation, you will be so proud of all that you have accomplished.

  Do something related to your project every day. This was the best technical advice that I received, and I will remember it forever. Whether it is reading more research, writing a paragraph, checking to make sure your quotes are correct, or editing your works cited, make sure you are working on your project a little each day. Developing a Capstone can be overwhelming, but by working on even the slightest detail daily, you can check tasks off of your to-do-list, and you will feel better.

  Lastly, and most importantly, enjoy. This may be the last time many of us will ever get to do independent research on a topic of our own interest. Revel in the moment. Be proud of the fact that you are doing this work as an undergraduate. Be thankful that you have the opportunity to grow and develop personally and intellectually by going through this process. You will learn so much about yourself by the end of your project. You will not regret the time you have dedicated to making it the best it can be.

Introduction

In the fall of 2016, thousands of people arrived at the Standing Rock reservation in order to protest the building of the Dakota Access Pipeline. The pan-Indian movement, one of the largest in United States history, gained the attention of environmental activists and the U.S. media as protestors argued that routing the $3.8 billion pipeline beneath Lake Oahe, a water reservoir located adjacent to the Standing Rock reservation, could pollute the tribe's main water supply (Holland and Volcovici). While the Standing Rock tribe, part of the Sioux nation, is attempting to preserve sacred burial sites that would be disturbed by the construction of the pipeline, the Native American community has also asserted its territorial sovereignty, or rights to maintain control over its space. The conflict between the Standing Rock tribe and the U.S. government has occurred, in part, because the two governments have competing visions of spatial sovereignty. While the United States has asserted that Native American communities have the right to control the regions that are defined by reservation borders, the Standing Rock tribe asserts that their rightful space extends beyond the edges of the reservation and is defined by natural features such as water sources. From this indigenous perspective, territorial sovereignty includes the right and ability of Native American communities to control not only the resources on their reservations but also the quality of resources that enter their reservations. The Standing Rock tribe's ability to maintain sovereign control over its territory could be undermined as the rerouting of the Dakota Access Pipeline has the potential to affect the quality of life within the community's space. The threat of pollution to the tribe's main water source endangers the health and safety of thousands of individuals.

While the protests at Standing Rock caused the United States Army Corps of Engineers to halt the construction of the pipeline at the end of 2016, until an in-depth environmental

assessment could be completed, an executive order from the President of the United States can impact the type of future assessment performed. On January 24th, 2017, President Donald Trump signed an executive order stating that any review of environmental factors associated with the building of the Dakota Access Pipeline should be completed in an expedient manner (Jones, Diamond and Krieg). As the construction company needs legal permission from the Army Corps to start construction on the pipeline in this region, a swift assessment would allow for the project to be completed more quickly.

Throughout the history of the United States, contestations over territory and the power to control territorial resources have been fought through the U.S. court system. Due to President Trump's recent executive order, it is hypothesized that this specific spatial conflict, too, will be resolved in court as "Native American tribes" have "vowed to fight the decisions through legal action" (Holland and Volcovici). U.S. courts have continuously demonstrated a tendency to rely on conquest ideologies when ruling on spatial disputes that occur between the United States government and Native American tribes. These ideologies stress Europeans' immediate and direct control over the spaces they "discovered."

However, as this project will discuss, European expressions of spatial control were always limited by the awareness of their own fictionality. The fifteenth-century Doctrine of Discovery and seventeenth-century English travel documentation articulated illusory expressions of dominance over the American space. Current court decisions that cite fictitious conquest rhetoric are undermined by the reality of spatial disputes and the complex struggles for power between Native Americans and Euro-Americans which continued throughout the colonial period and still continue today. In early modern England, discourses referring to contested peripheral spaces exaggerated claims of English power in numerous ways, including through cartographic

colonial travel documentation and representations of space on the London stage. By analyzing mapping strategies in English depictions of colonial Virginia and the role space plays in performances of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, I seek to demonstrate that early modern Englishmen had definitive control over neither spaces on the periphery of the empire nor spaces within the imperial center.

The Dakota Access Pipeline conflict is thus only the most recent spatial dispute between Native American and Euro-American communities. If the Standing Rock tribe attempts to seek relief through the U.S. court system, it is likely that a decision would mirror similar previous rulings. The most prominent recent case was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in 2005. In this case, *City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of New York*, the Court ruled in favor of the United States government on the basis of legal precedents established by the Marshall Court in the early nineteenth century that relied on ideological notions found in the fifteenth-century Doctrine of Discovery.

City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of New York involved a land dispute that arose after the Oneida Nation purchased 17,000 acres of their original territory from the New York State government on the open real estate market. The Oneida Nation argued that, based on the 1794 Treaty of Canandaigua, this newly bought parcel of land could not be taxed as it was considered to be "Indian Country" and therefore tax immune (City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of New York, 544 U.S. 197 (2005)). New York State argued that, being out of the Oneida possession for over 200 years, such tribal tax immunities could not be applied (Berkey 377). The U.S. Supreme Court agreed.

Justifying New York State's argument by citing the "acquiescence rule," the Court stated that the long-term possession of land by one government allows that government to possess and

control that region. That government's dominion is "conclusive" (379). Under Footnote 1, the Court explains the precedent for this justification by claiming that "Under the 'doctrine of discovery'… fee title to the lands occupied by Indians when the colonists arrived became vested in the sovereign – first the discovering European nation and later the original States and the United States" (City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of New York, 544 U.S. 197 (2005)). This legal principle, also referenced in the 1823 Supreme Court case *Johnson v. Mc'Intosh*, states that past European governments, and subsequently the United States government, had the right to obtain Native American land titles either "by purchase or conquest" (Johnson v. Mc'Intosh 22 Ill.21 U.S. 543, 8 Wheat. 543, 5 L. Ed. 681 (1823)).

The Doctrine of Discovery, originally conceived and implemented by Pope Alexander VI in 1493, stated that lands not inhabited by Christians were available to be "discovered" and claimed by Christian rulers. This decree allowed various European nations, including England, to justify their attempts to colonize foreign spaces and claim lands that were possessed by indigenous communities. The doctrine, created more than five hundred years ago and rooted in outdated religious principles at the start of colonizing efforts, is still cited and alluded to in modern legal discourses. Native American case law depends on treaties, statutes and other legal documents that are based on modes of thought that date back not only to the creation of the United States, but also to the time of European colonization. The referencing of past precedents and doctrines in legal cases has "weakened [the] condition of Indian tribes" over "the course of dealings with the federal government" (Berkey 383). These principles, which attempt to fit Native American land claims into European conceptions of space and systems of land ownership, consistently ignore Native American forms of territoriality and tribal sovereignty. Using these ancient doctrines to decide a future case involving the Standing Rock Tribe, United States judges

could, once again, deny a Native American tribe the ability to control its sovereign space. As Curtis Berkey states, "Unless the Court intends to signal a sea-change in its approach to Indian law cases, there is no reason to believe the Court cannot continue to interpret the meaning of and apply settled doctrines" dating back hundreds of years (383).

Chief Justice John Marshall states in *Johnson v. Mc'Intosh* that the Doctrine of Discovery gave European nations an absolute right to rule over New World lands. As a result of European ideologies and discourses that emphasized and promoted ideas and perceptions of absolute power over foreign spaces, there is a notion that this absolute right to rule was automatically fulfilled; Englishmen, as soon as they arrived on American soil, were able to overcome obstacles, claim lands, and conquer indigenous people (Barr, "Borders and Borderlands" 11). However, the document never truly dictated the nature of spatial disputes occurring during the colonial period. While the Doctrine of Discovery, continuously cited during European colonization and United States dispute resolutions, holds enormous legal weight, the creation of this doctrine at the time of colonization did not bind Native American communities to concede and relinquish their territories. The ideologies embedded within the document may have enabled Europeans to project ideas of grand power and control, but the types of territorial control specified within the document were always fictitious. Power relations in American spaces were much more complex than is suggested in colonial discourses. The English were not able to control and live in foreign spaces free of difficulty.

Texts attempting to promote English colonization emphasized the ability of Englishmen to control peripheral spaces as a way to offset the struggles English settlers were facing in colonial regions. By the time England began serious endeavors to colonize the Americas, many European nations had already been colonizing American spaces for over one hundred years. The

horrors and difficulties that plagued the Spanish colonization of the Americas and English attempts to control spaces in Ireland originally provided the English with cautionary tales of the moral, economic, and human costs of colonization (Thrush, *Indigenous London* 37). However, perceptions shifted in the early seventeenth century. Unprecedented urban difficulties, such as rural economic stagnation and policies involving immigration and enclosure, led to increased crowding, pollution, and disease in London that threatened the status quo of English life and the stability of urban centers (37). The process of colonization was thought to be a solution that could relieve urban problems. However, initial attempts at English colonization in the Americas proved to be full of great difficulties. Starvation, threats from indigenous inhabitants, mutinous conflicts between settlers, in addition to the disappearance of people from the community of Roanoke, caused many English investors to believe that English colonization would not reap social or economic benefits.

In order to increase investment in the failing colonial project, it became necessary for settlers working for colonial officials to document foreign spaces in English terms. The documentation of peripheral spaces, or outlying regions situated on the edges of the empire, emphasized the English ability to survive and control the regions near to and far from their settlements. Such documents enabled colonial officials to ease English anxieties about colonization by promoting the perception that the English had absolute power in North America. Readers and investors in London needed to be sure that the English could build permanent residences mirroring English societies, enforce hierarchical power structures, successfully farm, and explore regions far from settlements. The publication of travel documentation enabled the American space to be mapped visually and verbally, allowing settlers, explorers, and investors alike to see the benefits of colonization. For example, in order to highlight the fact that the

English had the ability and right to control peripheral regions far from the nation's imperial center, the English created maps and other textual documentation that deemphasized any reference to spatial contestation that would suggest the English had limited control in the American space.

The way that peripheral regions were constructed and represented in early modern texts impacted the way that common people in England perceived contestations over space and control. Many people interested in English colonial efforts would never set foot on American soil. Others would not have access to travel documentation, especially as many colonizers waited years after their journeys back to London to write and publish their experiences. Potential investors or "adventurer[s]," including priests, merchants, and grocers, stayed in England and had no intention of travelling across the Atlantic Ocean (Thrush, *Indigenous London* 40). To these men who remained in England, other forms of expression, such as theater, enabled them to imagine the excitements and anxieties produced in peripheral regions. The London stage impacted early modern English collective cultural understandings of colonization as plays such as Shakespeare's *The Tempest* referenced contestations over space and power on the empire's periphery.

Space, as geographers have noted, can be described as both geographical and physical. However, the production of space is also a social phenomenon. Henri Lefebvre, in *The Production of Space*, describes space as not only a container or plot of land produced in a neutral setting ruled by the laws of spatial geometry, but also as a concept that requires human interaction, in which human beings create their lives. Space, in this sense, is a combination of geographic form, built environment, representative meaning, and daily routine (73-92). Tensions necessarily arise as human beings fight not only over land mass, but also over what type of

realities they seek to construct within those land masses. Michel de Certeau similarly defines space as inhabited and practiced place. A static place comes to life with the practice of social interaction (117-118). Such spaces can be influenced by human interaction and movement in the present, but can also be influenced by historical interaction with the past.

Based on these interpretations, Lloyd Edward Kermode notes in "Experiencing the Space and Place of Early Modern Theater" that human beings strive to own space and make it "proper" to them, in order to dictate the meanings and ideologies that influence the space while also having the power to ensure that other people within the space abide by these socially constructed meanings (4). Tim Cresswell also notes in *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* that hegemonic ideology, specifically, is a dominant force that shapes space, determining how environments are read, thought about, used, and controlled (151, 161).

In the colonial settlements at the beginning of English colonization, Englishmen attempted to dictate the meanings and ideologies practiced within certain spaces in order to maintain a sphere of power on the periphery of the expanding English empire. However, throughout America, contestations occurred as different cultural traditions and people met, overlapped, and clashed, and as different communities attempted to construct, project, and maintain their own ideologies and meanings over the territories they occupied.

Although this project will focus on early modern English spatial discourses, it is beneficial to analyze indigenous perspectives on territoriality in order to have a clear understanding of the competing spatial discourses that have framed contestations over space and power within the history of North America. Scholarship focusing on North American spaces is large and varied, encompassing a broad range of spatial regions and distinctive Native American tribes. Juliana Barr, in "Geographies of Power: Mapping Indian Borders in the 'Borderlands' of

the Early Southwest," notes that Native American communities of the Southwestern region of what is now the United States were able to maintain exclusive control over broad territories that encompassed their hunting and gathering grounds. She defines native territory as a set of spaces marked through various residential, economic, political, horticultural and kinship networks. Regardless of the fluid way in which Native American tribes configured their polities, these factors did not undermine the structural integrity of a community's clear spatial domain (9-10). Pekka Hämäläinen notes that, at the time of colonization, indigenous communities abided by principles and practices that guided how societies shared resources within overlapping territories (35). Allan Greer describes how indigenous communities perceived treaties with Europeans as agreements to coexist and share resources within the same space; Greer also notes that indigenous communities recognized each other's claims over space by providing payment to conduct trade within others' dominions (84). Similarly, Patricia Albers and Jeanne Kay describe how Great Lakes and Northern Plains Native Americans were more likely to establish kinship-based models of land-sharing than to occupy mutually exclusive domains (47-91). These indigenous understandings of territoriality contrast with Euro-American perceptions of territoriality that emphasize the use of distinct and demarcated boundaries in order to indicate the individual and private use of land.

Indigenous perceptions of territoriality can also be understood by analyzing indigenous maps. Juliana Barr and Edward Countryman note in their introduction to *Contested Spaces of Early America* that indigenous maps served various functions including signposts, route guides, trespass warnings, markers of conquest, and signs of territorial possession (8). Lisa Brooks comments on indigenous map-making in *The Common Pot*, describing the way Northeastern tribes relied on interdependency within shared spaces and used birchbark writing and wampum

belts in order to communicate, create bonds between nations, record matters of importance, and note political relationships between people, waterways, and spaces (2-12, 35, 226). G. Malcolm Lewis similarly describes mapmaking practices among Native Americans pre-contact and post-contact, describing how encounters with Europeans influenced both indigenous and European mapmaking (9-33).

The work of these scholars indicates that we can disassemble the perception of absolute English control at the beginning of colonization by reviewing, and acknowledging the legitimacy of, Native American forms of territoriality. Additionally, we can demystify the history of English control in North America by reviewing English spatial discourses of the seventeenth century. While Juliana Barr notes in "Borders and Borderlands" that the French, Dutch, and Spanish were far more likely to acknowledge indigenous claims of space and indicate the limits of their own control within seventeenth-century texts, through thorough analysis of spatial discourses, we can see that English texts, too, indicate that there were definite and definable limits to the degree of control exercised by the English in colonial spaces.

