

THE SAVAGE SELF

THE SAVAGE SELF:
“INDIANS” AND THE EMERGENCE
OF THE MODERN BRITISH SUBJECT

By

ROBBIE RICHARDSON, B.A. (HONOURS), M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctorate of Philosophy

McMaster University

© Copyright by Robbie Richardson, December 2010

DOCTORATE OF PHILOSOPHY

(English)

McMaster University

Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Savage Self: “Indians” and the Emergence of the Modern British Subject

AUTHOR: Robbie Richardson, B.A.H. (University of Winnipeg), M.A. (McMaster
University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Peter Walmsley

NUMBER OF PAGES: vi, 244

Abstract

This dissertation explores literary representations of North American Indigenous people in eighteenth-century British texts. Throughout the century, “Indians” appeared frequently in British print culture, in newspapers, periodicals, and travel narratives, but the primary focus in this work is on imaginative writing such as novels, plays, poetry, and essays. Many of these texts are surprisingly overlooked, and scholarship regularly diminishes the significance of Indians in literature during the period. I argue that these texts explore modernity through Indigenous subjectivity, and ultimately contribute to the shaping of modern British identity.

While the figure of the Indian is often thought of as a primitive “noble savage,” Indians were also used to negotiate modern discourses which Britons were beginning to encounter throughout the eighteenth century. The important developments in British culture during the time, such as the forming of a unified British identity, the rise of capitalism and consumerism, and empire, impacted the lives and identities of Britons, and the Indian was used as a kind of “other self” to negotiate their effects. This dynamic began with texts surrounding the 1710 visit by four Iroquois “Indian kings” to London a few years following the Acts of Union, and increased mid-century as conflict in the colonies escalated. First Nations people began to play an important strategic role and were more frequently encountered by British soldiers and travellers, which led to a rise in textual representation in the metropolis. Both as critics of European culture and discursive sites upon which to project emerging cultural forces, Indians functioned as imagined modern subjects; by the end of the century, the figure of the Indian became appropriated by the Romantics and other writers, and the hybrid Briton who internalized Indigenous fortitude and cultural tenacity became the corrective to the decadence and corruption of European culture.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the faculty, staff, and students in the Department of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, who provided me with an ideal and collegial setting to write this work, and nurtured the diverse and interdisciplinary critical tools with which I could explore my field. The varied interests and perspectives of my colleagues and mentors has been inspirational and influential, and helped shape not only my approach to my own work, but to research and knowledge in a broader sense.

I am grateful to my supervisor, Peter Walmsley, for getting me through the process of writing this dissertation with encouraging words and feedback which was always timely and insightful. The level of professional and personal support was above and beyond any expectations. My committee members Eugenia Zuroski-Jenkins and Daniel Coleman also provided crucial words and ideas, and brought in alternative perspectives to the work which proved vital and productive. I am very thankful to the North Shore Micmac District Council and Hazel Francis for their support, and for taking a chance in helping out a PhD student. During the lonely process of writing, it was validating to know I had their backing and that of my community, Pabineau First Nation. The funding of the National Aboriginal Achievement Foundation and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council were also vital to allow me to write this dissertation.

My parents, my brother Scott and sister Deborah, and all my relations have greatly aided in providing encouragement and interest in my work, eagerly purchasing my published materials and listening patiently to my ongoing struggles. While to some it seemed my education would never end, they nonetheless continued to be proud of my work and modest achievements. Laurie Bertram was a consistent supportive force who provided much needed support, feedback, and dissertation-writing solidarity over the years, while Mark King, Jo Snyder, and David Guillas helped to bring clarity to my life. So many others have aided and influenced me in my work and life, and I am grateful to all those role models and kindred spirits.
Wela'lin.

The Savage Self: “Indians” and the Emergence of the Modern British Subject

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Indians and the Emergence of Britain	9
Chapter 2: Indians and the “<i>ancien régime</i>” of Identity	57
Chapter 3: Consuming Indians: <i>Tsonnonthouan</i>, Colonialism, and the Commodification of Culture	119
Chapter 4: Sentimental Appropriations: The Lure of Hybridity	170
Conclusion	233
Bibliography	238

List of Illustrations:

Figure 1: Peter Williamson, 1759	111
Figure 2: <i>Robinson Crusoe</i>, 1719	112
Figure 3: Mohawk Warrior, 1759	113
Figure 4: Delaware Indian, 1766	114
Figure 5: Delaware Indian, 1772	115
Figure 6: Delaware Indian, 1790	116
Figure 7: Peter Williamson, 1792	117
Figure 8: <i>Richard Falconer</i>, 1720	118

Introduction

This dissertation will explore representations of First Nations people in eighteenth-century British literature and their relation to “modernizing” developments occurring in Britain and its colonies which affected British subjectivity. These developments include the coalescing of an individual and national sense of British identity, the rise of capitalism and consumerism, and the growth of an overseas empire. The term “Indians” will be employed throughout in describing these representations. The reason for this usage is that the figure of the Indian is a specific, though as we shall see widely varied, discursive construction.¹ This construction is at times informed by actual encounters with Indigenous people, mediated through the accounts of explorers, traders, missionaries, and others, and in some cases is reflective of actual Native cultural values and experiences, but the purpose here is not to either prove or disprove British understandings; rather, it is to examine the function of this discourse in eighteenth-century British culture and society. There are numerous sites for investigation, from British government policy to newspapers to historical and ethnographic accounts, but the primary focus will be on imaginative literature.² It is in these texts that the various currents of thought forming the Indian are distilled and begin to engage with new British social and cultural discourses

¹ As Gerald Vizenor argues “[t]he word *Indian* [. . .] is a colonial enactment,” making the Indian “an occidental invention that became a bankable simulation” (11).

² For a useful overview of non-literary representations, see Bickham, Troy. *Savages Within the Empire: Representations of American Indians in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005, and Pratt, Stephanie. *American Indians in British Art, 1700-1840*. Norman: U Oklahoma P, 2005.

looking for purchase.

Other factors form the complex discourse surrounding Indians in Britain, from historical circumstance to the literary marketplace, but the emphasis throughout these chapters is on the relation between Indians and the latest developments in British culture of the time. To be sure, there exists a large body of pernicious, even pathological texts which paint Indians in the most negative and backwards ways imaginable, but the project of unpacking these works is not the goal of this dissertation. Some of these texts, including captivity narratives, will be addressed, but the purpose will be to examine the remarkable gap between the admiration and rejection of Indian subjectivity.

The methodology of this work is informed by Foucault's genealogical method; he describes genealogy as operating "on a field of entangled and confused parchments, on documents that have been scratched over and recopied many times" (76). It is not a search for "origins," but rather rejects this endeavour. The goal is to "identify the accidents, the minute deviations-- or conversely, the complete reversals-- the errors, the false appraisals, and the faulty calculations that give birth to those things that continue to exist and have value for us; it is to discover that truth or being does not lie at the root of what we know and what we are, but the exteriority of accidents" (81). The purpose of history in this view "is not to discover the roots of our identity, but to commit itself to its dissipation" (95). The construction of Indians and the discourse which produced this complex image both need to be understood and unpacked. From an

Indigenous perspective, it is important to see the relation between the discursive construction of Indians as a productive field of negotiation and the simultaneous rejection of Native people from modernity. Postcolonial theory has been working for some time on the task of dissipating the hegemonic European subject who dominated the nineteenth and twentieth century, uncovering the ways in which Western modernity was shaped and challenged by those who were oppressed by it. Much of this theory is informed by the European colonization of Africa and South Asia, in part because these regions can currently for the most part be described as “postcolonial” in the literal sense. North America, by contrast, is composed of settler states and therefore does not possess the same kind of colonial history. However, notwithstanding the problematics of utilizing a term such as “postcolonial” in the North American context,³ this approach also informs this dissertation in its interest in decentring the hegemony of Western modernity. Indians were ostensibly peripheral to the rise of British global cultural and economic domination, but focusing on these representations makes it clear that imaginative and real encounters with Indigenous people were crucial aspects to European self-imagining.

This dissertation does not claim to evoke an authentic Indigenous voice which resonates from the brittle pages of eighteenth-century British books, nor does it seek sites of agency to empower current First Nations struggles, though this is also an important project. Its goal is instead to examine the trope of the

³ For a discussion of this subject in the context of Canadian literature, see Moss, Laura, ed. *Is Canada Postcolonial?: Unsettling Canadian Literature*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier UP, 2003.

Indian, which is a powerful cultural myth that has had very real effects on Native populations, and the varied cultural functions it played in the formation of the contingent British subject. As such, this work is both a study of a discourse which has been called “savagery,” and of subject formation. Unlike the comparable discourse of Orientalism, the eighteenth-century construction of Indians did not always function as a definitive cultural “other” against which to define the self. Indians and Britons were often intertwined through trade and military alliances against the French, and many of the traits which British people hoped to possess were projected onto Native North Americans. Indeed, a popular myth at the time was that a Welsh prince named Madoc settled in America in 1170 and intermarried with the Indians, thus promoting a shared cultural history between both groups.⁴ The myth of an organic, eternal British identity is thus deeply entangled with the construction of a desirable yet ambivalent cultural other-self.

Srinivas Aravamudan uses the concept of “virtualization” in discussing “colonialist representations that acquire malleability because of a certain loss of detail, a process that enables readier identification and manipulation by readers, thus putting the trope of the tropicopolitan into motion toward an open-ended future” (17). His use of “tropicopolitan” implies both the linguistic trope and the actual resident of the “tropics” or “torrid zone.” The “noble savage” fits this description of a generalized, malleable trope, though Aravamudan is mostly silent

⁴ Gwyn A. Williams provides an account of the rise and reception of this story in *Madoc: The Making of a Myth*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987. It appears in numerous British histories of America during the eighteenth century.

in regards to representations of Indigenous North Americans in his otherwise insightful *Tropicopolitans*. But his framework is useful in its productive goal of redeploying colonialist representations and reclaiming agency for colonized people. That is, eighteenth-century representations of Indians are “mobile discursive resources for writers who depict colonialism and its consequences,” which can “yield a representational surplus with anticolonial potential” (19). It is in part that potential which I am hoping to reclaim with this dissertation.

The first chapter begins with a brief overview of the scholarly gap in terms of representations of Indians in eighteenth-century studies, and places this work within the field. It goes on to explore the evolving trope of the Indian from one of generalized exoticism to the more specific construction it would become. While earlier depictions tended to confuse or conflate the people of India with those from America (which still occasionally happened later in the century), the image of North American Indians became more solidified in the first decade of the century and was linked to the liberty of the British subject. The 1710 visit by the “Four Indian Kings,” representatives of the Iroquois, was a culturally significant event that produced a body of art and literature that reflected on the meaning of Britishness following the Acts of Union in 1707.⁵ In other words, from very early on the Indian became a kind of other-self, both mirror and projection, and also an enabling trope for the imagination of Britain as a benevolent force in the European scramble for world supremacy. As will be shown throughout this

⁵ See MacInnes, Allan I. *Union and Empire: The Making of the United Kingdom in 1707*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

dissertation, the Indian is connected to the most current developments in the British cultural imagination, and rather than representing a retreat to the primitive past, often speaks to the potentials and perils of modernity.