The complexities, anxieties, and English struggles regarding spatial control are revealed in visual and verbal mapping passages in travel documentation and representations of colonial spaces on the London stage. By analyzing the conversations surrounding contested spaces and power in early modern English spatial discourses, we can begin to understand how early modern English readers and viewers may have understood concepts of space and power at a time when the imperial nation was expanding. While early modern English texts such as John Smith's *A True Relation*, Smith's *Generall Historie of Virginia*, Ralph Hamor's *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia*, and William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* attempt to reduce English anxieties about imperial expansion, emphasize the benefits of colonization, and highlight the

definitive English power to control peripheral spaces, there are also instances in which these texts highlight the English inability to control peripheral spaces far from English centers of imperial control, as well as spaces closer to the empire's center.

In my first chapter, I argue that the early modern English writers John Smith and Ralph Hamor use mapping strategies in an attempt to claim English power within Virginia. Provided in a map form, the information within the text is presumed to be authentic, as maps are considered to be accurate portrayals of specific spaces. By verbally and visually mapping the geographical features, natural resources, and communities within the Virginia territory, Smith and Hamor attempt to portray the colonial space in ways that suggest that autonomous commercial mobility, permanent settlement, and cultural unity can result in definitive English control over the region. While these maps served to reassure readers that the English could successfully establish familiar and safe settlements segregated from the greater American "wilderness," it is important to understand that such spatial representations of the English colonial region were not accurate, mirror-like representations of an objective reality. As Juliana Barr and Edward Countryman state in *Contested Spaces*, these maps "were intensely political documents, boasts of power that were open to contestation and that could not be definitively enforced" (4). If looked at carefully, colonial spatial discourses, representing desire rather than reality, can reveal tension and the complexity of power relationships that suggest English settlers and colonial officials did not have absolute control within the American space. The complexities of power relations within Virginia can be viewed in the contradictory textual representations of space in Smith and Hamor's maps that appear to actually undermine the writers' claims of authentic, definitive English power within Virginia. The writers tacitly acknowledge a reliance on indigenous spatial knowledge, a dependence on indigenous aid, and indigenous cultural understandings of land use.

In my second chapter, I discuss the ways in which the concepts of space and power on the empire's periphery could be understood by and influence the perceptions of Englishmen at the heart of imperial England. Indications of colonization that appear in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* not only symbolized the emergence of colonial spaces, but also helped shape public attitudes and collective cultural understandings about English power in imperial regions. Performances in playhouses were able to represent foreign spaces in ways that mitigated anxieties related to contestations of power. In Shakespeare's *The Tempest,* anxieties are managed as the European ruler Prospero manipulates and controls other characters to ensure that plots of usurpation are foiled and the muddling of power structures does not occur. However, in a peripheral space, free from institutions that enforce social norms and traditional power structures, mutinous plots against leaders and dreams of new social norms can form. Prospero may ultimately be able to control the actions and movements of characters throughout the island in order to maintain traditional rule, but he has difficulties managing and controlling spaces that are far from the enclave in which he resides - "*In front of Prospero's cell.*" As a result of this inability to effectively monitor regions far from his residence and control the borders that separate the peripheral space from his satellite European center, Prospero has trouble controlling the areas that directly surround his cell. Caliban and other lower-class characters are able to enter Prospero's space because the distracted Prospero is unable to monitor their movements and plots of usurpation on "*Another part of the island.*" Prospero must stay constantly vigilant in order to maintain the small amount of control and power he has within his space.

Sitting in a playhouse in London, an early modern audience would likely have related the concepts of space and power presented in the play to issues regarding space and power in contemporary imperial discourses. As the empire expanded, traditional English social norms

spread outward to peripheral spaces that English settlers occupied. However, foreign influences were also able to impact the nature of social norms and English culture at the imperial nation's center. The play's references to and stagings of incidences of social disorder mirror incidences of social disorder that were occurring in both peripheral spaces and local spaces in the city of London, suggesting to audiences that English power is difficult to definitively maintain not only in spaces far from established institutions that enforce European rules, but also within those regions in which European norms and traditional power structures supposedly reside.

**CHAPTER I- CONTESTED SPACES AND THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER
IN EARLY MODERN "VIRGINIA"**

Introduction—

In the seventeenth century, Englishmen ventured to North America in order to pursue

colonial endeavors. Colonizers on these journeys sought to explore regions with abundant natural

resources that could aid England's economy and to establish settlements that could help reduce

the English problem of urban overcrowding. The creation of a new English world required

English settlements to be spaces that weren't influenced by the "wilderness" and the Native

American inhabitants surrounding them, even as such English settlements necessarily relied on

natural resources, as well as indigenous regional knowledge and aid. In an attempt to resolve this

contradiction, early modern colonial texts written between 1607 and 1624 attempt to manipulate

representations of Virginian spaces as a form of power.

One way to support claims of English power within Virginia was to map the Chesapeake

territory. English writers' representations of space in relation to power dynamics served to

reassure readers that the English had enough power to establish settlements permanently within

Virginia without English culture and ideology being altered or destroyed. The word "Virginia,"

placed on Smith's cartographic map of the Chesapeake region, represents an English attempt to

claim the space as its own (see Appendix A). Naming the area after the Virgin Queen, Elizabeth,

allows viewers to accept the space as one in which the English have definitive power, as the

name subscribes to an earlier fiction of Elizabethan imperialism. By renaming the entire area and

placing the name on a map, the English claim of dominance appears to be authentic and

implicates the region as a space of sovereign rule and authority.

Despite these documents' implications, European power was never definitively

established during the time of colonization. Early modern texts that depict and describe English

and indigenous spaces and power relations as already fixed and controlled by the English discourage readers from understanding the complexities of indigenous and European spaces and cultural dynamics within Virginia at the time of colonization. The perception that arose during the nineteenth century that framed early English colonization as a "histor[y] of a glorious expansion" continues to exert influence over the way people think about U.S. and Native American power relations and spaces today (Fuller 14). In actuality, the struggle for power within America remained for hundreds of years and continues today, as the concepts of space and power are still relevant in regard to debates over Native American reservations, territorial sovereignty, and cultural ideologies.

Within an area that had a large indigenous population and presence, it was impossible for English settlers to create an ideal "civil" European space that was uninfluenced by a "wild" and indigenous space. English settlers came into contact with Native Americans when they were exploring, trading, exchanging knowledge, and waging war. Struggles for power ensued as the opposing communities sought to control the Virginia space, or rather certain geographical features, natural resources, and communities within the claimed territory. In these contested regions, Native American and English communities strove to neutralize rivals, create dependencies, and influence the behavior of others in attempts to assert control over the territory and use the materials of the space without resistance (Hämäläinen 33). Colonial writers attempted to assert claims of English power, such as cultural superiority, mobility, spatial knowledge, and control of exchange networks within Virginia, by creating a body of literature that emphasized these types of power in the most seemingly authentic and accurate ways possible.

In John Smith's *A True Relation* (1608), his *Generall Historie of Virginia* (1624), and Ralph Hamor's *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia* (1615), the English writers attempt to manipulate interpretations of space in regard to cultural dynamics in order to express power over their "New World." As a result of mapping the Virginia region, the writers' claims of English power within Virginia are presumed to be authentic, as the claims are portrayed within maps, which are considered to be accurate portrayals of specific spaces. By verbally and visually mapping the geographical features, natural resources, and communities within the Virginia territory, Smith and Hamor attempt to portray authentic representations of the space that suggest autonomous commercial mobility, permanent settlement, and cultural unity can result in definitive English control over the region. However, the contradicting textual representations of space in these maps actually undermine the writers' claims of authentic, definitive English power within Virginia as the writers tacitly acknowledge a reliance on indigenous spatial knowledge, a dependence on indigenous aid, and indigenous cultural understandings of land use.

Goals of English Colonization—

Compared to other European nations, such as Spain and Portugal, England was late to start colonizing the Americas. England's first attempts at colonization in the late sixteenth century were deemed unsuccessful as settlers and explorers were unable to gain resources, establish viable commercial markets, or maintain settlements within American territories. While attempts at English colonization were originally criticized by citizens, a change in England's urban environment led to an increased interest in colonization at the start of the seventeenth century. English enclosure policies that had gained momentum during the sixteenth century resulted in landlessness and homelessness that, subsequently, led to great migration from rural areas to English cities (Seed 20). Famine, economic stagnation, and an increase in population

caused English communities to become overcrowded places of poverty. Many Englishmen agreed that colonization could reduce urban tensions by sending "the city's 'excess' people overseas" and by exploring regions with abundant natural resources that could aid England's economy (Thrush, "Meere Strangers" 199).

In order to promote colonial endeavors within the "New World," English explorers began writing texts that emphasized the benefits of colonization. One apparent difference between early modern English texts about Virginia and similar English texts that arise in New England two decades later is the amount of emphasis placed on religious goals and pursuits. While religion in the seventeenth century was a dominant feature of English life and culture, Virginian texts that are written between 1607 and 1624 do not appear to highlight colonial desires of converting indigenous individuals to Christianity. It is important to note that to many Virginia Company investors, religious goals were admirable, as John Smith acknowledges in his texts. However, the ideal objectives of colonization, including religious conversion, industrial commercialism and permanent settlement, proved to be difficult to actualize due to struggles Englishmen faced within the Virginia region itself.

Although many investors assumed that the English would be able to arrive in the Chesapeake region, build, explore, and conquer the space quickly and efficiently in order to then pursue other goals, the English faced many stalling hardships in the new environment that stifled such ambitions. During the first two decades of the colonization of Virginia, English settlers had to focus primarily on survival, as they continued to lose over half of their men to starvation and disease (Kupperman 24). The necessity of gaining sustenance, building protective housing, and simply trying to stay alive resulted in many original goals being set aside. While the English struggled to achieve stability within the Virginia space, English writers attempted to persuade

Europeans that the English had the power to control the Chesapeake region. The use of navigational technologies played a large role in English attempts to introduce and reintroduce claims of English superiority and power within the Virginia space.

Mapping: Technological and Symbolic Purposes—

The use of technologies was essential to the navigation and exploration taking place during the time of English colonization. Compasses, sextants, and maps all served a tangible and useful purpose in helping colonizers note where they had been and where they needed to go. In addition, the technologies served a symbolic and cultural function. Throughout the sixteenth century, early modern English explorers and writers relied on suppositions that English technologies such as printed books, guns, and magnetic compasses were necessary for the English to successfully expand their modern and civil society to the places they explored and colonized. Navigational technologies specifically, as symbols of English colonizers' advanced culture and superior knowledge, served as tools used to claim power over certain spaces.

Mapping is one type of technology that makes claims about space. A map, as a technology, is a valuable tool used to navigate through unfamiliar territories. Furthermore, like any other form of written text, a map is able to convey certain information that can then be interpreted by readers in specific ways. In the seventeenth century, it was common for spatial technologies and written documents to be used both as a way to navigate open oceans and to document occurrences and assets during merchant travels. Writing techniques associated with merchant voyages and trade, including log, itinerary, inventory and travel documentation, were also used during travels of exploration and contributed to the "'obsessive' documentation" of colonial expeditions (Fuller 2, 1). This type of extensive documentation, including the drawing of visual maps and the verbal mapping of regions, was used as a way for colonizers to try to

make sense of the world in which they lived (Barr and Countryman 2). English writers such as Richard Hakluyt acquired massive collections of printed documents that included meticulously detailed observations from explorers who noted the availability of commodities and the possibility of settlement in the Virginia space (Fuller 7).

It is clear that visual maps are important documents to analyze in order to make sense of certain spaces. Cartographic representations of space serve to show various geographic features, resources, and habitations that are within a given territory. In addition, verbal mapping can be effective and important in imagining and analyzing a given region. Verbal mapping, or the written descriptions of certain geographical features, natural resources and communities within a specific area, can help readers to imagine a given space more successfully than can be done by looking at a cartographic depiction alone. These verbal accounts produce vivid and detailed descriptions of spaces that can be difficult to discern from a cartographic representation of a region. The verbal descriptions, including imagery and specific details about a given space, can serve as an important tool used in the colonial process of information-sharing.

The instrumental point of view that colonizers adopted in their writings, from the obsessive documentation associated with colonial exploration, resulted in the perception that these writers were merely copying an environment onto a page and recording accurate facts associated with events and observations (Fuller 8). The same perceptions held true for cartographic representations of the world. A visual map appears to have much more objectivity, and thus authenticity, than a first-person explanation of a region, as the indications of a compass rose, cartouche, and lines of latitude and longitude give the appearance that everything else listed on the map is an accurate representation of that particular space. The notions of transparency and accuracy that were associated with these writings became a culturally accepted perception during

the time of English colonization. The perception was still accepted as John Smith and Ralph

Hamor wrote their "true" accounts about the territory the English named "Virginia."

While these instrumental writings were perceived as accurate, it is important to note that

their so-called "realities" were malleable and susceptible to various misrepresentations. For

example, on John Smith's cartographic map, one of the drawings, appearing in the top right

corner, is not an accurate representation of an indigenous man from the Chesapeake. The De Bry

engraving used in Smith's text was taken from Thomas Harriot's earlier colonial document, and

is actually a reproduction of an original drawing sketched by John White (Fuller 136-137). As

the ethnographic authenticity of the image becomes absorbed by the cartographic authenticity of

the overall visual map, a viewer may presume that this depiction is an accurate representation of

what an indigenous individual from the Chesapeake region looks like. However, the image

actually depicts an indigenous man that Thomas Harriot observed in the region that is now North

Carolina. While it may be easy to presume that Smith borrowed this image from Harriot in order

to save time and money, it is also important to question what other claims Smith attempts to

make by using inauthentic images within his visual and verbal maps.

The spatial discourses found within Smith's visual map and Smith and Hamor's verbal

mapping passages are used in order to make certain claims about the Virginia space. By using

these mapping discourses, the writers attempt to claim that the English ability to travel freely

throughout the region, build settlements that signify an intent to remain in the space permanently,

and maintain a "civil" cultural unity within the area enables them to have dominant control over

the Virginia region. Although the use of these strategies gives the illusion that the English were

in control of the Virginia space, contradictions found within the mapping discourses themselves

indicate that these maps, and the claims they make, act more as an expression of desire than reality.

Claims of English Commercial Mobility and Indigenous Immobility—

The first step to establishing a permanent presence within Virginia, and reaping the benefits of the colonial space, was to gain knowledge about the space itself. The acquisition of English spatial knowledge within Virginia occurred most prominently through English expeditions. This knowledge was deemed advantageous as it allowed settlers and investors to be aware of the locations of valuable natural resources, opportunities for trade, and the proximity and customs of surrounding indigenous communities. The colonial potential of the Virginia region is documented within John Smith's cartographic map, which depicts the Chesapeake Bay, numerous navigable rivers, different varieties of forests, mountainous regions, open plains, and prosperous fishing sites. The colonial potential of the space is also described within Smith's text as he writes, "[th]e mildnesse of the ayre, the fertilitie of the soyle, and situation of the rivers are so propitious to the nature and use of man" (*Generall Historie* 29). Navigable rivers and a large bay are positive attributes for commercial ships wishing to gain access to Virginian resources. The temperate climate and fertile plains also make Virginia a desirable place to create agriculture-based English communities. The information that was presumably gained via discovery is displayed by visually and verbally mapping the Virginia region. The integration of such information into these maps aids in informing viewers that the space depicted is accommodating to settlement, agriculture, and industrial commercialism. The information served to show investors that they could profit from both commercial activity and agriculture-based settlements formed from the permanence of an English colony within Virginia. Due to the information encompassed in these texts, colonial endeavors received validation and increased

consideration, which could lead to an increased English presence within Virginia, as adventurers recognized that colonial goals of commercialization and settlement could be actualized.