Chapter two looks at the beginnings of an attempt in British literature to reconcile the older form of British identity, described by Dror Wahrman as the *ancien régime* of identity, with the critique of this identity offered by representations of transcultural contact with Indians. According to Wahrman, this sense of identity involved play and fluidity, and concepts such as race and gender were understood as contingent or circumstantial rather than absolute. The first part of the chapter will show how Indians were a site of intense discursive negotiation in the shift to more stable, modern forms of identification, as well as more recognizably modern cultural values such as individuality and freedom from arbitrary power. The second half of the chapter looks at British hybrid subjects such as captives and soldiers prior to the 1770s and the ways in which their experiments in subjectivity were ultimately rejected by British people or disavowed as necessary strategies for bodily survival. This disavowal is contradictory to the notion of the *ancien régime* as a period of fluid subjectivity and identity play, but speaks to the unique status of the Indian as both other and self, as representative of both primitive and modern man.

The next chapter primarily uses the anonymously written novel *Memoirs of the Life and Adventures of Tsonnonthouan* (1763) to examine mid-century anxieties over the commodification of culture, or the conflation between

commerce and writing, and the effects of colonialism and capitalism on the British subject. Further, this novel speaks to the fear among Britons that their efforts at civilizing the Indians were actually producing the opposite effect. The Indian is subject to the degenerative forces of British culture, but at the same time is in this novel and other texts a surrogate vessel for the Briton facing new, unique developments in culture and individual experience. Just as the Indian must negotiate the potentially destructive effects of colonialism, the Briton is also threatened by the crassness of fashion, consumerism, and an expanding overseas empire.

The final chapter of the dissertation, like chapter two, looks at hybrid British or European subjects, but examines how the critique of Britain through the eyes of Indians became appropriated around the period of the American Revolutionary War. At this time, just as Britain emerged as a more definitive, less contingent construction, the figure of the hybrid Indian-Briton became a viable subject in literature in ways it was not just a few years prior. This is well-documented in the American and, later, Canadian context, and can be understood largely as a kind of “indigenization” of the colonial subject to grant them ownership and mastery over the land they have occupied. This explanation, however, cannot account for this same development in British literature, which instead used the Indian as a site of the imaginative reunification of the fractured transatlantic British subject in the wake of Britain's loss of the colonies, and a means for redefining the bounds of family and kinship. This more direct

appropriation of the Indian's voice fueled the rise of what Tim Fulford calls "Romantic Indians," and also marks the beginning of the fascination with Indigenous people and spirituality in various Western cultures.

The construction of the "savage self" is not uniform or universal, but represents one strand of eighteenth-century thought, a part of the broader pre-history of British global domination. There continued to be throughout the century a divided view of Indians, but this does not disprove the significance Indians played in subject formation; indeed, it shows the difficulty Britons faced when encountering alterity and seeing within it a disturbing and compelling sameness, a reflection of their failures and fantasies. Laura Brown notes that there is "an irony characteristic of the implication of modernity with alterity" (15). She explains that in what she describes as "the fable of the 'native prince'," in which the supposed royalty from "primitive" populations visited the metropolis in fact and fiction, cultural difference is ignored in favour of "a sentimental identification between the native and the European" (15). This is, according to Brown, a contradiction implicit in modernity itself because of "its yoking of exploitation and liberation, brutality and progress, fears and hopes." By viewing the relationship between modernity and otherness as one of both appropriation and disavowal, we can see the significance of the figure of the Indian as an enabling discourse, beyond the scattered visits by "Indian princes" throughout the century. Indeed, the Indian embodies the "yoking" of polarities more than any other non-European cultural group in the British imagination.

Chapter 1

“Indians” and the Emergence of Britain

Representations of First Nations people in British literature from the eighteenth century have received little attention compared to similar postcolonial studies of other non-European peoples. The large body of work dedicated to the position of India in eighteenth-century cultural imagery, for example, is varied and growing, and numerous studies have also been done on representations of African people and the slave trade in British literature.⁶ The absence of scholarly work on North American Native peoples is certainly not due to a lack in primary materials, since it is incontestable that “Indians” appear frequently in print and visual culture throughout the period. And yet there has not been a work dedicated to this endeavour since Benjamin Bissell’s *The American Indian in English Literature of the Eighteenth Century*, first published in 1925 and reprinted, with no changes, in 1968. While it is a useful resource, Bissell’s book, by the author’s own admission, amounts to a general survey of British works that depict Native peoples, offering little analysis and few non-canonical examples. Nevertheless, it is still referenced as the authoritative volume on the subject; for example, historian Troy Bickham, in his recent *Savages Within the Empire: Representations of American Indians in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (2006), explains his own focus

⁶ See Brown, Laura. *Ends of Empire: Women and Ideology in Early Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993; Dabydeen, David. *Hogarth’s Blacks: Images of Blacks in Eighteenth-Century English Art*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1987; Nussbaum, Felicity A., ed. *The Global Eighteenth-Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2003; Aravamudan, Srinivas. *Tropicopolitans: Colonialism and Agency, 1688-1804*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999; Woodward, Helena. *African-British Writings in the Eighteenth Century: The Politics of Race and Reason*. Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 1999;

on representations of First Nations people in material culture, government policy, and other “non-literary” examples as being necessary because Bissell’s work has sufficiently covered the literature of the period (9). Even if Bissell did indeed provide the definitive study on the figure of the “Indian” in print, the 83 years that have passed since his work was written have produced numerous scholarly developments in the field that would require a dramatic revising and re-visioning of the original volume.

Given the current interest in the literature of the British empire, how can we account for the absence, or at least belated and sporadic appearance, of studies on Indigenous North Americans as subjects of colonial writing during the formative years of British imperialism? Stephanie Pratt, who encountered a similar gap in the field of art history while composing her *American Indians in British Art, 1700-1840*, speculates that this is the case because “the contemporary situation of American Indians in the United States is not perceived to occupy as important a place in modern consciousness,” and therefore an “analysis of their imaging, and the lessons we might draw from it, is not as urgent a task as the analysis of other groups subjected to the colonial gaze” (5). There is a similar situation in Canada,⁷ though the rise in the interdisciplinary Native Studies field demonstrates a growing commitment to and interest in First Nations issues, and the study of contemporary Native literature is more widespread now than it has

⁷ This is not to suggest that Indigenous people have been erased from Canadian history in the same manner, since by necessity there has been a First Nations presence in government policy because of the Indian Act, but the narratives of imaginative nation formation have a similar gap.

ever been. Nonetheless, the gap in scholarship on reassessing the figure of the “Indian” is particularly evident in the field of eighteenth-century studies, despite the growing interest in colonial literature. Pratt notes that in terms of contact between European and First Nations people, the eighteenth century lacks the “glamour of the two founding moments,” and falls somewhere between the “excitement of European discovery and curiosity in the New World” during the sixteenth century, and the “mystique of the westward-moving frontier as the United States of America came into being” during the nineteenth century (4). Similarly, in the Canadian context, the nineteenth century is also seen as the birth of the Indian in literature and culture alongside the birth of the nation, and Daniel Francis’ *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture* begins in the 1840s (though Francis does reference Benjamin West’s painting “The Death of General Wolfe” from 1771 as an originary moment in white representations). As important as works such as Francis’ and others are, it is also necessary to look at the eighteenth century as a period which gave rise to subsequent representations of Native people, due to the combination of the exponential growth in print culture and increasingly complex relationships between Britain and different First Nations.

I have already suggested that Bissell’s 1925 study on the American Indian in English literature requires significant revision. This would include changing the entire premise of his work; he writes in his conclusion that, though the body of works he has accumulated about Indians is “highly significant, in its way, as an

indication of the development of exotic sentiment in an ‘age of prose and reason’,” he warns that it is

necessary to be careful not to exaggerate the importance of a movement which is at most subordinate to the main currents of eighteenth-century thought, or force the evidence to point to some foregone conclusion, some ingenious theory, some novel and striking paradox, calculated to startle rather than convince judicious readers and critics. (212)

As if anticipating the subsequent movements in literary criticism that would call for a greater attention to the seemingly marginal or superficial elements of literature, as in poststructural and postcolonial approaches, Bissell forecloses any possibility for further inquiry into these texts. The notion that the “noble savage,” to which he seems to reduce most English understandings of Native peoples, is “at most subordinate to the main currents of eighteenth-century thought” dismisses the effects of cultural forces on writers and thinkers of the period. Besides, is not the project of empire a “main current” of thought in the eighteenth century, and does not the construction of a national character in contrast to the “uncivilized” people of the world constitute one of the central intellectual endeavours? Further, if the conflict with the American colonies, as Dror Wahrman has argued, is constitutive to the modern British sense of selfhood, then surely the depiction of the peoples native to those colonies bear some role beyond subordinacy to larger trends.

While Bissell asserts that the larger implications for his study are insignificant in light of the intellectual and aesthetic achievements of the eighteenth century, he speculates that the startlingly wide range of “conceptions of

the savage” among Britons is indicative of “how much the whole subject was in the air” (213). In other words, the culture of metropolitan Britain was buzzing about the Native people of North America, and this is reflected throughout the literature of the century. While Bissell is willing to dismiss the significance of the figure of the Indian, I believe, as Edward Said has forcefully argued, that

[w]e must . . . read the great canonical texts, and perhaps also the entire archive of modern and pre-modern European and American culture, with an effort to draw out, extend, give emphasis and voice to what is silent or marginally present or ideologically represented . . . in such works. (78)

Said further suggests that, in the context of nineteenth-century literature, critics have often chosen to ignore authors’ thoughts on imperial expansion and other races in the belief that these notions fall outside the realm of culture. But those from cultures negatively impacted by the “facts of empire” cannot see culture as hermetically sealed from its “worldly affiliations.” This does not mean dismissing literature that participates in the pernicious aspects of the culture of colonialism, nor does it require that we cease to continue to learn and gain pleasure from these works. As Said notes, “rather than condemning or ignoring their participation in what was an unquestioned reality in their societies, I suggest that what we learn about this hitherto ignored aspect actually and truly *enhances* our reading and understanding of [these texts]” (73).

I am interested in tracing the discursive construction of the North American “Indian” in eighteenth-century British literature, and in examining the specific relation between this construction and British subject-formation. The

eighteenth century is widely argued to be the period in which the modern, Western self was produced, and various studies have attempted to document the birth of the British subject. The seminal work of E.P. Thompson, notably in *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963), and Ian Watt's *The Rise of the Novel* (1957) discuss the rise of 'modern' subject formations by tracking, respectively, their economic and aesthetic causes and effects. In more recent years, Linda Colley's *Britons: Forging the Nation* (1992) and Wahrman's *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* (2004) have looked at the project of constructing the confident, hegemonic British nation and subject that subsequently dominated the nineteenth-century world. Colley looks at the importance of a shared sense of Protestant identity in the rise of British nationalism, as well as the rhetoric of empire and expansion. In addressing this narrative in his important book *Tropicopolitans: Colonialism and Agency, 1688-1804* (1999), Srinivas Aravamudan adds that "[x]enophobia, colonialism, orientalism, and racism [played] just as large a role [...] in the constitution of a national identity" (10). Wahrman defines "the self" as "a very particular understanding of personal identity, one that presupposes an essential core of selfhood characterized by psychological depth, or interiority, which is the bedrock of unique, expressive individual identity" (xi). As he points out, he is not the first to suggest that this notion has a history, and anthropologists have long noted that identity and a sense of self are culturally contingent constructions. Beginning with Michel Foucault's notion that "it's the assertion of non-identity" that is

important today, Wahrman depicts the eighteenth-century sense of identity as having striking continuities with the postmodern sense of a fragmented, mediated, and non-essential self. In other words, the postmodern age, whatever that may ultimately mean, and the eighteenth century are the “bookends of modernity” (xviii).

Of course, Wahrman’s sense of modernity is in itself a contingent construction, a period whose effects cannot be said to have had universal impact or, rather, whose effects have been unevenly distributed. For colonized people, the “making of the modern self” often came at the expense of the unmaking of their previous cultures and selves, and the grand narratives of modernity served as exclusionary tools that marginalized many non-European people. Capitalism, imperialism, and the “imagined community” of the nation-state⁸ fragmented many cultures just as it “forged the nation” in Britain, and the modern age has been a calamity for the vast majority of First Nations people in North America.⁹ This makes the task of unpacking the relationship between the discourses of the modern Self and the savage Other an important step in decolonization.

The image of the North American Indian was developed during the eighteenth century through an immense body of ethnographic and missionary writing, but also through novels, poetry, and widely circulated popular texts, such as broadsheets and ballads. In the colonies, formal contact between British and

⁸ Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.

⁹ See Paul, Daniel N. *We Were Not the Savages*. Toronto: Fernwood, 2006; Wright, Ronald. *Stolen Continents: 500 Years of Conquest and Resistance in the Americas*. New York: Mariner Books, 2005.

First Nations peoples was becoming more frequent and sustained than at any other time; Native people became objects of profound interest on both sides of the Atlantic, not to mention key political allies, beginning in the Restoration and continuing at least for the next one hundred years. I am interested in the interplay between the concurrent emerging discourses of the Self and of the Savage. Some work has been done on assessing the influence of Native North American peoples on American national identities, including Donald A. Grinde, Jr. and Bruce E. Johansen's *Exemplar of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy* and Philip J. Deloria's *Playing Indian*, but these texts do not sufficiently cross the Atlantic and examine the uniquely British understandings of the "Indian" and their interaction with ideas of nationhood and race. While the well-documented effects of colonialism on First Nations subjectivity and culture were profound and continue to be negotiated, I am interested in the other side of colonial domination. Dipesh Chakrabarty notes that Europe always serves as the "silent referent in historical knowledge" for all non-European peoples (28); as a Native scholar, I intend to return the gaze and participate in what Chakrabarty provocatively calls "provincializing Europe" by showing how representations of Native people determined and undermined aspects of British identity.

There has historically been almost as much work produced about white representations of Indians as there have been studies of actual First Nations people and culture. Philip J. Deloria's books *Playing Indian* and *Indians in Unexpected Places*, for example, explore the significance of white performances

of Indianness in American national identity, and the ways that Native people engaged with and challenged the stereotypes about themselves in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, respectively. It would be a monumental undertaking to account for even a portion of the work on Indians in popular culture and literature, but suffice to say that overall the field is uneven, though some significant strides have been made in recent years thanks in large part to the resurgence in Native studies.¹⁰ In relation to the eighteenth-century, most of the work on Indians in literature has been done by American scholars,¹¹ and the main focus has been on Puritan captivity narratives, which I will discuss in greater detail below. The most nuanced work incorporates the notion of a transatlantic culture, transcendent of nation, which has become a popular and productive object of scholarly study in recent years. Concepts such as Mary Louise Pratt's application of "transculturation" to colonial encounters and literature and Benedict Anderson's well-known description of nations as "imagined communities" have allowed, as Laura Stevens suggests, "a shift from paradigms of isolated development to models of interrelatedness and multidirectional flow" (95). Paul Gilroy's *The Black Atlantic* is perhaps the most well-known work on transatlanticism, but a number of critics have been pursuing this concept in studies of literary and cultural history. Some of these works include Stevens' *The*

¹⁰ Much work has deliberately been on Native North American writing in order to reclaim agency. For representations in Canadian literature, see Goldie, Terry. *Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand Literatures*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1989;

¹¹ See, for example, Bellin, Joshua David. *The Demon of the Continent: Indians and the Shaping of American Literature*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2001.

Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility (2004), Gordon M. Sayre's *Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature* (1997), and Tim Fulford's *Romantic Indians: Native Americans, British Literature, and Transatlantic Culture 1756-1830* (2006).¹² Stevens examines the discourse surrounding British missionary projects in North America among different Native groups, and argues that although the actual conversion efforts failed, the literature about them was very successful in raising financial, ideological, and moral support among Britons. Sayre looks at both French and English colonial writings, which he divides into the genres of exploration narratives and ethnographic descriptions, and the ways in which these "actual" accounts influenced the production of colonial literature. He also examines some of the ways in which the cultural contacts between Europeans and Native peoples affected and challenged how the Europeans saw some of their own customs, particularly clothing, money, and writing. Finally, Fulford looks first at the ways in which representations of Indians informed British Romanticism, and then how some Native writers in the nineteenth century appropriated aspects of Romanticism and wrote back in a hybrid discourse. Each of these critics, particularly Stevens and Fulford, emphasize the transatlantic nature of Anglo culture; I consider my work to be a part of this broader shift in reassessing British literature produced in both Britain and its colonies, and I am interested in the interactions between the peripheral and

¹² For an overview of this work, see Stevens, Laura. "Transatlanticism Now." *American Literary History* 16(1): 93-102.

metropolitan spaces.

The importance of a transatlantic approach to representations of Native people is nowhere more evident than in the study of narratives of captivity, in which English people are captured by stereotypically cruel Indians. Captivity narratives constitute the most widely studied writings that depict First Nations people in North America prior to 1800. Much of this scholarship has been done by American scholars, and as a consequence the captivity genre has been appropriated into the canon of colonial American literature.¹³ The most well-known texts are Puritan captivity narratives written by women, particularly Mary Rowlandson's *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* (1682), which ranks among the most read texts from pre-Revolutionary America. These documents are frequently understood to represent the origins of a body of uniquely American writings, setting the pattern for later frontier texts in which, as Richard Slotkin has argued, the mythology of America was born in a "regeneration through violence." For First Nations people, this is deeply problematic for the way in which violent colonization is rendered into originary myth. These texts, instead, must be read in their transatlantic, colonial context; they participate in the broader captivity tradition rooted in Protestant England, and also contain elements of travel and ethnographic writing, spiritual autobiography, wartime propaganda, and sentimental fiction. Further, these narratives document and navigate what Mary

¹³ As Linda Colley notes, the vast majority of this work "remains determinedly inward-looking," as the narratives are "overwhelmingly scanned for the light they can throw on the evolution of *American* national identities and cultures" (*Captives* 140, author's emphasis).

Louise Pratt calls the “contact zone,” which she describes in *Imperial Eyes* as “the space of colonial encounters, the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict” (6). Her use of the word “contact” aims to “foreground the interactive, improvisational dimensions of colonial encounters so easily ignored or suppressed by diffusionist accounts of conquest and domination” (7). Pratt stresses the importance of interactions between subjects, and looks at them “not in terms of separateness or apartheid, but in terms of copresence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices, often within radically asymmetrical relations of power” (7). She is, however, surprisingly dismissive of captivity narratives, suggesting that they “traditionally constituted a safe context in which to narrate the terrors of the contact zone because the story is told by a survivor who has returned, reaffirming European and colonial social orders” (185). This may be true in some cases, particularly in Puritan narratives with a religious framework of redemption, but in most captives' accounts of life among the Indians there is a profound change in the English person by the time of his or her release or escape. The narratives of captivity from the middle of the eighteenth century, produced during a time of widespread and brutal colonial warfare, are the most unsettling to the British self and the “colonial social orders,” and it was these narratives that were by far the most widely read in Britain itself.

On the surface, the various ways that Indians are represented in literature

are too disparate and contradictory to form a single signification or broader discourse, and instead fall in to what Terry Goldie has described as the often simultaneous “fear and temptation” that typifies English and Commonwealth depictions of indigenous populations. Put differently, this can be understood as the “noble savage” and the “ignoble savage.” Goldie describes some of the “standard commodities” in “the ‘economy’ created by the semiotic field of the indigene” (15). These “commodities” include sex, violence, orality, mysticism, and the prehistoric. These categories of representation can also describe the eighteenth-century “semiotic field,” and are useful as a general framework. Yet the British understanding of the Indian during this period is just as often marked by profound ambivalence that defies either fear or temptation, noble or ignoble, and instead betrays the unstable foundations of Britain’s emergent sense of national identity. Goldie is correct, however, in asserting that “[t]he image of the indigene has been textually defined and, through an extended intertextuality, national and international, diachronic and synchronic, [. . .] it constantly reproduces itself, a pervasive autogenesis” (6). This “autogenesis” has even been appropriated amongst different First Nations communities and can be witnessed in the spread of a Pan-Indian identity that borrows mostly from a Plains Indian iconography, visible at pow-wows across North America.¹⁴ This, of course, is a very different dynamic, and speaks to the enduring strength of First Nations people and culture in the wake of colonization, yet it makes it all the more

¹⁴ See Hertzberg, Hazel W. *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1971.

important to revisit the origins of the construction of modern white representations of Indians, and of Native identity itself.

“The Indians of our age”: Native Peoples in Britain to the Time of Dryden

Representations of Native people in England began in the early stages of the European colonization of the Americas in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and travel collections such as Richard Hakylut’s *Principal Navigations, Voyages, and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589) were read with great interest. The travels of Martin Frobisher, Francis Drake, and Walter Raleigh also provided information on the peoples of the Americas, and the story of Pocahontas and John Smith has obviously had a significant cultural impact on representations of European and First Nations relations. Scholars such as Tzvetan Todorov, Jonathan Hart, and Stephen Greenblatt have looked at both the sense of wonder and the brutal violence in colonial encounters from this period.¹⁵ While there is certainly much to be said of these earlier works, they fall outside of the scope of my study. Suffice to say that, prior to the Restoration, there is a diverse body of work about the Native people of the Americas, and the manner and custom writing of the period, such as Thomas Hariot’s beautifully illustrated *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia* (1590), provided a template for the later rise in comparative ethnography.¹⁶ In non-ethnographic English literature,

¹⁵ Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. New York: Harper & Row, 1984; Hart, Jonathan. *Representing the New World: The English and French Uses of the Example of Spain*. New York: Palgrave, 2000; Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991.

¹⁶ His focus is on Spanish writing, but Anthony Pagden makes this argument in *The Fall of Natural Man: The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology*. New York:

however, there was little textual representation of Native peoples with any degree of specificity. Instead, North American Indians in English drama, poetry, and prose were generally lumped with the peoples of India, Africa, and other exotic locales under a general rubric of what we can call ‘otherness.’ Thus in William D’Avenant’s court masque *The Temple of Love* (1635), the wonders of the “Eastern world” are represented in part by “a naked Indian on a whitish elephant,” who is wearing the “tire and bases of several-coloured feathers, representing the Indian monarchy” (287). While the elephant is evocative of both the East and Africa, the feather-clad, naked “Indian” indicates a conflation of potential colonial subjects. This metaphoric understanding of non-European people arguably demonstrates the characteristics of early modern selfhood,¹⁷ but more likely is indicative of the as-yet unrealized fantasies of empire among the British court.