In order to access the resources and information necessary to pursue colonial goals, the English had to be able to move freely throughout the Virginia space. Details within Smith and Hamor's visual and verbal maps attempt to express that the English could, self-sufficiently, travel and explore throughout the Chesapeake region without resistance or threat from surrounding indigenous communities. As Smith and Hamor use mapping strategies to emphasize claims of English mobility, they also attempt to claim that indigenous communities are immobile and nonthreatening in order to assure investors that violent contestation would be unlikely in Virginia.

Claims of English mobility, represented in Ralph Hamor's verbal mapping passages, suggest that English settlers have vast control over the Virginia space, as the settlers are able to move outward from the English space of Jamestown to indigenous spaces in order to pursue English interests. This assertive outward momentum is described as Hamor notes that Governor Dale sent Englishmen "Into their [the Chicohominies'] river, to propose certaine conditions" for an alliance to be made (Hamor 12). The English are represented as negotiators who are able to move easily between spaces. The colonizers have the capability to enter an indigenous region and use "their river," in order to ultimately gain a "harvest [of] two bushels of corne a man" (13). Even though Hamor acknowledges that the English are entering an indigenous space, the English appear to have no trouble moving through the area, of their own accord, in order to impose their demands onto indigenous communities. Such claims of English mobility imply that the English have the power to go where they desire throughout the Virginia space with little to no limitation.

The claim of assertive English mobility is corroborated by the level of spatial detail portrayed on Smith's cartographic map. By including a variety of information on this map including forests, mountains, waterways, and the names of indigenous habitations and peoples that are demarcated throughout the entire document, it appears that the English have the power to travel to all of these distant places and gather useful information with very little difficulty, resistance, or confrontation. This outward momentum of movement from Jamestown, seen in Hamor and Smith's verbal descriptions of such movements and in markings on the map that extend far from the English center, implies that the English are a force to be reckoned with. These fearless men assertively desire to make their presence known.

Smith and Hamor's texts often imply that the English were courageous explorers who asserted their presence and control within the region. However, the texts also indicate that the settlers were often more preoccupied with survival than exploration. Survival required the English to travel outward from their Jamestown fortress in order to form relations with indigenous communities. Depictions of indigenous settlements and customs serve to show that English "explorers" spent time and effort to observe these people, their demeanors, and how they used the spaces that they occupied, in order to determine if it would be possible for the two groups to form amiable trade relations. Oftentimes in Smith's writings, "discovery" and "trade" are two concepts that go hand in hand. For example, Smith explains that his "journey to Powhatan" was "as well for discoverie as trading" (*True Relation* 39). Smith sends Englishmen to meet with indigenous individuals in order "to discover the Towne, their Corne, and force, to trie their intent" (38). Expeditions often end once Englishmen obtain food such as "fish, oysters, bread, and deere" through trade (38). The fact that many English settlers refused to leave the comfort of Jamestown, as "necessitie it selfe could not compell them to passe the *Peninsula*, or

Pallisadoes of *James* Towne," suggests that the acquisition of information and the desire to control the people and resources within a specific territory were not the main objectives of most English travel (*Generall Historie* 39). The passage above suggests that English mobility resulted directly from a need for sustenance and only secondarily involved an attempt to gain vast knowledge about a space or courageously assert an English presence within the region.

In the Second Book of his *Generall Historie,* Smith describes indigenous habitations as he verbally maps the areas that he "discovers." While travelling throughout the space and interacting with indigenous tribes, Smith systematically documents the number of "fighting men" residing in each indigenous community he encounters. For example, Smith lists, "The first… are the *Kecoughtans*, who besides their women & children, have not past 20. fighting men. The *Paspaheghes...* have not past 40. The… *Chikahamania* neare 250. The *Weanocks* 100. The *Arrowhatocks* 30" (23). The surveying of the land and noting of specific numbers of "fighting men" allow the English to know the number of people that are able to wage war if contestation occurs within the Virginia space. Smith goes on to observe, "Within 60 myles of *James* Towne, there are about some 5000 people, but of able men fit for their warres scarce 1500" (29). The English ability to travel 60 miles from an English settlement results in the acquisition of pertinent spatial information. The gaining of such information allows Smith to indicate to settlers and investors that potential confrontations between indigenous and English communities are nothing to fear because according to Smith, only a mere third of these communities' people pose a threat to English interests. If contestation was to occur, the English would be able to conquer and control these small, decentralized indigenous forces. The surveying of the Virginia space and the people within it occurs directly as a result of the English ability to move freely throughout the region. Due to being mobile and gaining information about indigenous populations, the

English are able to discern how much of a threat certain communities could be in order to properly prepare to defend English colonial interests.

Smith's verbal mapping passage also suggests that the English have the capability of knowing where indigenous people will be at all times, as he designates certain populations to certain areas on specific rivers. As Smith indicates that certain indigenous populations exist in specified places, he suggests that the indigenous people will always remain there, unlikely to move. This presumption of indigenous immobility is corroborated by Smith's visual map. By demarcating each specific, small indigenous community, while failing to represent groups of English people in a similar way, Smith attempts to portray indigenous individuals as being less likely to move far from these assigned spaces, unlike the English who are represented as moving freely throughout the Virginia region. The labelling of indigenous communities implies that these indigenous people will not move spontaneously or unexpectedly, furthering the implication that the indigenous peoples will not be a threat to English lives, partnerships or other colonial efforts.

Another image that portrays indigenous immobility appears in the top left corner of Smith's visual map. The image depicts members of the Powhatan tribe, sitting in an indigenous habitation. The individuals are depicted as being contained in a confined space, looking apathetic and unhostile, without weapons in sight. Smith's incorporation of this scene into his visual map furthers his claim that the English can easily move through the Virginia space as indigenous individuals appear to be passive and not a threat to English lives or colonial motives.

While these depictions of indigenous passivity and confinement appear to be accurate because they are placed on Smith's visual map, a reader who looks closely at the document will notice that the text beneath the Powhatan image contradicts all notions that indigenous

individuals are not a threat to colonial interests. The statement appearing below the depiction reads, "Held this state & fashion when Capt. Smith was delivered to him prisoner." Although in the visual depiction Smith attempts to claim that indigenous individuals are confined and passive, the text beneath the illustration emphasizes that this behavior was observed when Smith himself was captured, immobile, and confined within an indigenous habitation.

While English writers like Smith and Hamor often emphasize the captivities of prominent Native American individuals, such as Pocahontas, in order to highlight that indigenous movements can be restrained, it is important to note that Smith too is held captive by the Powhatan tribe, unable to escape detainment until the chief, Powhatan, releases him. By including this text within his cartographic map, Smith undermines his claim that the English can gain power within Virginia as a result of their unrestricted mobility. Smith, by being retained in Powhatan's custody, is unable to gain resources or control for himself, let alone the English colony as a whole.

In actuality, there are many instances in Smith and Hamor's texts that contradict claims of indigenous immobility. Smith and Hamor regularly describe cases in which indigenous individuals are represented as mobile. In one of the more revealing instances, Hamor describes the prominent leader Powhatan as being able to move freely throughout the Virginia space. Hamor incorporates a passage in which Powhatan states, "my country is large enough, I will remove my selfe farther from you" in order to "never see English man more" (42, 46). Powhatan's comments suggest that indigenous mobility will not be a threat to English endeavors and that, conversely, interference in the region will diminish as strong Native American leaders seek refuge and solace in places far from encroaching English spaces and influence. While it is apparent that the lack of Native American influence in the Virginia region would result in the

English ability to possess and control more space, it would also result in the diminishing of indigenous knowledge and aid that was essential to English survival. As Mary Fuller notes in *Voyages in Print*, "Powhatan tells John Smith that if he is pressed too hard, he will simply go away… and leave the English to starve" (94). Furthermore, while Powhatan is depicted as moving away from contested spaces that create power struggles, presumably relinquishing any power he has there in the process, his actions still suggest he is able to move freely and do as he pleases. Indigenous individuals' abilities to move freely contradict the claims implied by depictions of indigenous immobility in Smith and Hamor's mapping passages. An acknowledgement of indigenous mobility indicates that the English cannot know where these individuals will be at all times. This lack of definitive knowledge could be a potential threat to the English. Indigenous individuals could move in ways that harm English colonial interests of permanent settlement and industrial commercialism.

Descriptions in Smith's visual map and Smith and Hamor's verbal mapping passages suggest that the English can acquire the spatial knowledge needed to further colonial interests. However, the limits of English spatial knowledge are revealed by looking closer at textual contradictions found within mapping passages that acknowledge the parameters of autonomous English mobility and a reliance on indigenous aid and spatial knowledge. On Smith's visual map, a reader can see the multitude of spatial information that is depicted. In addition, there are crosses that appear amongst the depictions of mountains, rivers, and trees. The map's key explains the "signification of these markers" with the notation, "To the crosses hath bin discovered what beyond is by relation." Smith explains the meaning of this statement more clearly as he verbally maps the Virginia space within his *Generall Historie,* stating, "In which Mappe observe this, that as far as you see the little Crosses on rivers, mountaines, or other places

have beene discovered; the rest was had by information of the Savages, and are set downe according to their instructions" (25). While the English did travel and gain information about some of the spaces notated on the cartographic map, many of the areas depicted on Smith's map represent places in which English colonizers never set foot. Smith clearly admits that the English acquired less spatial knowledge than they desired through "discovery" and relied in part on indigenous knowledge in order to get their bearings within the "New World." Although the map gives the impression that the English had travelled far distances and acquired the spatial knowledge needed to advance colonial endeavors and gain control within the region, it appears that the English truly only explored a relatively small area surrounding the Chesapeake Bay. The reliance on indigenous knowledge to collect geographical and settlement information suggests that European-formed representations of space were influenced most directly by indigenous individuals. The English explored less, acquired less knowledge, and had less control within Virginia than Smith attempts to assert through his more prominent textual claims.

In addition to this small extent of exploration, the placement of other demarcations on Smith's cartographic map suggests that the English did not explore far or wide expanses of the Virginia space. By analyzing Smith's visual map, a reader can see that almost all of Smith's crosses appear at the end of waterways. Similarly, most of the indigenous towns that receive specific names are located along the same rivers. These details indicate that the English "discovered" the Virginia region primarily by ship. The absence of intricately demarcated indigenous communities in regions distant from the rivers suggest that English colonizers did not travel or explore far from rivers' shorelines. Without traveling far from their barges, it would be impossible for the English to gain the knowledge needed to further their quest for control.

The importance of waterways as avenues for commercial mobility is depicted on Smith's visual map and within Smith and Hamor's verbal mapping passages. The settlement of Jamestown, as seen on Smith's cartographic map, is situated on a river and is located on a peninsula that opens to the Chesapeake Bay. The importance of such a "towne" being "3 parts thereof invironed with the main River" is highlighted by scholars such as Juliana Barr and Edward Countryman, who note that travelling on waterways was necessary for colonial advancement (Hamor 30). Barr and Countryman describe the seas as "surfaces for European action" (5). European ships allowed waterways to be transformed from "barriers into highways" where trade and exploration of natural resources could take place effectively and efficiently (4). Resources and people could enter and leave towns easily by traveling along rivers. The reliance on waterways is also reflected in Smith's *A True Relation* as he describes that "Captaine Nuport['s]" wariness of an indigenous-English encounter resulted in his order for the Englishmen "to retire to the water side…to prevent the worst" from occurring (57). In order to avoid a confrontation with potentially hostile indigenous people, the Englishmen choose to stay close to the river in order to retreat quickly and safely if necessary. Access to waterways protects English lives and expeditions as they are capable of travelling safely throughout the Virginia space in order to trade, gather natural resources, and look for promising places for future settlements.

In order to use waterways for protection, commercial trade, and to gain pertinent spatial knowledge about the Virginia region, English colonizers rely on English barges. The significance of an English barge, as a vessel of efficient and superior technology, can be seen on Smith's cartographic map. English ships appear to be the only symbols associated with movement within the Chesapeake space. One large English ship is depicted in the bottom left corner of Smith's

visual map. The ship seems to be headed directly toward the Chesapeake Bay without concern for the large sea monster that may frustrate its course. The other English ship can be seen within the Chesapeake Bay itself, traveling toward narrower waterways. These two images give the impression that English ships are sturdy and efficient enough to navigate both harsh open waters and smaller waterways with ease.

While Smith's visual map attempts to claim that the English are mobile due to their advanced ships, textual contradictions are revealed as he verbally maps the Virginia space during expeditions. In Smith's *Generall Historie*, barges are represented as being inefficient for exploration. Smith notes that, at many times, English "barge[s]" weighed "about two tuns" (24). On the contrary, he describes the parallel indigenous technology as being light. While observing indigenous customs Smith states, "[indigenous] fishing is much in Boats…most ordinary are smaller…with which they will row faster then our Barges" (31-32). The construction of indigenous canoes allows for greater efficiency as Native Americans are able to travel faster, and thus farther in the same amount of time, than their English counterparts. English barges, on the other hand, create limitations to how fast and efficiently the Englishmen can move and travel throughout the space. With such transportation being essential to trading, following a food source, taking advantage of resources, and communicating with others quickly, the English inability to move efficiently throughout the space limits the amount of control the English can exert over the Chesapeake region.

The English barges also limit how far the English can infiltrate into the Virginia space as waterways become narrower. On one of his expeditions through Virginia, Smith states, "we passed on further, where… we were intercepted with great craggy stones in the midst of the river, where the water falleth so rudely… as not any boat can possibly passe… and to the shore

scarce passage with a barge" (*True Relation* 33-34). The English inability to move farther up waterways oftentimes results in the hiring of indigenous guides and the use of indigenous canoes in order to continue English explorations and commitments to trade. As the "river became narrower," the Englishmen "resolved to hier a Canow, and… leave the barge secure" (42). Due to the lack of efficient transportation, some Englishmen had to remain on an immobile barge in an area far from their settlements. The English colonizers' immobility results in their susceptibility to attack from indigenous individuals who are able to "surprise" the few men left onboard, resulting, in one instance, in the deaths of two Englishmen (*Generall Historie* 46). Staying stagnant in an unfamiliar place for too long resulted in the loss of English man-power as two English lives were taken. The verbal mapping of geographic limitations to English mobility suggests that the English, when far from their settlements, have less dominating power than Smith attempts to claim when emphasizing the power, safety, and swiftness of English ships within his visual map and verbal mapping passages.