By the mid-seventeenth century, Indians had frequently become idealized people representing man before the Fall; Milton writes in *Paradise Lost* (1667) that the “first naked Glorie” of Adam and Eve was like “of late / *Columbus* found th’ *American* so girt / with featherd Cincture, naked else and wilde / Among the Trees and Iles and woodie Shores” (IX.1115-18). The Indian was innocent and free, a figure that embodied, for English people influenced by the European Renaissance, the classical Golden Age. Paradoxically, a large body of missionary texts emerged, beginning roughly in the 1640s, calling for the conversion of the

Cambridge UP, 1982.

¹⁷ For a study of representations of non-Europeans during this period and their reflection of the early modern worldview, see Barbour, Richmond. *Before Orientalism: London’s Theatre of the East, 1576-1626*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

“heathens” to Christianity, which would presumably bring an end to that Golden Age. Thus, while the English admired the unclothed innocence of the Indians, at the same time they pitied the Native people who had been brutalized by the Spanish conquest, and sixteenth-century Spanish priest Bartolomé de las Casas’ writing chronicling the slaughter of people throughout the Caribbean and the Americas was read in English translations as *The Spanish Colonie* (1583) and *The Tears of the Indians* (1656) (Las Casas xlii). This sense of pity would prove significant in forming the ideological apparatus of the British empire, which I will discuss in greater detail below, and in rallying those missionaries and colonists working for the widespread conversion of the Indians.

The concept of the “noble savage” is often associated with the French and, more specifically, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who explored the notion of man living in a state of nature in his *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality Among Men* (1754). It is sometimes suggested by scholars, such as Robert F. Berkhofer in *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian, From Columbus to the Present* (1979), that the British did not in fact celebrate this discourse of the noble savage, nor did it achieve any kind of popularity in British texts as compared to the French. The term itself, however, has English origins; in John Dryden’s *The Conquest of Granada* (1672), the defiant hero Almanzar proclaims, “I am as free as Nature first made man / ’Ere the base Laws of servitude began / When wild in woods the noble Savage ran” (Act I, l.207-210). The noble savage is, in its first usage, one who bears no allegiance to any sovereign; as Almanzar boldly states in

the same passage, "I alone am king of me." Yet it is also a universalized state, a shared existence prior to laws and governance, and not particular to the Indians of the Americas. In several of his works, Dryden evokes images of Indians from North and South America in ways that are reflective of the discourses about Native people from his time, but also anticipate the dominant tropes of the eighteenth century. "Religio Laici" (1682) recites the argument of the Deists on universal salvation:

'Tis said the sound of a Messiah's Birth
Is gone through all the habitable earth:
But still that text must be confin'd alone
To what was then inhabited, and known:
And what Provision could from thence accrue
To Indian souls, and worlds discover'd new? (l.175-179)

To this argument, which is convincing enough to "startle reason [and] stagger frail belief" (l.185), Dryden responds with the claim that "boundless wisdom, boundless mercy, may / Find ev'n for those bewilder'd souls, a way" (l. 188-189). In other words, even the unsaved Indian souls will find their way to heaven thanks to a merciful God. As Stevens suggests in her account of British missionary efforts in North America, Dryden's response to the Deists was "insufficient" because "[t]o believe that heathens could be saved implied that they were better off than Christians" (126). Yet it points to the ways in which the figure of the Indian was used by multiple religious denominations in England to critique the shortcomings of other sects, and Dryden is responding to the frequent Deist use of Indians as evidence of the innateness of human morality, without revealed religion (Stevens 121). Indeed, Indians served a profound theological problem for

orthodox Protestants, as the pre-Catholic Dryden indicates, since only a cruel God would punish souls who were merely ignorant, and had not willfully rejected the Gospel. The figure of the Indian continued to fuel the arguments of more radical groups such as the Deists and the Quakers throughout the eighteenth century, who saw in the “virtuous but uninformed Indian” proof of the “inner light” of all God’s creation (Stevens 124-25), and Dryden tried to negotiate between this view and the conservative theology he wished to defend.

In addition to his evocation of the theological dilemma posed by Indians to the Anglican orthodoxy, Dryden set two of his major plays in the New World, the first being *The Indian Queen* (1664), co-authored work with his brother-in-law Sir Robert Howard, and its sequel, *The Indian Emperor, or the Conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards* (1665). Exotic settings were a common feature of Restoration drama but, in these works, the more recent Spanish colonization of the New World is evoked both implicitly and explicitly as a means of imagining Britain’s own fantasies of global conquest. Though it is set in Mexico before the arrival of the Spanish, *The Indian Queen* is framed by European conquest; in the prologue, an Indian girl and boy are awakened by the presence of foreign invaders. At first the boy laments “our soft rest must cease, / And fly together with our country’s peace! / No more must we sleep under plantain shade, / Which neither heat could pierce, nor cold invade” (l.1-4). Upon inspecting these new arrivants, however, the girl, Quevira, proclaims, “If these be they, we welcome then our doom! / Their looks are such, that mercy flows from thence, / More gentle than our native

innocence” (l.13-16). She puts herself at their mercy, declaring to her friend and to the invading audience, “By their protection, let us beg to live; / They came not here to conquer, but forgive.– / If so, your goodness may your power express, / And we shall judge both best by our success” (l.19-22). On the surface, the Aztec children are welcoming the invading Incas, but their language turns the scene into a dramatization of first contact with the English theatregoers. By constructing the play itself as a moment of colonial encounter, Dryden is inviting the audience to imagine themselves as benevolent masters, morally superior to the Spanish conquistadors in their goal of salvation rather than material gain. The epilogue continues with this analogy, with Montezuma wryly addressing the audience:

You have seen all that this old world can do,
We, therefore, try the fortune of the new,
And hope it is below your aim to hit
At untaught nature with your practised wit:
Our naked Indians, then, when wits appear,
Would as soon chuse to have the Spaniards here. (l.5-10)

He adds that, considering the cost of the production, it would be “a true voyage to the Indies lost” if the audience dislikes the performance. Though it is no doubt with tongue in cheek, the analogy of the contact zone places the people in the theatre in a dominant position over the production of the “new world,” and suggests that both venues require sensitivity and compassion to ‘profit’ from the experience.

In *The Indian Emperor*, Dryden continues to deploy colonial tropes, though in this play it is much more explicit. Picking up twenty years after the ending of *The Indian Queen*, its sequel depicts the destruction of Mexico at the

hands of Cortez. The prologue, whose speaker is not described or named, warns the audience that “[t]he scenes are old, the habits are the same / We wore last year, before the Spaniards came. / Now, if you stay, the blood, that shall be shed / From this poor play, be all upon your head” (1.5-8). The use of “now” distinguishes this production from the previous experience of the pre-European New World, in which the bloodshed among the Indians did not implicate Christians. The violence of *The Indian Emperor*, by contrast, is meant to make the audience reflect on the tragic implications of Spanish colonialism. Dryden is evoking the Black Legend of cruel Spanish conquest, and as a priest and several Spanish soldiers are torturing Montezuma in the final act, the priest declares that because the Indian Emperor refuses “our true God,” and also “hid his Gold, from Christian hands,” the soldiers must kill him and “merit heaven thereby” (qtd in Stevens 48). This points to the perversion and cruelty of Spanish religion, and, as Stevens suggests, the “inefficiency” of their colonial practices (48).

I have spent this time on Dryden, the most dominant and influential author of his day, to show how the colonization of the Americas became a pattern of thought in English literature, pervasive enough to be molded into metaphors for the enjoyment of a theatrical production. In the prologue to *The Conquest of Granada*, which ostensibly has nothing to do with the Native people of America, Dryden complains of playwrights who “bring old iron and glass upon the stage, / To barter with the Indians of our age” (l. 27-28). Again, the stage is set as a space of colonial encounter, though here the “Indians” are stand-ins for the critics and

the “vulgar” crowds who enjoy translated French farce and works of “dull sense,” while the colonizing traders are the writers, or “mongrel wits,” who are prolific in producing “trash.” While Dryden lacks the ethnographic specificity that would come in later representations of Native people in the eighteenth century, he sets the stage, as it were, for the emergence of some of the tropes that would define Indians. The dynamic of the contact zone in Dryden is decidedly one-sided, and his Indians are subject to the desiring and pitying gaze of the English Christian. In some ways, this dynamic remained throughout the century following Dryden’s death, particularly in the large body of missionary writings on North America. There was, however, a significant change in the air with the rapid pursuit of an overseas empire starting in the 1680s.

The appearance of *A True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson* in England in 1682 depicted a very different dynamic of cultural contact than that of Dryden, and the Indians in Rowlandson’s narrative are murderous “heathens.” As Stevens suggests, Rowlandson “seared the transatlantic English imagination with images of brutal savages” (179). The suffering English female body is a signification of the costs of empire, but also of the resiliency of the English subject empowered by God’s divine providence. Yet the true impact of this text in England may be overstated, since Britons had in fact already been reading captivity accounts by or about their countrymen and other Christians being held among non-Europeans for at least one hundred

years.¹⁸ Further, though Rowlandson's narrative was certainly immensely popular in the colonies, it was not reprinted in Britain after its initial publication until 1900 (Colley 151). It was read alongside relatively more nuanced French texts such as *The Jesuit Relations* and Lahontan's *New Voyages to North America* (1703), as well as English works that continued with the romanticization and pitying of Indians; for example, in the same year Rowlandson's narrative appeared with great success in London, a document entitled *A true account of the dying words of Ockanickon, an Indian King* was printed and, unlike the Puritan narrative, was re-printed the following year. This text, which was sent to England by a Quaker living in New Jersey by the name of John Cripps, depicts the last words of Lenape (later named the Delaware by the British) chief Ockanickon, upon whose death "many Tears were shed both by the Indians and English" (3). This sympathetic picture of Ockanickon, who wishes that the "Indians and the Christians" should live together peacefully, nonetheless "reinforce[s] a discourse of benevolent domination" (Stevens 186). In Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko* (1688), she writes that the natives of Surinam are "like our first parents before the Fall," and they represent "an absolute idea of the first state of innocence, before man knew how to sin" (76-77). Though the narrator claims that the Indians "understand no vice, or cunning, but when they are taught by the white men," she also asserts that "it were not difficult to establish any unknown or extravagant religion among them" (77, 122). Her bemoaning of England's loss of "those mountains of gold"

¹⁸ See Colley, *Captives*.

connects the ideological function of innocent and superstitious Indians to the imperial fantasies of untold wealth in the South American jungle. Clearly the figure of the Indian, often undifferentiated between North and South America, was not a singular construction.

This began to change through the course of the opening decade of the century, and the first play written about Native North American people in English during the eighteenth century is John Dennis' *Liberty Asserted* from 1704 (Pratt 43). The play is set in Canada among the Iroquois "Angie," an adaptation of the French "Agnie," which was one of their words for the Mohawk people. Dennis gives a short explanatory note about the setting of the play "for the Sake of those who have never read either Hennepin or La Hontan" (viii), referring to the English translations of these French ethnographic texts which were circulating at the time. He explains that a large part of Canada is possessed by the French, and "as the English and French divide the country, they divide the Natives." Thus, "the five Warlike Nations of the Iroquois are our Confederates," while the Hurons "are Friends to the French" (viii). The anti-French sentiment of this and other works by Dennis, who according to Theophilus Cibber "certainly over-rated his importance," led him to believe that the French would demand he be surrendered to them as part of the Treaty of Utrecht, and he thus implored his old patron the Duke of Marlborough to prevent this from happening (Cibber IV.221-2).

Yet while the preface of the play is anti-French, the play itself promotes a vision of the unity of all humanity, under the tutelage of the merciful and free

English. The image of benevolent conquest as the hallmark of British colonialism and heroism existed prior to this play, as in Sir William Temple's *Of Heroic Virtue* (1692; see Frohock 48-49), but its placement among the Iroquois and Hurons in Canada is a significant first. While texts about missionary efforts were already widely available, the military conquest of North America in the early part of the eighteenth century was not yet in the broader public consciousness; indeed, most information about North America came, as Dennis suggests in his preface, from French sources. There simply was not yet a large number of soldiers crossing the Atlantic, as there were beginning in the 1750s, and the colonists who were in the Americas were regarded as peripheral to most Britons. In addition, Britain had not yet achieved a defining military victory in North America,¹⁹ and depended instead on the decidedly less heroic plantation system for wealth extraction. While some people fantasized about a conquest akin to the Spanish sacking of Mexico and Peru, conquest in America was more often seen as conquering rival European powers and their patterns of colonization rather than the Indigenous people themselves. Indeed, at this stage, British conquest was seen as more heroic if it was validated by the consent of the Indians (Frohock 24-25).

The play centres around the deep friendship between an English general named Beaufort and Ulamar, the general of the Iroquois Five Nations. In the play, Ulamar, whose name sounds more akin to a Turkish character from a Restoration play than a First Nations person, was actually born a Huron, but he and his mother

¹⁹ See Frohock 24.

Sakia were taken when he was an infant and adopted into Angian society. Ulamar was taught European modes of conduct by Beaufort beginning at a young age but at the same time loves his adopted people, while Sakia loathes all Iroquois as her born enemies and hides Ulamar's paternity from him. Through the course of the play we discover his father to be a French general named Miramont, who turns out to be the noble Governor Frontenac, and Sakia bitterly laments the hostilities between the Iroquois-English alliance and the Huron-French forces. She also agonizes over Ulamar's love of the Angian princess Irene, presumably named after the Greek goddess of peace, because it would mean a marriage into the very centre of Angian society. Irene serves as a mediator for the homosocial relationship between Beaufort and Ulamar, since they both love her but each "cannot bear the Thought" of losing the other (19). When Beaufort is offered Irene by her father Zephario, he in turn insists she go to Ulamar, since that is what she desires and he "could die for Ulamar or her." The Angian chief Zephario, impressed by the friendship between the two men and by Beaufort's selflessness, declares, "The English always were a Gallant Nation, / And Foes to Force, and Friends to Liberty. / They who without the Mind possess the Body, / Possess by Force, and *Ravish, not Enjoy*: / He who can Absolutely rule himself, / And can leave others free is truly Noble" (25). The project of English colonialism is depicted, as is still the case in the foreign policy of many Western nations, as the spreading of liberty and freedom among the invaded population. The imagined sexualized body of the Americas, which Sir Walter Raleigh famously boasted

“hath yet her maidenhead,” is metonymically evoked in Irene.²⁰ However, unlike earlier colonial heroes such as Raleigh, Beaufort decides not to “ravish” Irene and allows her to be with her true love, with the knowledge that he could legitimately possess her if he desires. Richard Frohock notes that Dennis displaces actual colonial struggle for land and resources for “the fictions of romantic encounter,” and he “completely eclipses imperialist ambition behind the fictions of benevolent action and intent” (50, 45).

The various “fictions” of the play are similar to the strategies of representation in subsequent ethnographic and travel accounts, which asserted European hegemony while at the same time claiming innocence and passivity. Mary Louise Pratt labels this kind of strategy as “anti-conquest,” because “these strategies of innocence are constituted in relation to older imperial rhetorics of conquest associated with the absolutist era” (7). While Pratt is speaking more specifically to the rise of “objective” natural science in imperialist discourse, Dennis also situates his benevolent conquest in relation to previous rhetorics of imperialism. Beaufort laments older colonial methods when he declares, “Oh Europe, Europe! How hast thou been dull / To thy undoing? How thy heedless Magistrates / Have suffer'd poor unthinking Sots, to unlearn, / Their native Customs, and their native Tongues, / To speak your Jargon, and assume your ways” (34). Indeed, the text often adopts an explicitly anti-colonial position,

²⁰ For more discussion of this sexualized body and land, see McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995. 24-31

condemning the modes of aggressive expansion that demand conquered people “imitate” their masters, “[t]ho’ awkwardly our Asses ape your Dogs.” This critique becomes specifically against the French as it is further articulated in the play, and Ulamar condemns them for their introduction of “cursed Luxury” among the Hurons, “[w]hich makes them needy, venal, base, perfidious / Black Traytors to their Country, Friends to you” (34). Beaufort adds, “For you win Provinces, as Hell gains Souls; / ’Tis by corrupting them you make them yours: / They might defie your malice were they faithful: / But first you enslave them to their own base Passions; / And afterwards to yours.” The fact that this is almost precisely what English traders sought to do in the colonies through the introduction of alcohol and other trade goods makes this critique an ambivalent articulation of anti-colonial sentiment, meant to justify and also mask England’s own colonial enterprise. Beaufort’s insistence on the innate value of Indigenous cultures, as well as Ulamar’s claim that “every brave Man’s Country is the Universe” (17), suggests that Dennis is offering a transnational, cosmopolitan vision of masculine subjectivity, one that would become embodied by the Indian later in the century. Here we can see the homosocial bonds between patriotic men as the “anti-conquest” which Pratt describes. The play ends with Beaufort’s invitation to the French, after defeating their forces, to join “[w]ith us Asserting Godlike Liberty” (68).

The idea of the British empire as a force for liberty became an important part of imperial rhetoric during the eighteenth century, as we shall see in the case

of the Indian kings, and Native North American people were important symbols in this discourse. Ulamar praises Beaufort in the end as a “[t]ruly worthy Son, / Of Great Britania thro’ the World renown’d, / For propping falling Liberty, / Supporting sinking Nations,” and adds that the British are more interested in “rescuing one poor wretch” than in “subverting and destroying Empires, / And making Millions wretched” (67). Ulamar himself embodies this liberty, though he learned his virtues through Beaufort, and *Liberty Asserted* is the first successful play to bring representations of Native people to the stages of London in the eighteenth century and proclaim them to be as enamored with liberty as the English. Many more Indians would appear in literature following the actual appearance of “Agnie” people in London six years later, and the imaginative texts produced around them began to explore the linking of Indian and British selves.

The Four Indian Kings

In 1710, three Mohawk representatives of the Iroquois confederacy, or the Haudenosaunee, and a Mahican visited London during the reign of Queen Anne.²¹ They were by no means the first Native people from the Americas to visit England; since at least 1498, various peoples were brought, oftentimes coercively, from their homelands to be put on public display.²² They often, as in the case of the four Inuit people Martin Frobisher brought to England on separate voyages in 1576 and 1577, died shortly after arrival. Thus Trinculo remarks in *The Tempest*

²¹ For greater details on this visit, including many of the works produced during it, see Garratt, J.G. & Robertson, B. *Four Indian Kings*. Ottawa: Public Archives of Canada, 1985; Bond, Richmond P. *Queen Anne's American Kings*. New York: Octagon Books, 1974.

²² Alden T. Vaughan provides accounts for many of these visits in *Transatlantic Encounters: American Indians in Britain, 1500-1776*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.

(1610)that the crowds in England “will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, / [yet] they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian” (II.ii.30–31). The diplomatic mission from the Iroquois in 1710, however, had a far greater impact than any previous visitation, and was represented very differently. The very fact that these four men were depicted, and treated, as “Indian kings” presented a contrasting vision of Native societies and governance from the stateless, natural existence that had been largely accepted prior to this visit. The notion of kingship also emphasized First Nations' potential similarity with British society, making them exotic but recognizable people with whom Britons could culturally identify. This is reflected in the physical descriptions of them, and particularly in the portraits commissioned, which combine English heraldic symbolism and Native iconography in interesting ways that emphasize singular traits over cultural stereotypes.²³ Their tattoos, for example, as well as their clan animals are differentiated in each painting. These men, in fact, were not “kings,” since there was no such thing in the Iroquois confederacy, nor were they in any way equivalent to such a position. They were, as Eric Hinderaker claims in a mild overstatement, “a miscellaneous collection of young and relatively powerless anglophiles, among whom four of the five tribes of the Iroquois confederacy went unrepresented” (491). It does appear, however, that these men were nonetheless experienced warriors, and well-respected among their people. In several ways,

²³ Stephanie Pratt provides a detailed analysis of these portraits in *American Indians in British Art, 1700-1840*. Norman, OK: U of Oklahoma P, 2005 and “The Four ‘Indian Kings’” in *Between Worlds: Voyagers to Britain, 1700-1850*. London: National Portrait Gallery, 2007. 22-35.

the embassy of the Indian kings coincides with a major shift in British national identity, and deserves closer scrutiny.

Part of what distinguishes this visit among others is that it came in the midst of a massive proliferation in print culture, and thus there was a large body of literature produced that was inspired by the “kings,” including “fourteen broadsides, twelve or more chapbooks, numerous ballads and other publications” (Vaughan 121). Laura Brown points out that there was a “dramatic shift” in the size of the print industry from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to the eighteenth century, seen not only in the increase in printed material, but in the size of individual printing houses and number of people employed by them. She notes that this industry was not only a major contributor to important cultural changes during the period, but was, with its relentless technical innovations, free enterprising spirit, and dedication to profit, itself “a showcase for the broader cultural implications of modernity” (*Fables*, 137). The volume and breadth of the popular literature which discussed the kings, from the *Spectator* to decidedly less elite ballads, suggest a new access to cultural events and modest democratization of the public sphere.

There were other significant developments and events in British political history surrounding this visit; the War of the Spanish Succession was in its latter stages, and Queen Anne had only days before the kings' visit switched from the expensive Whig policy of heroically helping out Britain's continental allies to the so-called “blue-water” Tory strategy of focusing on the nation's own naval and

colonial endeavours (Hinderaker 489). As Hinderaker suggests, this move was beneficial for the Tories, who could present the Indian kings as symbols for this new strategy in the war, and maximize the publicity their visit would generate (490). Thus, while the mission was no doubt in part widely covered as part of an organic interest in the kings, this press also served a political objective.

By the time of the Indian kings' visit, the sense of national identity held by Britons was undergoing important transformations; the Acts of Union in 1707, which brought together Scotland with England and Wales into the Kingdom of Great Britain, created a new, layered sense of 'Britishness,' and, as Mel Kersey suggests, many writers "addressed the disparities between post- and pre-Union cultures" in an attempt to "reconcile older, 'purer' cultural identities with the mixed identity of Britishness" (266).²⁴ Joseph Addison used the visit of the Indian kings as the premise for exploring this dynamic in an essay in *Spectator* number 50 (April 27, 1711), noting that he is just as "desirous of learning what Ideas [the Indian Kings] have conceived of us" as about their own "Manners and Conversation" (237). He claims he has managed to obtain the papers of "King *Sa Ga Yean Qua Rash Tow*," chronicling his impressions of the visit to "the Isle of *Great Britain*," from the upholsterer who was the landlord for part of the kings' stay; upon reading this essay, Swift lamented that he had given the idea for this satire to Steele (though it was in fact Addison who wrote this piece), and regrets doing so because he "intended to have written a book on that subject" but

²⁴ See also Colley, *Britons*.