While the English barge was left stagnant, necessity required other Englishmen to continue their travels to an indigenous town to trade goods. In order to do this, these colonizers resorted to indigenous modes of transportation. The Englishmen "put [themselves] upon the adventure: the country onely a vast and wilde wildernes, and but onely that Towne: Within three or foure mile, [they] hired... 2. Indians to row [them] the next day" (*True Relation* 42). The verbal mapping of how the English navigated the Virginia space in this instance is significant, as it contradicts Smith's claims that the English obtained mobility and the power to travel when and where they wanted by using their own ships. On the contrary, English mobility often stemmed directly from indigenous aid, knowledge, and transportation. As a result of not having the knowledge or equipment needed to travel on their own, Englishmen are constantly forced to rely

on indigenous navigational knowledge and to trust that their guides will get them to their destinations safely. A reliance on indigenous knowledge and aid, in the case above, did not result in the accomplishment of English quests as indigenous warriors were able to ambush the English and start shooting at them with arrows. Smith claims in *A True Relation* that while travelling with indigenous guides in canoes "200 men, invironed [him]," ultimately resulting in his captivity (44). As a result of their inability to move efficiently through the Virginia space on their own, the English explorers must rely on indigenous knowledge and aid to achieve English goals. By describing this reliance on indigenous aid and knowledge, Smith tacitly acknowledges a lack of English control. The inability to determine where, when, and how Englishmen travel results in the English susceptibility to indigenous attack, the halting of an English expedition, the loss of English life, and the captivity of a prominent English leader.

English Permanence: The Creation of Settlements and the Intent to Remain—

Another claim Smith and Hamor appear to make by visually and verbally mapping the Virginia space is that the English intend to create a lasting and permanent English presence within the region. Smith includes the word "James-towne" on his visual map, placing the anglicized word among various indigenous place-names. The marking of this English settlement on Smith's map indicates that the English work and reside in that particular space. An intricately detailed cartographic map is designed to be used by explorers for years after its creation. Therefore, the inclusion of this English word on Smith's cartographic map conveys the idea that the English existence within the Chesapeake territory is fixed and will remain constant within the region for years to come.

Claims of an established English presence within the Virginia region are furthered by verbal mapping passages that describe the creation and maintenance of English settlements. The

importance of establishing and maintaining fixed structures within Virginia is emphasized by John Smith in his *Generall Historie* as he states, "Officers, to *James* towne he hastened… [to imploy] about necessarie workes, as felling of Timber, repayring their houses ready to fall on their heads" (110). A deterioration of permanent housing within the English fort could lead to uncomfortable and dangerous living situations. In order to have a permanent influence within the region, the English needed to build settlements that could provide them with needed shelter and protect English lives from harsh weather conditions and dangerous enemies. By repairing houses and clearing forests to provide fertile lands for agricultural use, English strength and viability could increase, and attempts to control the Chesapeake space could be attained.

While the building of houses and the use of the land provided the English with tangible resources needed to sustain their presence within the Virginia space, these actions also held a symbolic significance within the English culture. Patricia Seed explains the cultural significance of English settlement in her study *Ceremonies of Possession*. Seed notes that "[e]recting a fixed (not movable) dwelling place upon a territory, under English law created a virtually unassailable right to own the place" (18). The building of a house or fence legally represented possession and control of the space on which these structures were built. English law may have played a limited role within the Virginia space, but the cultural significance of fixed dwellings still psychologically affected English settler perceptions of land possession. In Europe, as well as in this new American space, the building of "the first house was critical to the initial stages of English settlement… because of [its] cultural significance as [a register] of stability, historically carrying a significance of permanence" (18). According to the English perspective, the establishment of structures within a space could lead to lasting possession and ultimate control. At the time of English colonization in the seventeenth century, some communities in England

had already been sustained for over a thousand years. In a chaotic "new" world full of turbulent uncertainty, settlers hoped that the continual use of land and building of housing would serve as a visual indicator of an intent to remain within the region. The long-term possession of a certain territory could lead to definitive control over that area.

Hamor and Smith contrast English settlement patterns with indigenous settlement patterns in an attempt to claim that indigenous communities have no control over the spaces they occupy due to their lack of fixed housing within specific, demarcated areas. Smith verbally maps indigenous homes themselves as a way to show that unlike English houses that are described as sturdy and stable, indigenous "…houses are built like [English] Arbors, of small young springs bowed and tyed" (*Generall Historie* 30). The description of indigenous houses being made out of "small" tree limbs "tyed" together implies that these structures are very weak and impermanent. By describing these structures as insecure and insubstantial, Smith indicates that indigenous structures are not permanent or meant to last a lifetime. Without durable and permanent fixtures on the land to signify the use of the space, indigenous communities do not control or possess these spaces, according to Smith.

Smith also, in an attempt to claim that indigenous communities have little control over the spaces they occupy, analyzes indigenous uses of agricultural fields. When verbally mapping the region, Smith mentions that indigenous communities "make so small a benefit of their land" (30). Smith states that the Virginia territory has plains "where the Salvages inhabit" (22). However, he goes on to state that the fields are "all overgrowne with trees & weeds, being a plaine wildernesse" (22). By making such observations, Smith indicates that these indigenous communities do not use open fields in ways that properly suit agricultural needs. Compared to the English, who would amend the region that "is overgrowne with trees…by good husbandry,"

the indigenous communities let themselves live in "plaine wildernesse" (25). According to the English, without cleared lands and permanent agricultural fields to signify use and possession of the land, the Native Americans do not have a claim over the space that they occupy.

Smith attempts to further the implication that Native Americans have no true permanent settlements within Virginia by describing an expedition he goes on with indigenous guides. When the English and indigenous people must quickly choose a campsite in order to avoid a bad storm, Smith observes an indigenous man who "having in his Canow, as commonly they have, his house and household, instantly set up a house of mats" (*True Relation* 58). Smith's description of the man having his entire house and household within his canoe, as all indigenous people "commonly" have, suggests to English readers that indigenous peoples do not have homes to signify the usage and control of a certain space. Rather, these indigenous communities are depicted as nomadic, travelling with their belongings always with them and claiming no specific space as their own. However, Smith completes the description of this event by noting that the indigenous supplies "succoured [the Native Americans] from the storme" (58). The indigenous individual who carried his "household" with him was prepared for the storm and benefitted from having a warm, dry place to sleep for the night. Native Americans within the Chesapeake region might not have shared the English supposition that a fixed dwelling represents the permanent possession and use of the land. In reality, the indigenous individuals' mobile, unfixed dwellings provide for a more convenient travelling experience, allowing indigenous people to move throughout the Virginia space effectively and efficiently. This unrestricted movement enables the indigenous individuals to use wide expanses of the Virginia space in order to trade, follow food sources, and plant crops in fertile areas.

Smith's claims contradict one another as he attempts to represent Native American communities as both immobile and nomadic. Indications of dispersed, small settlements on his visual map, images that depict members of the Powhatan tribe as confined to one particular space, and verbal passages describing the confinement of prominent indigenous individuals suggest that Native Americans within the Chesapeake region are not a threat to colonial endeavors. However, through his mapping passages, Smith also attempts to portray indigenous communities as not permanently fixed to any particular space, and therefore undeserving of any claim to territorial possession. By claiming that indigenous individuals have no permanent settlements, but rather, travel-friendly shelter, Smith unwittingly indicates that they can move freely, allowing for more efficient trade and sustainability. Smith's discourse, suffering from blatant internal contradiction, undermines the claims Smith attempts to make as he suggests indigenous individuals are immobile while also indicating that indigenous forms of land use may prove to be more advantageous than English forms of land use within the Virginia space.

Competing Cultural Understandings: Links between Land Use, Cultural Unity, & Power—

An analysis of Smith's cartographic map and verbal mapping passages reveals that he desires to express a claim of English cultural unity and Native American dispersion. The depiction of multiple, widely dispersed indigenous habitations, indicated by differing names on Smith's visual map, demonstrates that these indigenous communities are isolated from one another and have few interactions with each other. Verbal mapping passages also suggest that indigenous communities are not culturally unified. In one instance, Smith states, "[t]he most of these rivers are inhabited by severall nations, or rather families, of the name of the rivers" (*Generall Historie* 23). According to his textual clarification, Smith finds the word "nation" to be an incorrect description of these indigenous habitations that appear to have no centralized form

of community. The differentiation between the families, noted within both the visual and verbal maps, suggests that all families are their own independent units who have, at most, weak ties to other surrounding family units and no immediate forms of centralized power. Unlike these dispersed communities, the English community, depicted on Smith's visual map, is represented as controlling more space than that of just an "ordinary [howse]" due to the word "James-towne" being stretched to fill the space between two rivers. This lettering symbolizes a solidified community that is able to preserve pure English ways of life.

Hamor and Smith also contrast claims of indigenous disunity with the claim of English cultural unity within their verbal mapping passages by emphasizing characteristics of the village structure within English settlements and by noting the importance of a separation between English and Native American spaces. When coming to the "New World," settlers hoped to create established settlements that mirrored settlements back in England. Ralph Hamor describes the colonial settlement of Henrico as having characteristics of an English village such as "well framed howses," "a hansom Church," "watch houses," and roads "laid, of Brick" (Hamor 30). These characteristics not only provide settlers with the comforts of home in their new disorienting environments, but they also allow certain cultural values and societal standards to be maintained, even in this new setting. The building of a church allows settlers to have a place to worship while also enabling certain English morals to be upheld. The presence of a watch house and the existence of "pales, posts and railes, to impale [the] purposed… towne" indicate that Englishmen have the ability to protect and preserve their people, values, and interests from opposing cultural forces (*Generall Historie* 110). With the fear of "going native" being prevalent among Englishmen, the creation of village structures allowed settlers to maintain their civilized

cultural understandings and be uninfluenced by their environments while living and working within the Virginia space.

Smith's verbal mapping of English settlements suggests that the English desired to separate themselves from the surrounding indigenous space in order to preserve English cultural unity. After "400. Indians…had assalted the [Jamestown] fort," Smith states, "[w]ith all speede we pallisadoed our Fort" (*True Relation* 35). The English settlers made it a priority to repair the fort and establish fixed boundaries that visually indicated the parameters of the English space. Smith's description of palisades indicates that these fences were necessary to keep English houses and farms safe from indigenous attacks. Additionally, Smith's reference suggests that the palisades themselves served as boundary markers that visually signified the separation of indigenous and English areas. As the English attempted to maintain centralized and unified settlements that preserved English ways of life and prohibited indigenous influence within the settlement's walls, the settlers hoped to obtain definitive control within their confined space and remain intact as a cohesive, unified cultural power.

The concept of the English plantations policy furthered English perceptions that they had the ability to gain control within Virginia. While the English believed that the possession of land could result in control over the specific space they used, plantations were thought to increase this power by creating a "coherent network of estates" that could "[introduce] change into… society" (Gillespie 47). An English network of settlements could lead to more English-defined spaces for settlers to control. Smith refers to the potential to expand English settlements, and thus pure English control, as he verbally maps places he explores. On one of his expeditions, Smith mentions that the land is "excellent fertill ground… so strong a prospect, for an invincible strong City" (*True Relation* 62-63). Smith's verbal mapping of the land in terms of suitability for future

settlements reveals the English desire to expand influence within the region. Desires for English expansion came to fruition as more English settlements were built within the Virginia space. The significance of such expansion as a way to further pure English ways of life within Virginia is revealed as Ralph Hamor states, "the further enlargement yet of this Town, on the other side of the River, by impaling… is secured to our use" and "secured by five Forts" (30-31). The expansion of English-controlled spaces in order to form a network of estates could be accomplished by farming and fencing the land that the English occupy, as was done in other regions of English colonization (Gillespie 47). Definitive English control, along with pure English values and social policies, could increase in Virginia as the English began to clear, farm, and build village-like structures upon more land that they deemed themselves to possess. The defensive forts such as Jamestown and Henrico that surrounded the English fields, functioned to protect this land from non-English use and interference. These practices, in theory, served as a way to create a large, connected, centralized English-dominated space within Virginia.

Indigenous interpretations of land use and cultural unity in regard to power dynamics appeared to be different than those of the English. English cultural understandings of land use and unity required the separation of English spaces from surrounding spaces as a way to signify private ownership and control over the land. Conversely, early modern indigenous communities understood each other to occupy and claim certain spaces as their own while still maintaining dynamic networks of relations that allowed for the sharing of resources and the use of other communities' spaces. Pekka Hämäläinen explains that while English "colonial agents, were blind to indigenous forms of territoriality…indigenous societies knew precisely where their dominions began and others' ended. They abided by a complex array of principles and practices that guided how societies could share resources and how territories could overlap and merge at the edges"

(35). Although Native American and English concepts of land use were not the same, indigenous practices such as paying for permission to conduct trade within a certain space authenticate Native American nations' claims of control within the Virginia area (Greer 84). While Hämäläinen states that colonial settlers were unaware of indigenous forms of territoriality, Smith's description of indigenous customs suggests that the English did know the terms and practices that accompanied the entering of indigenous space. In his *Generall Historie* Smith states, "They all know their severall lands, and habitations, and limits, to fish, soule, or hunt in, but they hold all of their great *Werowance Powhatan*, unto whom they pay tribute" (38). Not only does Smith acknowledge the fact that indigenous communities know the extents of the spaces they control, but he also acknowledges the fact that other nations must "pay tribute" to a political leader in order to gain the resources of and access to the land. This paying of a tribute to use a particular space indicates that this area is in fact controlled by a certain indigenous community.

While English settlers attempt to portray themselves as a cohesive group able to control particular spaces as a result of their cultural understandings of land use and possession, the acknowledgement of indigenous political communities and their claims over particular spaces weakens English attempts to claim and expand definitive English control within Virginia. Smith's claim that indigenous communities have weak forms of centralized power, as a result of not properly using the land, appears to be contradicted by verbal mapping passages in which Smith acknowledges that indigenous leaders reign over large political kingdoms. In one instance, Smith meets with a great indigenous "Emperour" at "Weramocomoco" who proceeds to tell Smith about his "Many Kingdomes" that fall within the Virginia space (*True Relation* 48, 49). Smith states that he "requited [the indigenous chief's] discourse (seeing what pride hee had in his

great and spacious Dominions, seeing that all hee knewe were under his Territories)" by

"describing to him the territories of Europe" and the English nation's grand colonial endeavors

(49). Within his text, Smith reveals that certain indigenous chiefs have dominions and are aware

of where these dominions begin and end. He also tacitly recognizes that the small indigenous

families mentioned above are part of a centralized form of community and government that

occupies a particular space. By feeling the need to requite the chief's discourse, and by

describing indigenous communities as kingdoms or dominions that parallel the dominion of

England, Smith appears to acknowledge the legitimacy of centralized indigenous communities

and their cultural understandings of land use.

      Smith's claims that particular indigenous communities are small and scattered are

undermined further as he marks the large indigenous political "kingdoms" on his cartographic

map. The representation of larger nations is indicated by the oversized lettering used to name

indigenous nations across vast sections of the visual map. The juxtaposition between the size and

positioning of the word "Powhatan" and the word "James-towne" helps to visualize the

disproportionate amounts of space that the Native American nation and the English nation

occupy respectively. While many indigenous nations are easy to identify by looking at Smith's

map, the English-controlled space, labeled "James-towne," is a space that is relatively difficult to

see on Smith's visual map. As Barr and Countryman reference in their introduction to *Contested

Spaces of Early America*, the writing and thus highlighting of Native American habitations on

maps prominently mark their placement within a space rather than erase their presence from the

area (16). While the English may have possession of a confined enclave of pure English control

that can grow incrementally as they attempt to acquire more land, the expanse of indigenous

settlements and dominions is blatantly apparent, suggesting that English claims of pure English control over the entire Virginia space are relatively weak and insubstantial.