“[Addison] has spent it all in one paper” (111). Clearly the possibility of reflecting on British culture through the figure of an Indian was an alluring prospect for the wits of the day. Michel de Montaigne had already done so in France over a century earlier, with his “On Cannibals” (1580), but certainly Addison’s piece is the first of its kind in eighteenth-century English writing.

Addison begins his essay from *The Spectator* with the epigraph, “Nunquam aliud Natura, aliud Sapientia dicit,” or “Never does nature say one thing and wisdom another” (qtd. in Kersey 272). He is attempting to represent the natural, unadorned simplicity of the Indian king in relation to the artifice of British life, and is particularly interested in satirizing fashion, partisan politics, and the irreligiousness and hypocrisy of many English people. Another contemporary source from the Iroquois visit describes the “natural Eloquence and Simplicity, peculiar to that Sort of People, who, tho’ unpolish’d by Art and Letters, have a large Share of good Sense and natural Reason” (“The Four Kings,” 4). The rational savage was largely constructed by French authors at the time, particularly Lahontan, but was developed in British texts throughout the century, in part from Locke. The king’s observations begin with his description of St. Paul’s Cathedral, in which he speculates how “this prodigious Pile was fashioned into the Shape it now bears”:

It was probably at first an huge mis-shapen Rock that grew upon the Top of the Hill, which the Natives of the Country (after having cut it into a kind of regular Figure) bored and hollowed with incredible Pains and Industry, 'till they had wrought in it all those beautiful Vaults and Caverns into which it is divided at this Day. As soon as this Rock was thus curiously scooped to their Liking, a

prodigious Number of Hands must have been employed in chipping the Outside of it, which is now as smooth as the Surface of a Pebble; and is in several Places hewn out into Pillars that stand like the Trunks of so many Trees bound about the Top with Garlands of Leaves. (189-190)

The king perceives the church as an organic whole, and his brethren similarly assume it was created by the God to whom it is dedicated. Addison, who along with Steele was interested in and successful at disseminating a uniquely British culture of politeness, is through the king's eyes creating a vision of Britain that seamlessly connects artifice and natural unity. The cathedral, as a stand-in for the nation, was constructed by many hands, and now appears in the eyes of the Indian king to be polished and eternal. Addison effectively combines the fantasy of pre-Union cultural purity with the post-Union self-fashioning in the metaphor of the church, and to do so in this publication was indeed significant; as Kersey suggests, "[f]or those Britons who could read, the public's reception and discussion of the *Spectator* enacted a daily performance of identity" (269). At the same time, the king observes other aspects of British culture that are too artificial, such as those parishioners in the church who, instead of worshiping God, are "bowing and curtisying to one another" (190). The divide between Whigs and Tories is an unnecessary and unnatural division, and the king is warned that the Tories are apt to hate him for being a foreigner, while the Whigs would attack him for being a king. Ultimately it is the cathedral itself that escapes the satire of the king and provides a unifying metaphor for Britain, which seems to reinforce Colley's argument for the importance of Protestantism in British nation building.

In the end of the essay, however, Addison does not sound a note of self-assured nationalism, but rather one of cultural relativism, writing, “I cannot likewise forbear observing, That we are all guilty in some Measure of the same narrow way of Thinking, which we meet with in this Abstract of the *Indian Journal*[,] when we fancy the Customs, Dress, and Manners of other Countries are ridiculous and extravagant, if they do not resemble those of our own” (192).

While *Spectator* 50 uses the Indian kings to fortify a version of British identity, the visitors also offered an alternative way of being. In 1712, two years following the visit, a group of British noblemen terrorized the streets of London identified as “Mohocks,” and Steele reports in *The Spectator* no. 324 that “[a]greeable to their Name, the avowed design of the Institution is Mischief.”²⁵ The memory of the Indian kings provoked some members of the gentry to explore the possibilities in other subjectivities, using the imaginary Indian costume in a way that has some resonance with, and even anticipates, the Boston Tea Party in 1773. John Gay wrote his play *The Mohocks* in the same years as the scare, and he places disguise at its core. While ballads such as “The Mohocks Revel” (1712) declared that these British men decried “Crowns and Scepters” and were “[g]ainst Monarchy,” both the historical tale and *The Mohocks* itself point to the distinct class element of identity in the eighteenth century more broadly. In the play, the Mohocks give each other names such as “Cannibal” and “Molock,” and are able

²⁵ Scholars have debated the extent to which the Mohock terror was real or created by the press; see Guthrie, Neil. “No Truth, or Very Little in the Whole Story?: A Reassessment of the Mohock Scare of 1712.” *Eighteenth-Century Life* 20.2(1996): 33-56.

to switch in and out of their identities. They promise that “[n]o laws shall restrain / Our libertine reign, / We’ll riot, drink on, and be free” (1.25-28), and, indeed, they have terrorized the population of London to such a degree that the constables who are meant to be tracking them down surrender meekly when confronted by them. The rogues then switch clothes with the hapless night watchmen, and are able to convince others that the watchmen are, in fact, the Mohocks. Though they are found out in the end, and maintain that their game of making others pass as them is simply “an innocent frolick,” this play demonstrates the ability of “gentlemen” to transform themselves in ways that the working classes cannot. This transformation is ultimately a menace to British society, as seen by the large amount of negative and paranoid press that the Mohocks received. While there was a more fluid sense of the boundaries of identity at this time, the performance of an Indian or “savage” subjectivity, as the next and final chapters will suggest, was not a desirable act until much later in the century. In a decidedly different note from Addison's call for toleration at the end of his imagined letter, Steele adds in his essay on the British Mohocks in the *Spectator* that “the Manners of *Indian Savages* are no becoming Accomplishments to an *English fine Gentleman*” (424). While the rational Indian may offer important critiques and insights into British identity, the notion at this time of appropriating their way of life meant degeneration into savagery, not an elevation of reason and sentiment.

If, on the one hand, the Indian kings allowed for a reflection on what it meant to be British internally, they also embodied the expanding borders of

mercantile capitalism and British influence abroad. Hinderaker describes them as crucial and enduring symbols for the “imaginative construction of the first British empire,” and much of the print surrounding their visit points out the potential benefits Britain could obtain from a friendship with the Iroquois. Thus the author of the publication *The four kings of Canada. Being a succinct account of the four Indian princes lately arriv'd from North America* (1710) wishes to point out in his final chapter “how easie, as well as advantageous, it wou'd be to *Great Britain* to establish powerful Colonies” in the “fertile” homeland of the Indians (45). In “Windsor-Forest” (1713), Pope evokes the visit of the kings in his fantasy of a new imperial era following the Treaty of Utrecht, when he writes of a time when “ships of uncouth form shall stem the tyde, / And feather'd people croud my wealthy side, / And naked youths and painted chiefs admire / Our speech, our colour, and our strange attire!” (l.401-404). The broader purpose of the king’s visit, which was either not well-known or deemed unimportant among the printing houses, in fact stemmed from a military failure in the colonies, and the Iroquois men were sent to revive the efforts of colonial governors and administrators to invade and “conquer” the French colony (Hinderaker 488-489). It was presented, however, as a plea for help from the Indian kings to rescue their people from French Catholic forces. Following their attendance at a performance of *Macbeth*, in which the “mobocracy” in the theatre demanded that the kings sit on the stage facing the crowd during the play, the lead actor presented an epilogue to the Indian kings that welcomed those who “[n]ow seek protection on Britannia’s

shore.” It continues, “O Princes, who have with amazement seen / So good, so gracious and so great a Queen; / Who from her royal mouth have heard your doom / Secur’d against the threats of France and Rome” (qtd in Genest 451-452). The kings allowed the British to imagine themselves as a benevolent colonial force, and the Iroquois request for more churches and clergy in their settlements enforced this belief. Mohawk historians have confirmed that there was a desire for more Christian missionaries, but have suggested that this was not as much to preach and convert as to ward off witchcraft (Pratt, “Four Indian Kings,” 35n.10).²⁶

The kings were not universally well-received; among those who disapproved of the Indian kings being treated as if they were European royalty were some of the Whigs who resented the political advantage the “blue water” Tories gained through the visit. Daniel Defoe was one of these unhappy Whigs, who also strongly identified with his fellow Protestant dissenters in the colonies who he read were being scalped and slaughtered in large numbers (*Captives* 164). He would later describe Mohawks as “the most Desperate, and most Cruel of the Natives of *North-America*,” and he claims it is a “particular Barbarity singular to them” that when they take prisoners, “either of the *English* or other Natives, they always *Scalp’d them*” (qtd in Vaughan 129). He reminds his readers that this is the same “small Nation of *Savages* in the Woods . . . from whence our four pretended *Indian Kings* came lately of their own Fools Errand” (qtd in Hinderaker

²⁶ See also Richter, Daniel K. “Some of Them... Would Always have a Minister with Them”: Mohawk Protestantism, 1683-1719.” *American Indian Quarterly* 16.1 (Fall 1992): 471-84.

524). It is not surprising that Defoe's *The Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719), often described as the first British novel in the modern sense, should be in large part about an Englishman claiming a piece of the New World and subjugating and re-naming an Indian man. It is tempting, though perhaps untenable, to link Crusoe's pathological hatred of the cannibalistic "savages" with Defoe's own antipathy towards the Indian kings, fueled by their celebration among the British public.

The embassy of the Indian kings was in many ways a carefully orchestrated event to achieve an immediate political effect: the renewal of the campaign against the French in North America. Culturally, the literature of the time tied the figure of the Indian to emergent discourses of selfhood and nation, creating a climate which was sympathetic to the production of a novel such as *Robinson Crusoe*. Throughout the eighteenth century there are echoes of the visit by the Indian kings, often in unexpected places. The landlord for their stay, mentioned in Addison's essay as providing the king's journal, was the upholsterer Thomas Arne. In a piece *The Tatler* no. 171, Steele reports that the Indians were so grateful for their landlord's kindness in caring for one of them when he fell ill, and for Arne's comfortable furniture, that they rename him "Cadaroque" (281). This is presumably a derivation from Katarakouy, the location of the strongest fort in their homeland and site of modern day Kingston, and is meant to be an honour to Arne. At the time of the Iroquois visit, Arne, or rather Cadaroque, had an infant son, who presumably grew up around the family memory and, likely, framed

mezzotints of the Indian kings. In 1740, this son, Thomas Augustine Arne, would help compose “Rule, Britannia!,” the “first mature cultural expression of Britain’s new imperial identity” (Hinderaker 526). Thus the quintessential anthem of British patriotism and self-confidence was composed in the shadow of Indians.