Conclusion—

Maps, during the age of exploration, were considered to be accurate depictions of the spaces they represented. While maps were considered to be efficient technologies used to navigate through certain regions, they were also used by nations to convey symbolic claims of power. By visually and verbally mapping geographical features, natural resources and communities within the Virginia territory, early modern colonial writers like John Smith and Ralph Hamor attempted to portray supposedly authentic representations of the Virginia space that suggested the English had definitive control over the region. The use of this specific medium, which exudes the supposition of a true reality, fosters a reader's belief that English claims of commercial mobility, permanent settlement, and the maintenance of cultural unity within the Virginia space were authentic. For centuries, historians, scholars, and other readers have used these texts and their accentuated claims of English control to justify English superiority and the English nation as an imperial power.

While Smith and Hamor use mapping strategies to indicate and highlight claims of English stability, control, and domination within the Virginia region, the maps also depict less-noticeable indications of Native American influence, suggesting the English did not have definitive control over the Virginia space. Continuous textual inconsistencies that appear within verbal mapping passages and on Smith's visual map frustrate claims of English power as the English writers tacitly acknowledge Native American perceptions of land use, an English reliance on indigenous knowledge, and an English dependence on indigenous aid. While English writers attempt to represent English communities as superior to their Native American

counterparts, it is important to note that John Smith and Ralph Hamor describe indigenous individuals and communities in ways that highlight the intricacies and complexities of their political systems, settlement patterns, and forms of territoriality. Smith and Hamor unwittingly indicate in their texts that indigenous individuals and communities are competent peoples that the English consistently depend on for aid and support in the early stages of English colonization. Such textual claims are not emphasized as clearly as claims of English power and accomplishment. However, by reviewing these less-noticeable signs of English struggle, readers understand that early modern English spatial power was not definitive or absolute.

When focusing on these tacit acknowledgments of English struggle and Native American forms of control at the start of colonial endeavors, it becomes clear that English attempts to control American spaces were not smooth and uncontested. Throughout the eighteenth century, the English continued to struggle while attempting to expand settlements into traditional indigenous spaces. As the British colonies were transformed into the United States, attempts to use, occupy, and claim certain spaces were disputed and contested by Euro-American and indigenous communities. Still today, debates regarding sovereignty and self-determination, and contestations over the right to control certain spaces, occur between the United States and Native American nations. By analyzing early modern colonial texts, we see claims of English power sustained. However, when looking more closely to analyze simultaneous and yet subtle acknowledgements of indigenous forms of power that Smith and Hamor represent through their mapping discourses, history appears to rewrite itself, revealing that quests for power within early modern Virginia were in fact quests of struggle, struggle that would continue as the English, and later Americans, sought to control vast expanses of North American space.

CHAPTER II- MUDDLED POWER: THEATRICAL REPRESENTATIONS OF UNSTRUCTURED SPACES AND LIMITED CONTROL IN SHAKESPEARE'S *THE TEMPEST*

Introduction—

The 1611 performance of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* is the first theatrical example known to reference colonial expansion of the English empire (Skura 57). Englishmen enjoying performances of the play in London at the turn of the seventeenth century would have likely been aware of the political and social discourses about English expansion that were prevalent in London at the time. While *The Tempest* appears to indicate and reference English expansion, performances of *The Tempest* were able to do more than depict foreign spaces within the theater. As Meredith Anne Skura notes, "Shakespeare… more than almost any other, both absorbed and shaped the various conflicting discourses of the period" (58). Performances of *The Tempest* that depicted the peripheral spaces of an expanding empire also helped to influence how Englishmen perceived the maintenance of traditional English power structures within global, national, and local regions.

Performances of *The Tempest* taking place in London's Blackfriars Theater would have likely shaped an early modern audience's understandings of space and power at a time when the English empire was expanding and English rule was being fragmented. As the theater space was transformed into a far-away island, stage representations could help form an audience's geographical and cultural understanding of peripheral regions to which they had never travelled (Mulready 3). By analyzing spaces in the play's diegetic world that represented regions far from European power structures that dominated the regions surrounding London's Blackfriars Theater, we can view how various members of early modern English society, not just editors,

scholars, and readers of travel documentation, would have come to understand concepts of space and power both on the empire's periphery and at the nation's center.

In the theater space, English social concerns and public anxieties regarding the muddling of power within peripheral imperial regions were able to be mitigated and managed. In *The Tempest,* hierarchical European power structures remain intact. Yet even on the fictional island, signs and incidences of social disorder occur, as the peripheral space is ungoverned by established institutions enforcing European rules. Prospero, who despite his fraught relationship to the European power structure, can tenuously be read as a European ruler within the foreign space of the island, experiences difficulties obtaining direct control over areas depicted as other "*part[s] of the island*" that are far from his cell. In these regions, lower-class characters are able to fantasize about rising in social status, usurping power from those in charge and creating new societies unlike those of European monarchies. Closer to his cell, Prospero appears to have more control over the actions and movements of others, as he is able to manipulate other characters in order to pursue his own interests. However, in this small enclave in which Prospero appears to have complete control, trouble arises. Without being aware of or able to control actions occurring on other parts of the island, Prospero's control over his own space is threatened.

References to the island space within *The Tempest* and the ways that those areas are represented through stagings of the play indicate that peripheral environments, lacking the institutions needed to enforce European power structures, cannot be easily controlled by European rulers. Problems that arise on the edges of Prospero's island influence the actions Prospero must take to secure control in his satellite European space. Clear boundaries between spaces on the island cannot be maintained as Prospero is unable to adequately surveil those who enter the area close to his cell. Spatial discourses found within the text of Shakespeare's *The*

Tempest and the staging of the play within the Blackfriars Theater indicate that with no way to adequately control the boundaries between peripheral and central imperial regions, it becomes difficult to maintain absolute control over these spaces of an empire. Sitting in a playhouse in London, an early modern audience would have likely related the concepts of space and power presented in the play to their own understandings of space and power within the globalized London city and the expanding English empire. The materiality of the play's performance and the spatial representations within *The Tempest* suggest that individuals located in peripheral spaces, satellite spaces, and spaces close to an imperial center all face similar situations of change, fluidity, and instability that make managing such regions difficult. Ultimately, absolute power cannot be obtained over any region of an empire.

The Destabilization of Control in Spaces of the Expanding English Empire—

At the time *The Tempest* was first performed in 1611, English rule was beginning to expand. As the population of England grew due to immigration and the English colonized foreign spaces, anxieties about maintaining control increased. English officials desired to maintain order and hegemonic rule within the empire as Englishmen began interacting with non-English people in England, on the nation's periphery, and in spaces overseas (Marshall 387). King James and Jacobean officials became concerned with "masterless men" whose mobility could threaten the English social order and social norms (A. Vaughan and V. Vaughan 53, 35).

Even as the imperial government attempted to create fixed settlements in English regions in order to signify permanent possession and maintain control, people within early modern England were moving in fluid and varying ways. The physical and social landscape of the nation began to change as immigration and enclosure policies led to increased mobility (Rollison 3, 2). English officials became concerned with the negative effects mobility could have on English

culture as vagrants were seen as threatening the established social order (Dillon 104). Many statutes attempted to limit illegitimate movement. The 1572 Act against Vagabonds, updated in 1597 and 1604, created harsher penalties for those men who were deemed masterless (104). The creation of such policies indicates English officials' desires to maintain English power structures and social norms that emphasize permanence and stability.

Gypsies represented one group of masterless men within the English nation who threatened social norms within English spaces. English officials saw Gypsies, with their intermittent mobility, and thus landlessness and joblessness, as directly frustrating traditional hierarchical power structures that relied on employment and property ownership to determine a person's permanent placement and status within society (A. Vaughan and V. Vaughan 35). Mobile vagabonds threatened traditional English norms by entering and disrupting physical regions where society had adopted a conceptual space of traditional English norms that regulated family, household, and region (Dillon 104). As mobile people entered and left English regions at will, it became increasingly difficult for English officials to control people and enforce norms within the English space. While early modern Englishmen were becoming increasingly apprehensive about their ability to maintain control in peripheral spaces far from imperial centers, the emphasis on combatting vagabond issues within England indicates that even within the English nation itself, officials could not always adequately control space.

Enforcing English norms and rules in peripheral spaces located within the British Isles also proved problematic. Englishmen attempted to project English norms and power structures within the spaces they sought to control. Yet, without traditional institutions firmly intact in these regions, maintaining distinct social norms and power hierarchies abroad proved to be a difficult task. At the turn of the seventeenth century, the plantation systems in Ireland had caused Irish

resistance to English authority (Marshall 378). Disputes in Ireland did not derive from conflicts that arose between English settlers and English officials, as would be the case with Jamestown. However, the internal colonization of Ireland provides more evidence indicating that Englishmen had difficulties acquiring total control over the spaces they occupied. English plantations provided Englishmen with small enclaves of control, but obtaining total control within the peripheral Irish region could not be actualized without the presence of firmly established English institutions that enforced hegemonic power structures.

At a time when Irishmen were resisting English rule within Ireland, English officials were also struggling to firmly establish authority within the American colonies. Early modern travel documentation references English officials' anxieties in regard to the leveling of social power in spaces on the periphery of an ever-expanding English empire. Stephen Greenblatt notes that the deepest fears of the English did not concern indigenous communities or natural resources found within new imperial spaces, but instead concerned the discipline of the English colonists and "common seamen" (150). In a new region full of potential and possibility, with a sovereign King located far from the land that settlers occupied, colonial settlers appeared to have more leeway in creating societies that differed from the society maintained in England. Without strict adherence to traditional English norms and power structures, disorder and chaos occurred in Jamestown, where mutiny and starvation threatened to destroy the colonial project.

In an attempt to keep stricter control of the proceedings in the Jamestown settlement, Sir Thomas Gates, the newly appointed governor of the colony, was sent to Jamestown in order to run the settlement in a more disciplined fashion. In 1609, several ships embarked from England with men, supplies, and colonial officials on their journey toward the Jamestown colony (A. Vaughan and V. Vaughan 39). Governor Gates was given orders to structure the Jamestown

settlement in a way that better maintained order so that houses could be built, lands could be cleared, crops could be planted, and discovery expeditions could be run more efficiently (Greenblatt 151, 154). An ordered society that resembled that of old England could result in the success of the colonial project abroad.

However, the lack of established institutions enforcing English norms and power structures at sea affected Governor Gates' ability to control the actions of his subordinates, especially when a tropical storm caused the Governor's ship and crew to be stranded on a Bermudan island. Several writers of travel documentation indicated that a crisis of authority occurred on the island as the Governor and his admirals, along with common English people and the ship's crew, had to work together in order to survive and rebuild their ship. The storm that caused the shipwreck acted as a leveling force that resulted in an untraditional power hierarchy (Greenblatt 149). In this unmanaged foreign space, the Governor and other officials who had a high social status in England took orders from seamen and English settlers who had more experience with building shelters and boats. As Stephen Greenblatt states:

> Only with a set of powerful inward restraints could the colonists be kept from rebelling at the first sign of the slippage or relaxation of authority. The company had an official institutional interest in shaping and controlling the minds of its own people. But the Bermuda shipwreck revealed the difficulty of this task as well as its importance: set apart from the institutional and military safeguards established at Jamestown, Bermuda was an experimental space, a testing ground where the extent to which disciplinary anxiety had been internalized by the ordinary venturers could be measured. (150)

The ship's crew and admirals were forced to work together on equal terms in order to survive on the island distanced from institutions that could more effectively safeguard English order and power. In this island space, the Governor and his admirals had difficulty convincing the majority of the ship's passengers to follow the crown's orders. The Virginia Company had ordered Sir Thomas Gates to reside in Jamestown, but the English passengers protested the move from Bermuda (151). Settlers desired instead to abandon official orders and remain in the space full of good weather, green foliage, and an abundance of timber, fish, fowl, and wild pigs (A. Vaughan and V. Vaughan 39). Provoked by the abundance of land and resources, and without threats from institutions enforcing traditional hierarchies, lower-class citizens desired to disobey the commands of authority in order to stay on the comfortable island. The anxieties that English officials faced when thinking about the maintenance of traditional power hierarchies and social order within peripheral spaces were realized on the island. While the settlers ultimately traveled to Virginia under Thomas Gates' command, the unstructured region enabled settlers to protest and disobey commands from figures of English authority, resulting in disorder and the endangering of colonial goals.

While William Strachey's report of the Bermuda Shipwreck was not published in the "True Reportory" until years after *The Tempest* was first performed in London, various scholars have suggested that Shakespeare was informed about the Bermuda shipwreck and used colonial travel documentation to write his play. Alden and Virginia Vaughan state in *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History* that in the fall of 1611, the principal topic regarding the Virginia enterprise must have been the "wracke and redemption" of Thomas Gates' vessel (40). They further state that Strachey, even before writing his official account of the shipwreck, would have been a sudden celebrity in London (40). As Shakespeare knew some of the promoters of the

Virginia enterprise, it is likely that Shakespeare was aware, while writing *The Tempest*, of the shipwreck and English settlers' residence on the Bermudan island. It is reasonable to assume that Shakespeare would have had knowledge of colonial endeavors, even without knowledge of William Strachey's report, as accounts such as Richard Rich's *Newes from Virginia: The Lost Flocke Triumphant*, Silvester Jourdain's *Discovery of the Barmudas*, and The Virginia Company's pamphlet *A True Declaration of the Estate of the Colonie in Virginia* were all published in 1610 (41).

Passages within *The Tempest* that reflect texts describing the Bermuda shipwreck suggest that colonial travel documentation influenced the creation of the play. In addition to the opening scene of *The Tempest* that is performed on a ship, other scenes that take place on the island reference English anxieties about the lack of traditional power and structure within peripheral spaces. Situated on an unidentified island, the play's events would have emulated English concerns at a time when the English empire was expanding and control was becoming fragmented in spaces far from London. Furthermore, while the fragmentation of English control influenced power structures in regions on the edges of the empire, it also influenced power structures and social norms within the center of the empire itself: the city of London.

Performance and the Blackfriars Stage within the World City—

Events occurring within the English empire reached English citizens in London through theatrical performances. Plays that referenced colonial endeavors manipulated and managed audience anxieties regarding the preservation of social order in spaces far from institutions of hegemonic control. The theatrical techniques of "arousing and manipulating anxiety" were "crucial elements in the representational technology of the Elizabethan and Jacobean theater" (Greenblatt 133). Anxiety-inducing moments within *The Tempest* involve the muddling of power

structures enabled by an unstructured foreign space. Sitting in a theater, faced with characters who were causing chaos and disorder by attempting to redefine power relations within the play's diegetic space, audience members would have been forced to acknowledge and confront imperial English concerns that paralleled the plots occurring within the play.

The theater served as a space in which audience members could view, learn about, and analyze stories that related to events occurring throughout the early modern English empire. Citizens would likely have been aware of large projects such as the Ulster plantation and the Virginia project as English colonial discourses flooded the city in the form of travel documentation (Marshall 400). However, for citizens who did not read or had no access to travel documentation, the theater space could provide a way to stay informed about colonial endeavors. In the "New World" and other peripheral regions, where no traditional institutions of power and control existed, it became necessary for English officials to create the hegemony required for the English to rule effectively and pursue national interests. Yet, as these added spaces were assumed under the control of the English empire, they fractured the English identity and made it harder for the English to maintain absolute control within these regions (Bartolovich 23). *The Tempest* is able to dramatize the excitements and anxieties that were associated with the decentered, changing, and fluid nature of these peripheral spaces.

Representations of decentered spaces in *The Tempest* not only informed Londoners about colonized peripheral regions, but also sensitized Londoners to the decentered nature of London itself. For theater-goers who watched an early modern performance of *The Tempest*, reading a space onstage was difficult as spatial conceptions were left open, mutable, and undefined by props or staging. As Lloyd Edward Kermode notes, the less immediate invocation of a particular space on stage forced audience members to work harder to understand the relationships between

character and place (8-9). Through this process that allowed audience members to process the relationships between space and power relations at their own pace, audience members were able to clarify and reconfigure their understandings not only of the spaces represented on stage, but also local, national, and transnational spaces that influenced their daily lives. Just as peripheral spaces in *The Tempest* were characterized as fragmented and fluid sites of muddled power, England's imperial center, too, faced instability. The Blackfriars liberty and the inner city of London were sites of flows and convergences, muddled social order, and spatial decentering that would have had an impact on an audience's perceptions of space and power within the empire.

An early modern performance of *The Tempest* at the Blackfriars Theater would have been likely to reflect and awaken a London audience's anxieties regarding the commercial and settlement expansion of the English empire. The theater was located in the Blackfriars "liberty" of early modern London which, while within London's city walls, was a specific self-governed entity free from the jurisdiction of London (Bly 65; Dillon 97). Throughout the early seventeenth century, King James attempted to secure jurisdiction over the Blackfriars liberty and other liberties such as the Whitefriars. Although in 1608, many liberties, including the Whitefriars, were incorporated under the city's rule, the Blackfriars liberty remained partially sovereign (Dillon 99-100). In the 1608 Charter, the government accepted that the Blackfriars would maintain certain privileges while receiving supervisory control from London officials. The King thus had limited control over the liberty space, as Blackfriars was not fully incorporated under the rule of London.

The status of the Blackfriars liberty likely would have influenced audience reception of the difficulties characters faced while on the island in *The Tempest*. An audience in this setting, a region that could not be effectively controlled under the city's rule, was likely to be more

sensitized to the problems of space and control in the play because such problems overwhelmed English authorities in their own backyards. As Prospero attempts to manage and define strict boundaries and control over the area in which he resides, audience members also would have been able to think about the negotiation of city limits and the control officials had over English spaces close to England's imperial center.

The Blackfriars liberty was not the only space categorized as unmanageable in the early modern era. The problem of unmanageable space could also be seen in the greater city of London. In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the city of London was becoming a global space. While King James and other royal officials attempted to construct London as a neatly enclosed metropolitan area, the city soon became what Deborah Harkness and Jean E. Howard call a "disorienting collection of places and spaces" (2). With the Royal Exchange opening in the city in 1570, and with England diversifying its trade relations with foreign nations, many people, from many different parts of the world, were entering London (Bartolovich 14, 15). London, as a port city, was a space that enabled local, national, and transnational markets to be integrated. The city became the nexus of the expanding English imperial nation as joint-stock companies, trading ventures, plans for colonial exploration, and commercial networks were all embedded within the city limits (Bartolovich 14; Harkness and Howard 3). While colonial projects centered in London focused on the outward expansion of the English empire, people and goods from the periphery of the English empire were also influencing the composition and social space of the city area. Foreign influences helped to produce a disorienting English space as foreign nationals brought goods into the city in order to trade and do other business with Englishmen. Maintaining control over English rules and norms

became a concern to English officials as globalization caused the metropole to become overwhelmed and overrun with goods, people, and services produced in non-English spaces.

The challenging effects of an expanding imperial domain could be represented on the stage in early modern performances such as that of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. While Shakespeare's play may have represented foreign regions on the London stage, the ambiguous nature of the setting in the play suggests that the space could represent any region, whether it be colonial, national, or local, that allows for the destabilization and fluidity of power relationships (Bartolovich 18). The conjuring of societal issues within a performance was a technique playwrights regularly enacted in early modern theater (Bly 68). *The Tempest* references the challenges that could arise as a result of the intermixture of people in a disorganized region. Similar challenges were prevalent in London. As the residential and commercial spaces of London grew, citizens began to worry about the effects, including "vices and eveill[s]," that foreign elements could have on the English population (Bartolovich 16). Sitting in London's Blackfriars Theater, audience members likely would have been aware of the similarities between the play's unidentified island space and a changing London environment.

It is true that *The Tempest* "offers a powerful fantasy of control for an unsettled London in the throes of massive change" (Bartolovich 25). At a time when England was experiencing population growth, increasing unemployment, epidemic disease, and threats to the hierarchical structure of society at home and abroad, the theater space allowed these anxieties of pervasive and unavoidable social deconstruction to be manageable (Greenblatt 137). Even so, audience members within the theater were continually forced to confront feelings of fear, anxiety, and grief along with potential threats to the reigning social order. These feelings plagued not only the characters in the play but also English officials who presided in London, Ireland, and Jamestown.

The Tempest's vague setting allowed an audience to associate problems in the play with problems faced in the English empire. While problems plaguing the English empire were often perceived as occurring in peripheral regions far from the center of institutionalized English control, the physical location of the Blackfriars Theater in the Blackfriars liberty and the changing social space of imperial London suggest that problems portrayed in *The Tempest* are not only meant to represent issues present on the periphery, but also those that occur at the heart of the empire. By viewing occurrences within the city itself, an English audience would have been growing increasingly aware of the decentering and destabilizing expansion of the English empire. With no spaces uncontaminated by globalizing influence, every space within the English empire could feel fraught and uncontrollable.

Disorganization of Traditional Power Structures Far from European-Held Spaces—

In *The Tempest,* the character Prospero, occupying the role of a traditional ruler, attempts to suppress rebellious individuals who desire to overthrow the reigning social order on the island. Although he is eventually able to control people who try to subvert traditional power structures, Prospero experiences difficulties managing actions that occur far from the area in which he resides. Unstructured island spaces far from his cell require constant and vigilant management in order to prevent a relaxation of authority that could cause people to rebel against traditional forms of social order. Yet, as is displayed in various scenes throughout *The Tempest*, the disorganization of social norms and the muddling of hierarchical social structures do occur in regions located far from Prospero's cell. "*On a ship at sea*" and on "*Another part of the island,*" characters are able to control the actions of their superiors and plot to undermine the power that their superiors hold. Representations of space on the stage and textual references to ambitions for power that form in distant regions of the island suggest that there is a potential for the

disordering of power structures in peripheral regions that are distant from institutional influences of hegemonic rule.

In the opening scene of *The Tempest*, viewers experience a space that is separated from any form of established hierarchical rule. The scene directly echoes colonial travel documentation that describes Sir Thomas Gates' 1609 Bermuda shipwreck. In both instances, traditional hierarchical power structures are dissolved as, in the midst of the storm, officials and commoners must work together as equals in order to survive. On the ship's deck, Gonzalo remarks to the other elites, "Let's assist [the seamen], / For our case is as theirs" (Shakespeare 1.1.53-54). At first, the storm acts as an equalizing or leveling influence. Gonzalo's remarks emphasize the fact that, regardless of social status, all individuals in this space are literally in the same boat, threatened with death. The desire to assist the lower-class seamen with their duties leads to an immediate collapse of the distinction between those who labor and those who rule, the very anxiety many Englishmen had about power relations in foreign spaces at the time of English expansion.

While Gonzalo's expression indicates a leveling of power in this sea space, the Boatswain's comments to Gonzalo, Alonso, and Antonio indicate a reversal of traditional power roles. Situated on a ship in the middle of a tempestuous storm, the power of the European nobility seems lessened, and the seamen appear to be more powerful as their skills can ensure everyone's survival. It is the seamen who must keep the ship afloat. When Alonso, King of Naples, comes to the ship deck, the Boatswain tells the King, "I pray now, keep below" (1.1.11). Shortly afterwards, the Boatswain tells another Italian official, Antonio, "You mar our labor. / Keep your cabins; you do assist the storm" (1.1.13-14). The political skills of a King and Duke can be of no help on a ship that is about to capsize. The skills of the lower-class seamen are more

useful. The Boatswain, in a sea space, holds more power than the social elites. He is able to tell them to stay below deck; they are a nuisance to the workers who must perform their duties onboard. As Gonzalo attempts to put the Boatswain back in his place by exclaiming, "Nay, good, be patient," the Boatswain forcefully replies, "When the sea is. Hence! What cares these / roarers for the name of king? To cabin! Silence! / Trouble us not!" (1.1.15-18). The Boatswain challenges Gonzalo to "use [his] authority" to calm the sea if he believes that his councilor skills are so powerful (1.1.24). In this specific environment, Gonzalo's councilor status, and the power he is able to exert by holding such a title, is useless in controlling the weather, or lower-class seamen. The seaman, rather, appears to be in charge during this confrontation, resulting in a shift in the traditional European hierarchical paradigm.

Spaces described as "*Another part of the island*" also allow for traditional power structures to become muddled as European characters are able to fantasize about new social structures and regimes. When the European nobles walk together through the island space, they note that this other "*part of the island*," separated from Prospero's rule-dominated region, appears "to be desert" (2.1.37). The emptiness of the island seems to be a benefit to Gonzalo who states "Here is everything advantageous to life" (2.1.52). A space that is presumably deserted, or uninhabited, is also a space that is free from institutional power structures that dictate social positions and societal norms. Free from these constraints, the characters are able to imagine and plan to create new social norms and structures.

In the foreign space, Sebastian and Antonio, nobles who serve under King Alonso, are able to plot to overthrow the King by taking his life. Sebastian tells his friend, "Draw thy sword. One stroke / Shall free thee from the tribute which thou payest, / And I the King shall love thee" (2.1.296-98). After killing the King, Sebastian and Antonio would be free from the King's

commands, their former duties, and their old social statuses. Alonso, as a European King, embodies the ultimate authority who must enforce traditional social norms and order. By killing the King, the two nobles would undermine the power that their superior holds. At the same time, Sebastian would be illegitimately assuming that power, disrupting the legitimacy of the social hierarchy in order to do so. The two men have their swords drawn, ready to kill the King, when Ariel causes Gonzalo to wake up, forcing the action to be suspended. Even after this attempt is halted, the two men agree that they will kill the King at the next possible opportunity they receive. While another opportunity does not present itself to the men, this scene shows that the island space can inspire subversive ambitions.

The space described as "*Another part of the island*" also allows Gonzalo to dream of a completely new society. While Gonzalo desires to be the King of his society, his societal plan appears to transform traditional power structures even more drastically than Sebastian and Antonio's plan. Gonzalo notes that in his ideal society, "Letters should not be known; riches, / And use of service, none; contract, succession, / Bourn, bound of land, tilth, vineyard, none; / No use of metal, corn, or wine, or oil; / No occupation; all men idle, all; / And women too, but innocent and pure; / No sovereignty" (2.1.155-61). The resources Gonzalo observes while travelling through the island allow him to imagine a society that, with so much abundance, is able to thrive without labor, politics, or wealth. This egalitarian society would be organized unlike a European society that relies upon property ownership, wealth, and professional occupation to order the social hierarchy. While Gonzalo doesn't appear to act upon these fantasies, the space that he occupies allows for these dreams and the thorough planning of a new, untraditional social structure.

In a region free from social constraints and power structures, Stephano, Trinculo and Caliban are also able to thoroughly plot Prospero's murder, which would result in Stephano being named ruler of the island. The details of the plot include "knock[ing] a nail into his head" and "[b]atter[ing] his skull" with his books (3.2.65, 94). At the end of Act Three, Scene Two, the two lower-class characters command Caliban, a man who is familiar with Prospero's region of the island, to lead the group in that direction, enabling them to cross the boundary between "*Another part of the island*" and the space "*In front of Prospero's cell.*" In Act Four, Scene One, the next scene in which these characters appear, the audience views the men within Prospero's space, affirmed by Caliban's statement, "Pray you tread softly…/…We now are near his cell" (4.1.194-95). Prospero is able to prevent Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo from murdering him. However, these characters are able to get dangerously close to accomplishing their goal. While none of the dreams of undermining traditional power structures ultimately comes to fruition, and all usurpation attempts are eventually discovered and foiled, these plans, dreamt in a region far from Prospero's direct control, could possibly be achieved as the lower-class men are provided the opportunity and breathing space needed to thoroughly plan attacks and cross boundaries into the ruler's domain.

Controlling Spaces Close to a European Center—

Prospero appears to have difficulties maintaining total control over regions far from his residence on the island. However, it seems initially that Prospero is able to keep better control of the space in which he resides. Prospero's home on the island is noted by the stage direction "*In front of Prospero's cell.*"

One way in which the relationship between space and power is represented within *The Tempest* is through the material staging of scenes. Three different stage directions indicate that

three different stagings were available for an early modern audience to view. Characters interact with one another "*On a ship at sea*," on "*Another part of the island*," and "*In front of Prospero's cell*." Although scholars know little about the actual staging of early performances of *The Tempest*, in later decades of the seventeenth century, performances of *The Tempest* at the Blackfriars Theater represent the space in front of Prospero's cell as being orderly and neat. The props and set pieces that would have occupied the area upon the stage were placed in symmetry with one another, and Cyprus groves represented on the stage were indicated as being "carefully ordered" (A. Vaughan and V. Vaughan 175). It is quite possible that, performed in the same theater a few decades prior, an early seventeenth-century performance of *The Tempest* would have been staged in a similar fashion. The area in front of Prospero's cell would have likely been well-groomed, trees would have appeared to be well-maintained, and other props would have been organized onstage in a symmetrical pattern. The space in front of Prospero's cell would have been structured. The neat appearance of the area in which Prospero lives mirrors the supposed structure and orderliness of settlements in Europe, suggesting to an early modern English viewer that a peripheral space can be structured, well-maintained, and resemble settlements and cities in Europe.

Within the island space, Prospero seeks to repress and punish rebellious and destructive forces in order to pursue his interest in marrying his daughter Miranda to Prince Ferdinand. Prospero's power to manipulate characters' movements appears to be stronger closer to his home on the island, where traditional power structures are maintained. His ability to effectively manage the area in front of his cell suggests to an English audience that it could be possible to maintain European control over peripheral spaces that are considered satellite sites of an imperial

nation. "*In front of Prospero's cell,*" Prospero can supposedly control the movements and behaviors of other occupants of the island such as Caliban, Ariel, and Ferdinand.