Thomas Tickell's “On the Prospect of Peace” (1712), published two years after the visit by the Indian kings, combines Dennis' fantasy of liberating conquered people through British colonialism with the reality of the visit by the Iroquois. Tickell writes of Queen Anne that “[h]er Labours are to plead th'Almighty's Cause, / Her Pride to teach th' untam'd Barbarian Laws: / Who conquers, wins by brutal Strength the Prize; / But 'tis a Godlike Work to civilize” (8). He continues,

Did not the Painted Kings of India greet
Our Queen, and yield their Sceptres at Her Feet!
Chiefs who full Bowls of hostile Blood had quaff'd
Fam'd for the Javelin, and invenom'd Shaft,
Whose haughty Brows made Savages adore,
Nor bow'd to less than Stars, or Sun before.
Her pitying Smile accepts their suppliant Claim,
And adds Four Monarchs to the Christian Name. (8-9)

Despite his confusion over where the “Indians” who visited London came from, Tickell sees in them the possibility for a righteous and profitable empire built on British moral superiority and trade. He imagines that “[f]earless our Merchant now may fetch his Gain, / And roam securely o'er the boundless Main” (9), while at the same time “savage Indians swear by ANNA's Name” (15).

Colonial Contacts and Betrayals: *Inkle and Yarico*

Another key paradigm of cultural contact was established through the

story of Pocahontas, which famously projects the fantasy of the desirability of the European male onto the “Indian princess,” a trope which has appeared in countless texts since that time. It also became a crucial story in American national history beginning in the nineteenth century, as it provided an early coherent origin (Hulme 141). Mary Dearborn argues that the Pocahontas story is among the “single most important metaphor[s] of female ethnic identity” (qtd in Margo Hendricks 236). Aphra Behn's *The Widow Ranter* (1690) evokes a similar tale, in which the Virginian Indian queen Semernia falls in love with English colonist Francis Bacon. In the end he kills her accidentally while fighting off other Indians, and subsequently takes his own life by swallowing poison. This tale suggests, as Margo Hendricks notes, that “miscegenation is both desirable and dangerous” (236-7). Indeed, while the Pocahontas story was circulated beginning quite early in the century in Robert Beverley's *The History and Present State of Virginia* (1705), it was eclipsed by the much more ambivalent story of Inkle and Yarico, one of the most popular narratives of the eighteenth century, in which miscegenation becomes a metaphor for the immorality of imperialism.²⁷ Whereas Dennis' play masks colonial struggle with romantic encounter, this tale uncovers it with the opposite strategy.

The story of Inkle and Yarico first appears in Richard Ligon's *A True and Exact History of the Island of Barbadoes* (1657, 1673), though Ligon only briefly

²⁷ For a compilation of various versions, see Felsenstein, Frank. *English Trader, Indian Maid: Representing Gender, Race, and Slavery in the New World: An Inkle and Yarico Reader*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1999.

mentions his encounter with an “Indian maid” from the mainland who fell in love “upon the first sight” of a young Englishman being pursued by her people, and saved him from harm (qtd in Felsenstein 74). She nursed him in a cave, and they eventually found his ship and boarded it. Upon their arrival in Barbados, he “forgot the kindness of the poor maid, that had ventured her life for his safety, and sold her for a slave, who was as free born as he: And so poor Yarico, for her love, lost her liberty” (74). John Oldmixon repeats this version in his *The British Empire in America* (1708), with the added commentary that the man's behaviour was “hardly credible in an *Englishman*,” but more suitable in a Spaniard or a Frenchman (16). Oldmixon adds the details that Yarico was “so true a Savage” that she refused to wear clothes, and that she would later have a child with a white servant. However, it is in Richard Steele's piece for *The Spectator* number 11 (March 13, 1711), printed a little over one month before the piece on the Indian kings, that the story of Inkle and Yarico is fully developed.

Steele's version of the story is an expansion of Ligon's tale, and is told by a woman named Arietta in response to a fop's misogynist tale about the inconstancy of women. The story begins with the character Thomas Inkle of London, a young man who sails to the Indies “to improve his Fortune by Trade and Merchandize” (42). Inkle's father made sure to instill in his son “an early Love of Gain, by making him a perfect Master of Numbers, and consequently giving him a quick View of Loss and Advantage, and preventing the natural Impulses of his Passions, by Prepossession towards his Interests” (42). Steele's version elaborates the

context of mercantile capitalism and blind self-interest which is implicit in the previous versions, and his use of a female narrator offers a potential critique of reckless male colonialism as it plays out, as Nicole Horejsi notes, “on the body of a woman” (205). More specifically, the originary betrayal of colonialism occurs on the body of an Indian woman, so often allegorized as the figure of America. Indeed, after Yarico discovers and rescues the exhausted Inkle, she brings “a great many spoils” to his cave so that it is “richly adorned,” mirroring the flow of goods from the colonies to Britain.

Though she is described as a “naked American,” Yarico nonetheless “every Day came to him in a different Dress, of the most beautiful Shells, Bugles, and Bredes” (43). Brown observes that in eighteenth-century imperialist discourse, “female adornment becomes the main emblem of commodity fetishism,” and women are associated with mercantile capitalism and its attractions and ambiguities because their “marginality allows them to serve, in the writings of celebrants and satirists alike, as a perfect proxy or scapegoat” (119, 112). Thus in Pope’s “The Rape of the Lock” (1712, 1714), the English desire for imported goods is gendered as feminine; Pope’s *Clarissa* notes that women are “deck’d with all that Land and Sea afford” (V: 11), and earlier Belinda’s dressing table is said to hold “[t]he various Offerings of the World” (I: 130). This “glitt’ring Spoil” includes “India’s glowing Gems” and Arabian perfumes, as well as combs made from elephant ivory and tortoise shell (I: 132-136). In Steele’s text, Yarico herself becomes an exotic object for the merchant Inkle, who decides to sell her when he

arrives in the Barbados and the planters set up a “[m]arket of the *Indians* and Slaves, as with us of Horses and Oxen” (43). Steele explains,

Mr. *Thomas Inkle*, now coming into *English* Territories, began seriously to reflect upon his Loss of Time, and to weigh with himself how many Days Interest of his Money he had lost during his Stay with *Yarico*. This Thought made the youngMan very pensive, and careful what Account he should be able to give his Friends of his Voyage. Upon which Considerations, the prudent and frugal young Man sold *Yarico* to a *Barbadian* Merchant; notwithstanding that the poor Girl, to incline him to commiserate her Condition, told him that she was with Child by him; But he only made use of that Information, to rise in his Demands upon the Purchaser. (43-44)

The cold calculation of the merchant class, epitomized a few years later in Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, is in *Inkle and Yarico* responsible for the moral bankruptcy of British colonialism. Peter Hulme speculates that Yarico, “caught between the devil of cannibalism and the deep blue sea of the trading soul, is less of a 'savage' than a transposition of the difficult position of the English aristocracy, caught between the savagery of the lower orders and the growing threat from the merchant classes” (239). She is, as Indians would often become in eighteenth-century texts, a stand-in for a form of British subjectivity facing a potential threat or drastic change to its existence. The anti-colonial critique of the tale, which would by the end of the century be used as a condemnation of slavery by abolitionists, is here potentially reduced to an anxiety over the emergence of the middle class. However, the widespread popularity of this story throughout the century suggests that it represented more than just the dangers of the bourgeoisie, and also addressed the deep misgivings many in Britain felt over the expansion of

trade and empire.

An illuminating contrast to the story of Yarico's betrayal is the ballad "The Four Indian Kings," printed shortly after the Iroquois visit in 1710. While this broadside did not achieve the level of impact that the story of Yarico and Inkle obtained, it nonetheless was still being printed over a century later. In this short poem, one of the kings falls in love with an English woman he sees in St. James's Park. He proclaims that "[t]he young ladies of this nation, / They are more than mortal sure" (qtd in Bissell 216). This particular young woman, he bemoans, "is far above me, / Although I am an Indian king." He sends a messenger to deliver a ring to her, and to declare his interest while he waits "burning / Wrapt in scorching flames of love" (217). The woman tells the messenger that she cannot be with the king, even if he were "king of many nations" and she "born of mean relations," because "[h]e's a Heathen by profession, / I a Christian bred and born" (218). The messenger assures her that the kings are all fond of Britain and open to receiving "the light of grace," and she replies to him that if the king considers changing his faith, she will entertain his proposition. The broadside ends at this point, on the brink of conversion and miscegenation, though in later editions, such as "The Three Indian King's Garland" from 1765, the king becomes a Christian and they marry in the presence of Queen Anne. Nonetheless, there is an interesting distinction between this apocryphal story and the fate of Yarico; both the Indian king and the ill-fated maid fall in love with Britons, and the forces of religion and commerce, respectively, interject and prevent or postpone their

unions. Both texts also turn contact zones between British and Indigenous peoples into spaces of romantic encounter and sentimental drama, making them “classically Freudian,” as Hulme suggests of Yarico and Inkle (253-54). That is, in the case of Inkle, the narrative offers a potential critique of British behaviour through a displacement of the political into the sentimental. In the case of the Indian king's unrequited love, the petition to Queen Anne for military assistance and missionaries becomes a desire for a devout English woman. Just as the Iroquois presented Anne with “belts of wampum,” the king offers a diamond ring to the woman to woo her. She is, like the good queen, happy to listen to the Indian's request on the condition that he adopts Christianity and renounces his pagan beliefs. In actual fact, the Iroquois emissaries were already Christians, but this would make for a less interesting ballad. While there is a rather different outcome between these two texts, the tendency to sentimentalize the figure of the Indian, and to fantasize over sexual unions with them, sets an important precedence in representations of the “savage.”

For British people in the first decades of the eighteenth century, there was a growing sense of what we can now call “modernity”; Fredric Jameson describes the “modern feeling” as “the conviction that we ourselves are somehow new, that a new age is beginning, that everything is possible and nothing can ever be the same again” (qtd in Brown, *Fables*, 9). The rise of the nation-state, the birth of capitalism, the discourse of liberty and rights, and subjectivity itself can all be traced to this period and, more than any other non-European people,

representations of Indians from the Americas reflected and influenced “modern” British discourses. Thus the ambivalence over the cultural fables involving Native peoples, from the deeply betrayed Yarico to the suppliant Iroquois, speaks to the ambivalence over modernity itself. And Indians were decidedly linked to modernity, notwithstanding the myth of the Golden Age. In *The Tatler* number 278, one essay notes that those who study classical history and knowledge are engaging in “frivolous Enquiries, and impertinent Studies,” and that “[t]hese poring Bookworms will run you a long Detail of every injured Prince and State that sued to the *Roman* Senate for Protection, but know nothing of the Four *Indian* Kings that were lately here” (438). The kings' visit epitomizes the new and the modern, in contrast to the impulse to find meaning in the ancient and increasingly irrelevant past. As the following chapters will show, the importance of the figure of the Indian throughout the century is connected to the current developments in British culture rather than a desire or nostalgia for the primitive past.

This is only the beginning of the story. The period subsequent to 1710 witnessed an even greater proliferation in printed materials, and the simultaneous rise in both the novel and a vast body of ethnographic and historical writings on First Nations people suggests, on the surface, that the former provided the interiority and individualism equated with modern subjecthood while the latter supplied the “Other” with which to define that Self. On closer reading, however, I expect to find the two to be entangled, forming a kind of “ethnography of the

Self” which sought to re-define Britishness and the boundaries of identity. This is particularly evident in some of the non-canonical British novels of the eighteenth century, including Edward Kimber’s *The History of the Life and Adventures of Mr. Anderson* (1754), John Shebbeare’s *Lydia or, Filial Piety* (1755), the anonymously penned *Memoirs of the Life and Adventures of Tsonnonthouan* (1763) and *The Female American* (1767) by “Unka Eliza Winkfield.” In captivity narratives produced during the mid-eighteenth century, the Indian threatens to split the unified British self by revealing its own artifice; if the “savage” of the captivity narrative is able to re-write the British body into an Indian body (i.e. “going native” in some form), then identity itself is called into question. The Indian, in other words, both makes and unmakes the modern self. During the 1770s, this threat of fracture becomes a desire to appropriate the Indian into British subjectivity in the form of the hybrid Briton-Indian who generally represents a corrective to the effeminate gentry or overly sentimental man of feeling.