Just as the ordering of the space in front of Prospero's cell gives viewers the visual indication that Prospero is in control of the region in which he resides, actions that occur in front of his cell also indicate that he can control individuals who enter and leave the area. Within the first act of the play, viewers become aware that Prospero has controlled the actions of other inhabitants on the island since he arrived twelve years prior. Viewers learn that Prospero, through the power of coercion and manipulation, has taken the land from the island native Caliban. As Caliban speaks to Prospero in front of Prospero's cell, Caliban states, "This island's mine by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou tak'st from me" (Shakespeare 1.2.331-32). Caliban, originally enticed by Prospero's manipulative powers and gifts, "showed [him] all the qualities o' th' isle, / The fresh springs, brine pits, barren place and fertile" (1.2.337-38). Caliban states that he was once his "own king," but is now one of Prospero's "subjects" (1.2.341, 340). He also tells Prospero, "here you sty me / In this hard rock, whiles you keep from me / The rest o' th' island" (1.2.342-44). Caliban referencing himself as a subject of Prospero indicates to an early modern English audience that Prospero is acting as a ruler within the island space. As Caliban himself notes in the accusation, "here you sty me," Prospero is able to control Caliban's movements and keep him from roaming free. Such representation of the relationship between a European and an indigenous individual parallels the relationship between English settlers and Native Americans within the Chesapeake region. As is noted in Chapter One, Englishmen attempted to convey their own power by portraying indigenous people as immobile. Likewise, by keeping Caliban immobile, Prospero appears to have the power to limit and monitor the majority

of Caliban's actions and behaviors, ensuring that Caliban cannot cause trouble that would

undermine Prospero's power on the island.

Ariel is another character whose movements and actions Prospero is able to manipulate

and control. Viewers become aware that Ariel, trapped in a tree for years as a result of Sycorax's

wrath, was freed by Prospero who "arrived and heard thee" and "let thee out" (1.2.292, 293). As

payment for this act of kindness, Ariel became indentured to the ruler and was forced to perform

tasks for Prospero. Most of Ariel's commands are given in front of Prospero's cell. Ariel's

compliance with the commands that are given within the ruler's space suggests that Prospero has

great power to manipulate and control characters who occupy the region directly in front of his

residence.

While Prospero is able to manipulate the actions of the island's inhabitants in order to

further his personal interests, he is also able to employ a more persuasive type of power within

his space, using charms to paralyze Ferdinand. During Ferdinand and Prospero's first interaction,

Prospero states, "Thou dost here usurp / The name thou ow'st not, and hast put thyself / Upon

this island as a spy, to win it / From me, the lord on't" (1.2.454-57). Accusing Ferdinand of

being a spy, Prospero is able to justify Ferdinand's subsequent captivity. Prospero confronts

Ferdinand, and ultimately controls his movements in order to root Ferdinand to a particular

space, enabling Prospero to spark and monitor the Prince's relationship with Miranda. Instead of

attempting to persuade or manipulate Ferdinand into submission, Prospero subdues the European

prince by "*charm[ing] [him] from moving*." This stage direction written in Act One, Scene Two,

indicates that the actor playing Ferdinand is frozen on the stage, unable to use his drawn sword to

fight Prospero. Prospero goes on to state, "For I can here disarm thee with this stick / And make

thy weapon drop" (1.2.473-74). These lines, too, indicate that Prospero has the power to disarm

Ferdinand with a movement of a wand. While Prospero often indicates that he has studied magic, and knows how to implement it, this is the only time an early modern English audience is able to see Prospero physically using his skill. For an audience viewing the play, this is the one visual depiction of Prospero's active power within the diegetic world, and this one depiction is limited to one staging within the play: the space "*In front of Prospero's cell*." To an audience, whose perception becomes the play's reality, such staging would suggest that Prospero is able to exert the most power within the region closest to his cell, enabling him to effectively control that space.

By using the power of force to paralyze and disarm Ferdinand, Prospero is able to keep Ferdinand confined to a particular area and monitor his actions. This confinement enables Prospero to ensure that future power can be obtained for himself and his family. He can keep Ferdinand close to Miranda and watch the two lovers in the space close to his residence from "*[behind, unseen]*" (3.1). While Ferdinand and Miranda are not aware of Prospero's presence within the scene, the audience is able to view him. Prospero's presence on stage during this scene suggests that in Ferdinand's space of confinement, the area surrounding Prospero's cell, Prospero has the power to view and monitor the characters' behaviors and actions. The ruler must vigilantly do so in order to make sure that Miranda and Ferdinand fall in love, remain abstinent, and marry. Prospero is able to effectively keep a personal watch on his daughter and her suitor, ensuring that power will be maintained for his future family line.

Through representations of space and power depicted in front of Prospero's cell, viewers are able to perceive that, in areas that Europeans directly occupy, order can be maintained and self-interests can be pursued. Members of an early modern English audience watching a performance of *The Tempest* could have their concerns about social disorder in peripheral

regions alleviated by observing Prospero's ability to maintain control over the satellite space in which he resides.

Lack of Absolute Control Even in a European-Held Space—

Prospero appears to have definitive power over the region closest to his cell. However, this perception becomes complicated as, with no way to effectively monitor the boundaries between spaces on the island, Prospero cannot maintain absolute control over regions far from or close to his satellite center. The fragility of Prospero's power within his own space is highlighted in the scene in which he becomes distracted while dealing with Ferdinand and Miranda. In Act Four, Prospero, occupying the area in front of his cell, uses his power to command Ariel to create an illusion that will influence and manipulate Ferdinand and Miranda's thoughts and actions. In order to fulfill his interest in securing a royal position for his future heirs, Prospero must ensure that Ferdinand and Miranda remain abstinent. Prospero creates an illusion in which goddesses celebrate the couple's desires to marry and warn the two about lust and impurity. As Prospero attempts to influence the couple to stay chaste, the display distracts him. Prospero fails to monitor the boundaries of his space, enabling Caliban, Stephano and Trinculo to enter into Prospero's residence in order to kill him. This looming threat undermines the perception that Prospero is able to directly control the actions occurring within his space as he remembers to combat the issue only at the very last second.

Prospero's lack of control over the area close to his cell stems from his inability to control who enters this space from other parts of the island. After Prospero witnesses Miranda and Ferdinand fall in love, he states, "my rejoicing / At nothing can be more. I'll to my book; / For yet ere suppertime must I perform / Much business appertaining" (3.1.93-96). In the beginning of Act Three, Prospero is cautious about celebrating the achievement of his ultimate

plan for power because he is aware that there is still business to attend to and issues that could

arise. However, by the beginning of Act Four, Prospero has allowed himself to narrow his

interest in order to focus on the particular goal of marrying Miranda to the Prince, abandoning

his interest in monitoring threats coming from other parts of the island. Prospero himself claims

to have forgotten "that foul conspiracy / Of the beast Caliban and his confederates / Against [his]

life" (4.1.139-141). He goes on to state, "The minute of their plot / Is almost come," indicating

that he has only minutes to spare before the lower-class characters attempt to kill him (4.1.141-

42). By the time the distracted Prospero remembers the murderous plot, the lower-class men are

already near Prospero's cell (4.1.195). Boundaries between other regions of the island and the

space in front of Prospero's cell disappear, as Prospero is unable to vigilantly monitor the

borders of his enclave. In order to control the totality of his space, Prospero must be aware of

actions occurring not just in the area directly surrounding his cell, but also on other parts of the

island. Actions in these other regions have the potential to affect the region directly in front of

his cell.

Caliban's plan of usurpation can occur because he is able to occupy regions farther from

Prospero's cell. The mobility needed to collect firewood for Prospero and Miranda, a task

Caliban is forced to complete as Prospero's subject, also enables Caliban to meet lower-class

European men who are willing to kill a European duke in order to control the island for

themselves. Prospero, rarely ever occupying spaces represented as "*Another part of the island*,"

cannot physically view or monitor the actions taking place in these regions. Without being

physically present in regions far from his cell, Prospero faces difficulties controlling or

manipulating plans that form in these areas. Unable to effectively monitor incidents that occur

outside of the space in which he resides, Prospero cannot have firm control over the region in

front of his cell. Caliban and other lower-class Europeans are able to plot Prospero's murder and eventually enter the European ruler's space in order to do harm.

Prospero is not the main individual who monitors events that occur on "*Another part of the island*." He relies on a more mobile character to monitor and manipulate actions for him. It is Ariel who boards the ship in Act One and divides the nobles into isolated groups. Ariel is the individual who enchants the European men with his music and puts them into trances. He is also the character who is able to conjure other spirits to present a masque in front of Prospero's cell. Ariel may never be seen by characters onstage, unless dressed as a harpy or as Ceres (Egan 62). However, an audience is able to see the spirit conducting charms in several spaces including "*On a ship at sea,*" on other "*part[s] of the island,*" and even *"In front of Prospero's cell."* From Ariel's presence on stage during various scenes, an audience can understand that the spirit is mobile throughout the island. Prospero, unlike his messenger, is rarely seen far from the area surrounding his cell. This spatial depiction suggests to viewers that in order for Prospero to rule other parts of the island and the area in front of his cell effectively, he must rely on Ariel and his magical powers.

While Prospero is able to monitor some incidents by commanding Ariel to spy on and distract others on the island, maintaining absolute control of the island space through the use of a conduit is not always effective. In order to control plans occurring on other parts of the island while also attempting to pursue interests within his residential space, Prospero must trust that Ariel can effectively monitor actions and relay pertinent information back to him. However, in Act Four, Scene One, Ariel is unwilling to remind Prospero of the crucial detail that Trinculo, Stephano and Caliban are coming to murder him. Once Prospero remembers Caliban's plan of usurpation himself and commands Ariel to address the concern, Ariel states, "Ay, my commander. When I presented Ceres, /

I thought to have told thee of it, but I feared / Lest I might anger thee" (Shakespeare 4.1.167-69).

Ariel's withholding of pertinent information indicates that Prospero cannot rely on Ariel as

effectively as he can rely on himself. Prospero's inability to rely on Ariel to effectively surveil and

recall plots occurring in peripheral island spaces causes power close to his imperial center to become

fragile and vulnerable to attack.

Prospero, relying on Ariel to monitor actions occurring far from his residence, is only

seen on "*Another part of the island*" once. Even in this instance, Ariel is the individual using his

powers of illusion to distract the European nobles from finding Prince Ferdinand. Prospero

merely watches from above. The positioning of Prospero during the banquet scene at the end of

Act Three does connote a sense of Prospero's power as he stands invisible "*on the top*" (3.3). As

John C. Adams indicates, this stage direction most likely refers to the highest gallery in the

theater where musicians play music. The Blackfriars Theater, unlike the Globe Theater, had two

galleries, one positioned on top of the other (413). Prospero, standing in the uppermost position

on the stage, would have been occupying a space that was rarely used by stage actors during a

performance. Prospero would have appeared high above the floor seats looking out upon the

audience and the characters engaged in the banquet scene. The dramatic effect connotes a sense

of power as Prospero is able to look down upon the stage and witness everything that the

characters are doing. He is able to surveil all movements, actions, and discussions, potentially

enabling him to better control this island space in order to suit his needs. This top-level position

could suggest to viewers that, on this island, Prospero is omniscient, thereby aiding his ability to

influence the wills and movements of those who enter regions he seeks to control.

The positioning of Prospero at the end of Act Three, Scene Three parallels the

positioning of the goddess Juno in Act Four, Scene One. In this scene, Juno *"descends"* from her

chariot via a stage trap located in "the heavens." Juno, who also later "alights" during the masque scene, represents a heavenly figure who is wise and all-knowing. By occupying the same space upon the stage as the goddess Juno, Prospero may also be perceived as god-like and wise.

Yet it is important to note that the power ascribed to Juno in the masque scene is not real power; Juno is not represented within the play as being a true goddess. The doubling effect of the masque taking place within the overall performance of *The Tempest* allows viewers to be aware of the fact that Juno is not a goddess, but a spirit portraying a goddess. This spirit has no omniscient power at all; she and all of her power are an illusion. Prospero makes the audience aware of this fact after he breaks the silence required for the masque to be performed and tells Ferdinand, "These our actors, / As I foretold you, were all spirits and / Are melted into air, into thin air " (Shakespeare 4.1.148-150). The illusion that Prospero calls an "insubstantial pageant" is a vision made of a "baseless fabric" that quickly and easily fades (4.1.155, 151). Just as the vision itself is "baseless," the power attributed to Juno in the masque scene is also "baseless." Instead of reasoning that Prospero, like Juno, is wise, omniscient, and powerful, Prospero, like Juno, is represented as having only the illusion of power as he stands above individuals. Prospero's positioning during the banquet scene appears to indicate that this European figure is able to control all spaces on the island. However, the similarity between Prospero's positioning and the positioning of the illusion of Juno in the next scene ultimately suggests that the power both entities appear to hold is a mere fantasy considering "We are such stuff / As dreams are made on" (4.1.156-57).

Prospero's actions during the masque scene also reveal that he only maintains tenuous control close to his residence. Initially, audience members view Prospero as powerful due to his ability to use his charms, close to his cell, to summon goddesses and "[Make] this place

Paradise" (4.1.124). Yet the goddess' presence and presumed power within this scene are fragile. Prospero warns that it only takes one word to break the silence and have the divine figures disappear. Shortly after Prospero warns Ferdinand and Miranda to be completely silent, Prospero himself speaks, breaking the illusion of power the goddess has. A visual depiction of Juno's power transpires as she is raised above the stage in her chariot to speak to the characters below. It is in this moment, the moment when Juno's presumed power is represented as strong, and her knowledge omniscient, that the illusion of the masque is broken. Just as Prospero reveals his flaw of a mortal's memory and recalls Caliban's trespass, Juno and the fantastical world disappear. The audience is left with the image of Prospero, Ferdinand, and Miranda standing alone on stage forced to confront Caliban and his lower-class friends. Even within the space closest to his residence, Prospero is unable to conjure lasting visual depictions of strength and power. Instead, he ultimately reminds the audience of how fragile his powers truly are.

The genre of *The Tempest* inherently shows the instability and limits of colonial power as the social meanings and constructions formed by watching the play within the theater space disappear at the end of the performance. In the meta-theatrical masque scene, Prospero refers to the masque as an "insubstantial pageant" and a "baseless fabric," which also describes the genre of performance more generally. A theatrical experience is merely an illusion that fades quickly and easily at the end of a show. It therefore becomes impossible to represent colonial power in absolute terms within the theater space because spaces within the play's world and all power found in them disappear. The only absolute ever represented is the termination of conceptions of power at the end of a performance. The genre of performance highlights the instability of its content, in this case suggesting that definitive power cannot be represented or achieved in any empire.

Conclusion—

The struggles to control and maintain power in peripheral and satellite spaces are represented within Shakespeare's *The Tempest.* Prospero, occupying only a small portion of the island, has difficulty efficiently monitoring actions that occur in regions far from his cell. In these areas, described as "*On a ship at sea*" and "*Another part of the island,*" a lower-class boatswain is able to command European nobles, nobles are able to plot to kill the Italian King, and lower-class Europeans and an indigenous islander are able to plot to kill the Italian Duke. Closer to his cell, Prospero initially appears to have more definitive control. In this space, he is able to command his servants to help him achieve his goals, and he is able to limit characters' movements. However, even in the areas closest to his cell, Prospero's power remains fragile. Without vigilantly being able to monitor the fluid boundaries between his cell and other parts of the island, lower-class characters are able to enter his space unannounced in an attempt to kill him.

At the end of *The Tempest*, concerns about power in peripheral spaces are supposedly resolved. Prospero is able to reveal Antonio and Sebastian's murderous plot against King Alonso and Caliban, Trinculo and Stephano's plot to kill Prospero. Miranda and Ferdinand's love is shown to King Alonso, and all Europeans return to Italy in order to carry out the rest of their lives. Anxieties regarding the muddling of power are alleviated and traditional power hierarchies and social norms are restored.

Despite all issues being resolved at the end of the play, the problems the play creates can never truly alleviate audience members' concerns. Tensions arising around the issues of space and power are so vividly depicted that these problems cannot easily be erased. The numerous difficulties Prospero faces while attempting to control regions on the island suggest to audience

members that the control maintained and managed at the end of the play is tenuous and fragile. Right until the end of the performance, Prospero must remain constantly vigilant in order to make sure he can control actions occurring within his space.

The problems Prospero faces in *The Tempest* are similar to problems that English settlers faced within the Chesapeake region. Representations of power and space within a performance of *The Tempest* indicate to an early modern audience that control is difficult to obtain in peripheral regions. On an island that has few institutions enforcing traditional European social norms, Prospero struggles to manipulate and halt the actions of subordinate characters. There is more leeway afforded to lower-class characters and less ability for European rulers to control rebellious individuals in peripheral spaces far from European centers. Indications of Prospero's struggles further the claims made in Chapter One, showing that, despite a small enclave of presumably definitive control within a peripheral space, Europeans had trouble definitively controlling the vast regions that surrounded their settlements. In both instances, power obtained by Europeans is limited and fragile.

Chapter Two furthers the claims made in Chapter One by suggesting that European control was not only fragile and limited in peripheral regions surrounding European settlements, but also fragile in satellite spaces and areas close to the empire's center. Even in a space occupied by a ruler who attempts to enforce traditional power structures close to his residence, absolute control cannot be acquired. The inability to control peripheral spaces impacts Prospero's ability to effectively control the space closest to his residence. The destabilization of traditional norms and power hierarchies enables boundaries between imperial spaces to become blurred, permitting peripheral influences to become significant concerns for those who reside in the empire's center. *The Tempest* would thus have evoked early modern English concerns about

imperial expansion and even the changing nature of London itself, as absolute control dissolved when actions occurring in peripheral spaces influenced satellite and central sites of power. The lack of definitive distinction between the periphery and center ultimately suggests that rulers could not establish or exert absolute control over any space within the expanding empire.

Conclusion

Early modern spatial discourses reveal the anxieties and struggles faced at the start of English colonization. Contestations over space and control can be seen in visual and verbal mapping passages in travel documentation and representations of colonial regions in the London theater. Colonizers in the early seventeenth century represented spaces in ways that attempted to portray claims of English power as authentic and accurate. In John Smith's *A True Relation* (1608), his *Generall Historie of Virginia* (1624), and Ralph Hamor's *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia* (1615), the English writers attempt to manipulate interpretations of space by mapping geographic features, natural resources, and communities within Virginia in ways that suggested the English could obtain autonomous commercial mobility, permanent settlement, and cultural unity within the American space. However, the contradicting textual representations of space in these maps actually undermine the writers' claims of authentic, definitive English power within Virginia, as the writers tacitly acknowledge a reliance on indigenous spatial knowledge, a dependence on indigenous aid, and indigenous cultural understandings of land use.

As the English empire began to grow and expand in the early seventeenth century, anxieties about maintaining absolute control and hegemonic rule became an increasing concern at home, on the nation's periphery, and in regions overseas. In the Blackfriars Theater, these anxieties could be addressed and mitigated as Shakespeare's Prospero ultimately controls regions close to his residence within a peripheral space, ensuring that hierarchical European power structures could remain intact far from the nation's imperial center. However, signs and incidences of social disorder occur, as the peripheral space is free from established institutions enforcing European rules. Without being aware of or able to control actions occurring on other

parts of the island, Prospero's control over his own space is threatened, suggesting to an early modern audience that peripheral spaces, regardless of distance from a European-held center, can only be tenuously controlled.

By analyzing the conversations surrounding contested spaces and power in early modern English spatial discourses, we can begin to understand how early modern English readers and viewers may have understood concepts of space and power at a time when the imperial nation was expanding. While early modern English texts such as *A True Relation*, *Generall Historie of Virginia*, *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia*, and *The Tempest* attempt to reduce English anxieties about imperial expansion, emphasize the benefits of colonization, and highlight the definitive English power to control peripheral spaces, there are also instances in which these texts highlight the English inability to control peripheral regions far from English centers of imperial control as well as areas closer to the center of the empire.

We can thus see that English claims of power in the early seventeenth century were not absolute. Colonial spatial discourses, representing desires rather than realities, ultimately reveal the complexities of power relationships that indicate English settlers and colonial officials struggled to control peripheral spaces of the English empire. Early modern texts show that European ideologies of absolute power did not dictate the nature of spatial disputes occurring during the colonial period. Despite the perception that Englishmen had an absolute right to rule lands that were claimed by Native American tribes, this absolute right to rule was not automatically fulfilled upon arriving on American soil. English perceptions did not bind Native American communities to concede or relinquish their territories. In fact, Englishmen struggled to overcome obstacles, create settlements, and encroach on lands possessed by indigenous communities.

Early modern ideologies projecting the idea that the English had absolute power in peripheral regions suggest that English and indigenous spaces and power relations were already fixed at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Such ideologies discourage readers from understanding the complexities of indigenous and European spaces and cultural dynamics within Virginia at the time of colonization. The fantasy that the English were able to easily control American regions continues to exert influence over the way United States judges think about U.S. and Native American power relations and spaces today. Conquest ideologies embedded in the Doctrine of Discovery and early modern English colonial texts are still used by courts today when ruling upon spatial disputes occurring in America. By reevaluating early modern spatial discourses that indicate struggles of English power in peripheral spaces, readers can understand that the struggle for power in America continued throughout the seventeenth century, remained for hundreds of years, and continues today.

If we continue to frame debates about Native American territory and sovereignty in terms of conquest ideologies, Native Americans will continue to be denied their rights to maintain power and control over the regions in which they live. The examination of early modern spatial discourses that reference the lack of absolute power that Englishmen had in peripheral American spaces can correct the ideological perceptions of definitive English control. Native American spatial perspectives, ideologies, and forms of territoriality can be better acknowledged and validated as we begin to understand that Native American communities claimed and controlled vast American spaces prior to, during, and after the arrival of the English. Such understandings can help us reframe spatial debates within the United States today, allowing us to come to fair and just resolutions regarding contestations over space and sovereign control in America. By deemphasizing ideologies grounded in the myths of absolute power and control, we can begin to

better understand the realities of the contested spaces that formed in the seventeenth century and

still continue to form and take shape today.

Appendix A
John Smith's A Map of Virginia

Works Cited

Adams, John C. "The Staging of The Tempest, III. Iii." *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 14, no. 56, 1938, pp. 404–419.

Albers, Patricia, and Jeanne Kay. "Sharing the Land: A Study in American Indian Territoriality." *A Cultural Geography of North American Indians*. By Thomas E. Ross and Tyrel G. Moore. Boulder: Westview, 1987. 47-91. Print.

Barr, Juliana. "Borders and Borderlands." *Why You Can't Teach United States History without American Indians*. Susan Sleeper-Smith, Juliana Barr, Scott Manning Stevens, Nancy Shoemaker, and Jean M. O'Brien. Chapel Hill, NC: U of North Carolina, 2015. 9-25. Print.

Barr, Juliana. "Geographies of Power: Mapping Indian Borders in the 'Borderlands' of the Early Southwest." The *William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 68, no. 1, 2011, pp. 5–46.

Barr, Juliana, and Edward Countryman. "Maps and Spaces, Paths to Connect, and Lines to Divide." Introduction. *Contested Spaces of Early America*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania, 2014. 1-28. Print.

Bartolovich, Crystal. "'Baseless Fabric': London as a 'World City'." *"The Tempest" and Its Travels*. By Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman. London: Reaktion, 2000. 13-26. Print.

Berkey, Curtis. "City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation." *American Indian Law Review*, vol. 30, no. 2, 2005, pp. 373–384.

Bly, Mary. "Playing the Tourist in Early Modern London: Selling the Liberties Onstage." *PMLA*, vol. 122, no. 1, 2007, pp. 61–71.

Brooks, Lisa Tanya. *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota, 2008. Print.

City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of New York, 544 U.S. 197 (2005).

Cresswell, Tim. *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Certeau, Michel De. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, CA: U of California, 1984. Print.

Dillon, Janette. *Theatre, Court and City, 1595-1610: Drama and Social Space in London*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.

Floyd-Wilson, Mary, and Garrett A. Sullivan. *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. Print.

Fuller, Mary C. *Voyages in Print: English Travel to America, 1576-1624*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.

Fulton, Robert C. "'The Tempest' and the Bermuda Pamphlets: Source and Thematic Intention." *Interpretations*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1978, pp. 1–10.

Gillespie, Raymond. "Plantations in Early Modern Ireland". *History Ireland* 1.4 (1993): 43–47. Web.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "Chapter 5: Martial Law in the Land of Cockaigne." *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*. Berkeley: U of California, 1988. 129-65. Print.

Greer, Allen. "Dispossession in a Commercial Idiom: From Indian Deeds to Land Cession Treaties." *Contested Spaces of Early America*. By Juliana Barr and Edward Countryman. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania, 2014. 69-92. Print.

Grier, Miles P. "Staging the Cherokee *Othello*: An Imperial Economy of Indian Watching." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 73, no. 1, 2016, pp. 73–106.

Hämäläinen, Pekka. "The Shapes of Power: Indians, Europeans, and North American Worlds from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Century." *Contested Spaces of Early America*. By Juliana Barr and Edward Countryman. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania, 2014. 31-68. Print.

Hamor, Ralph. *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia and the Successe of the Affaires There till the 18 of Iune. 1614. Together with a Relation of the Seuerall English Townes and Forts, the Assured Hopes of That Countrie and the Peace Concluded with the Indians. The Christening of Powhatans Daughter and Her Mariage with an Englishman. Written by Raphe Hamor the Yonger, Late Secretarie in That Colony*. Oxford: Text Creation Partnership, 2004. *Early English Books Online [ProQuest]*. Web. 9 Nov. 2015.

Harkness, Deborah, and Jean E. Howard. "Introduction: The Great World of Early Modern London." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 71, no. 1, 2008, pp. 1–9.

Holland, Steve, and Valerie Volcovici. "Trump Clears Way for Controversial Oil Pipelines." *Reuters*. Thomson Reuters, 24 Jan. 2017. Web. 01 Feb. 2017.

Hornsby, Stephen J., and Michael Hermann. *British Atlantic, American Frontier: Spaces of Power in Early Modern British America*. Hanover: U of New England, 2005. Print.

Jager, Rebecca K. "Pocahontas." *Malinche, Pocahontas, and Sacagawea: Indian Women as Cultural Intermediaries and National Symbols*. N.p.: U of Oklahoma, 2015. 211-45. Print.

Johnson v. Mc'Intosh 22 Ill.21 U.S. 543, 8 Wheat. 543, 5 L. Ed. 681 (1823).

Jones, Athena, Jeremy Diamond, and Gregory Krieg. "Trump Advances Controversial Oil Pipelines with Executive Action." *CNN*. Cable News Network, 24 Jan. 2017. Web. 04 Feb. 2017.

Kermode, Lloyd Edward. "Experiencing the Space and Place of Early Modern Theater." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 43.1 (2013): 1-24. Web.

Kupperman, Karen Ordahl. "Apathy and Death in Early Jamestown." *The Journal of American History*, vol. 66, no. 1, 1979, pp. 24–40.

Lamb, Mary Ellen, and Valerie Wayne. "Chapter 7: Virtual Audiences and Virtual Authors: The Winter's Tale, The Tempest, and Old Wives' Tale." *Staging Early Modern Romance: Prose Fiction, Dramatic Romance, and Shakespeare*. 1st ed. New York: Routledge, 2009. 122-45. Print.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1991.

Lewis, G. Malcolm. *Cartographic Encounters: Perspectives on Native American Mapmaking and Map Use*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 1998. Print.

Marshall, Tristan. "The Tempest and the British Imperium in 1611." *The Historical Journal*, vol. 41, no. 2, 1998, pp. 375–400.

Mintz, S., and S. McNeil. "John Smith's 1616 Letter to Queen Anne of Great Britain." *Digital History*. Uh.edu, 2014. Web. 09 Nov. 2015.

Mulready, Cyrus. *Romance on the Early Modern Stage: English Expansion Before and After Shakespeare*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Print.

Read, David. *New World, Known World : Shaping Knowledge In Early Anglo-American Writing*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005. *eBook Academic Collection (EBSCOhost)*. Web. 9 Nov. 2015.

Rollison, David. "Exploding England: The Dialectics of Mobility and Settlement in Early Modern England." *Social History*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1999, pp. 1–16.

Seed, Patricia. *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492–1640*. N.p.: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.

Shakespeare, William, and Robert Woodrow Langbaum. *The Tempest: With New and Updated Critical Essays and a Revised Bibliography*. NY, NY: Signet Classics, 1998. Print.

Skura, Meredith Anne. "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in 'The Tempest.'" *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 1, 1989, pp. 42–69.

Smith, John. "A True Relation by Captain John Smith, 1608." Ed. Lyon Tyler. *Original Narratives of Early American History* (2003): 27-71. *American Journeys Collection*. Wisconsin Historical Society, 2003. Web. 9 Jan. 2016.

Smith, John. "John Smith's A Map of Virginia." *John Smith's Virginia, 1612, Tracy W. McGregor Library of American History, Special Collections (A 1612 .S55)*. N.p.: n.p., n.d. N. pag. *University of Virginia Library*. Web. 21 Oct. 2016.

Smith, John. *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England and the Summer Isles: With the Names of the Adventurers, Planters, and Governours from Their First Beginning An: 1584 to This Present 1624. With the Proceedings of Those Several Colonies and the Accidents That Befell Them in All Their Journeys and Discoveries. Also the Maps and Descriptions of All Those Countryes, Their Commodities, People, Government, Customes, and Religion Yet Knowne. Divided into Six Bookes. By Captaine Iohn Smith Sometymes Governour in Those Countryes & Admirall of New England*. London: n.p., 1624. *Literature Online [ProQuest]*. Web. 3 Oct. 2015.

Steele, Ian Kenneth. "English Jamestown and the Powhatan, 1607-1677." *Warpaths: Invasions of North America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1995. 37-59. Print.

Thrush, Coll. "'Meere Strangers: Indigenous and Urban Performances in Algonquian London, 1580-1630'." *Urban Identity and the Atlantic World*. By Elizabeth A. Fay and Leonard Von Morzé. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. 195-218. Print.

Thrush, Coll. *Indigenous London: Native Travelers at the Heart of Empire*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2016. Print.

Vaughan, Alden T., and Virginia Mason. Vaughan. *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991. Print.