In 1776, the year of the American Declaration of Independence and also the year which Wahrman quite precisely dates as the birth of the modern self, noted chronicler and journal writer James Boswell, perhaps the quintessential example of a man in possession of the interiority which is requisite for selfhood, met in London with Mohawk leader Thayendanegea (or Joseph Brant as he is more commonly known) for an interview to appear in *The London Magazine*. Boswell begins his article with the historical note that “[i]t is well known that the

chief of the Mohock Indians visited England in the reign of Queen Anne,” and adds that Brant is the grandson to that chief.²⁸ The kings, now reduced to one, yet again come up at a pivotal time. Boswell reflects that Brant “has not the ferocious dignity of a savage leader,” and “to those who study human nature, he affords a very convincing proof of the tameness which education can produce upon the wildest race.” During the time of Queen Anne, by contrast, the “wild American chief” represented a “very rude and uncivilized nation,” and “somewhat more than half a century has made a very great change upon the Mohock nation.” It does not occur to Boswell, nor could it have, that his own self-confidence in who he is, and his comfortable privileging of British ways of knowing the world, could in some way be owing to those Iroquois men. For Brant, dressed in the “ordinary European habit” while at the same time bearing his tomahawk, upon which “is carved the first letter of his Christian name, . . . and his Mohock appellation,” it was impossible not to see the conjoined nature of English and Mohawk selves.

²⁸ Their precise relationship is somewhat disputed; see Vaughan, 220-232 and Pratt, in *Between Worlds*, 57-67.

Chapter 2

Indians and the “*ancien régime*” of Identity

One of the more frequent and longstanding critical gestures in eighteenth-century studies is to attempt to locate the origins of what has been described as the “modern self”; as discussed in the first chapter, the foundational work of E.P. Thompson and Ian Watt, as well as more recent works by Linda Colley and Dror Wahrman, contribute to the narrative of subject formation in the eighteenth century by tracing the economic, aesthetic, historical, and cultural origins of British modernity. Feminist and postcolonial scholars such as Laura Brown and Srinivas Aravamudan have looked more closely at the important and ambivalent role of alterity in these origins, and this chapter will similarly look at the relation between the Indian and the British subject during a formative period. Wahrman's *The Making of the Modern Self* (2004) will be particularly important for the following work; he utilizes the argument put forth in Charles Taylor's *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (1992) which traces the trajectory of personal identity toward modern forms, but instead of exploring the writings of a select number of canonical philosophers, he observes broader cultural practises and beliefs, since, as he notes, the self exists in social life. Most significant for my purposes is his description of what he calls the *ancien régime* of identity. Wahrman argues that the “pre-modern” sense of self and personal identity has much in common with postmodern conceptions of gender, race, and selfhood

broadly as socially constructed and mutable. He suggests that Berkeley and Foucault, for example, are thinkers who each are skeptical about the meaning of identity as fixed, and so provide a kind of beginning and end to modernity (xviii). He argues that this earlier regime of identity was emphatically “*not* characterized by an axiomatic presupposition of a deep inner core of selfhood.” Instead, the “specific categories of identity . . . could prove to be mutable, malleable, unreliable, divisible, replaceable, transferable, manipulable, escapable, or otherwise fuzzy around the edges” (198).

In this chapter I will first use Wahrman's description of eighteenth-century identity in order to explore literary encounters between Indigenous North Americans and Britons who exemplify the *ancien régime* in three culturally significant texts. I will argue that Indians in these works, and as frequently represented in other places in British literature of the period, embody a subjectivity on which was projected elements of the “modern self” described by both Taylor and Wahrman. Rather than a sentimental or neo-classical trope, the Indian is a radical departure from and critique of the standing order. As Robert F. Berkhofer Jr. notes, “the Noble Savage really pointed to the possibility of progress by civilized man if left free and untrammelled by outworn institutions” (76). The first text I will look at is the 1749 edition of *An apology for the life of Bampfylde-Moore Carew*, a widely popular work which novelized the life of the eponymous impostor and so-called “king of the beggars,” who was transported to North America for his transgressions and encountered Indians while fleeing white

colonial society. The second text is a periodical article that first appeared in the *Universal Spectator* for January 30 and February 6, 1742, and was also excerpted in the *London Magazine* that year. Ostensibly a continuation of Joseph Addison's well-known letter from an Indian king from the *Spectator* 50, the essay records the observations of an Indian encountering some of the cultural events and fashionable activities of mid-century London, acknowledging while at the same time disregarding the fact that Addison's king was meant to be one of the 1710 Iroquois delegation to Queen Anne. Finally, I will turn to John Cleland's play *Tombo-Chiqui, or, the American Savage*, printed in 1758 though never performed. Like the earlier British play *Art and Nature* (1738) by James Miller, which saw Colley Cibber play the part of the American "savage" Julio, Cleland's play is an adaptation of Louis François Delisle De La Drevetière's *Arlequin Sauvage* (1721). It is similar in plot to the periodical essay, in that it is primarily about a North American Indian encountering and critiquing British society, but it also contains greater cultural transgression and a romantic sub-plot.

The second part of the chapter will look at the ambivalence of eighteenth-century Britons toward the possibility of European transculturation among Indians. One of the important myths in North American culture is of the white man adopted into a Native society and accepted fully as a member of that group. This hybrid figure, embodied in James Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826) and Kevin Costner's *Dances With Wolves* (1990), works on an ideological level to displace Indigenous people and strengthen settler claims to

land ownership. While such adoptions did indeed happen in practice, there is little evidence of their producing the kinds of heroic subjects documented in the mythology around “going Indian.” Philip Deloria's *Playing Indian* traces the related phenomenon of cultural appropriation, from the Boston Tea Party to New Age sweatlodges, and the ways in which Indigenous cultures have been both effaced from and written into American national history. In early and mid-eighteenth-century Britain, cultural appropriation and hybrid subjects did not operate in the same way and, indeed, it can be said they did not exist at all in the forms more familiar in subsequent times until near the end of the century. While there was less certainty about the differences between races and cultures, as Wahrman has shown, there were nonetheless demarcated, sometimes superficial, cultural distinctions that were not as frequently transgressed.²⁹ This section will look at transcultural exchange and influence during the eighteenth century and the ways in which these representations prefigured and challenged the kinds of cross-cultural fellowship and romanticization that began to emerge in North America around the time of the Revolutionary War, which will be discussed in the final chapter.

Taken together, these sections are meant to explore the imagined and real contact zones between British and Indian selves and their effects on British subjectivity. The Indian as represented in these texts provides an alternative self, and both critiques and shapes newer forms of individual and cultural conceptions

²⁹ See, for example, Castro, Wendy Lucas. “Stripped: Clothing and Identity in Colonial Captivity Narratives.” *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 6.1 (2008): 104-136.

of Britishness. While the figure of the Indian does in many ways provide an otherness with which to contrast British people, it also opens a space of cultural imagination which desires the fantasy of Indian freedom and integrity. In other words, it is British people who are the others in these texts, alienated from themselves and their history, and unable to access the stable cultural practices of the people they sought to both eliminate and appropriate. The first section explores the ways in which literary representations of Indians prefigured the shift from the *ancien régime*, while the second section looks at Britons attempting, and failing, to access the new forms of subjectivity offered in Indian societies.

The *ancien régime* Encountering Indians

Bampfylde Moore Carew, the “King of the Beggars,” is described by Wahrman as an example of one of the popular cultural figures during the *ancien régime* of identity, forming part of the “notable gallery of impostors” (259). While he was an actual historical figure, in novel form his life grew and changed after each subsequent edition, and *An apology for the life of Bampfylde-Moore Carew* was one of the more popular works from the 1740s and 1750s, and into the nineteenth century. Both Henry Fielding and Tobias Smollett reference it in their works as an example of popular and widely read writing, for better or for worse. Carew was from a respectable family and was well educated, but he ran away from school and joined a band of “gypsies” as a teenager. In the 1749 edition of the novel, written by the printer Robert Goadby, the story is greatly expanded, particularly its transatlantic elements. After years of conning people in various

disguises all across Europe, Carew is sentenced to transportation for seven years as a result of his idle vagrancy by a vindictive judge and sent to Maryland.³⁰ While the author notes that the protagonist will miss his wife and daughter, Bampfylde also agreeably reflects on the “[o]ppportunity of making his Name as famous in *America*, as it was already in *Europe*” (9). His ambition is for something even less tangible and more ephemeral than the speculative stocks sought after by the merchant class. However, upon arriving in Maryland he finds things to be less accommodating than he anticipated, and he is sold into indentured servitude to three men. He flees these men and then poses as a crew member from a privateering ship, but is eventually caught and is given an iron collar or “pot hook” around his neck, like a runaway slave. Carew's social position is constantly unstable and determined by his outward appearance, but his adornment in the iron collar of a slave threatens to lock him into the position of this signification, no longer able to transgress the fluid boundaries of colonial society.

Some of Bampfylde's friends come across him and arrange for his escape, and they note that any person caught removing the iron collar will receive “forty Pounds Penalty and half a Year's imprisonment” (33). They tell him to seek out “the friendly Indians,” who will help him remove his collar. They assure him that these Indians are “great Friends to the English, and trade with us for Lattens,

³⁰ For a study of the lives of transported criminals, see Morgan, Gwenda & Peter Rushton. *Eighteenth-Century Criminal Transportation: The Formation of the Criminal Atlantic*. New York: Palgrave, 2004.

Kettles, Frying-Pans, Guns, Powder, and Shot, giving us in Exchange, Buffalo and Deer Skins, with other Sorts of Furs” (33). Their material relationship to the British indicates that Bampfylde himself has become a commodity, adorned with the iron “pot hook” around his neck. Yet this exchange also points to the unique status of the friendly Indians, because they are willing to break the English law in Maryland and liberate a rogue whom the British deemed a criminal. They are friendly to those who are English but who exist on the boundaries or outside of white colonial society, namely traders and runaways, pointing to the critique Indians often provided of what Berkhofer Jr. calls “outworn institutions.”

Bampfylde's friends warn him, however, that “there are two other Sorts of Indians” that need to be avoided because they are “very cruel to the Whites” (33-34). They are distinguishable by their flat foreheads and short stature, respectively, and will not hesitate to murder the Europeans they encounter. At this point in the text the author notes that “here the Reader will, we make no Doubt, be pleas'd to see some Account of the *Indians*, among whom our Hero was treated with so much Kindness and Civility, as we shall relate in its proper Place” (34). What follows is an extended, fifteen page ethnographic account taken directly from John Oldmixon's sprawling history *The British Empire in America* (1708, 1741). Beginning in the early seventeenth century, the inserted text combines accounts of exploration and settlement with observations on the manners and customs of the Indians around Maryland. While the backwardness of their religion is emphasized, at the same time the account discusses their moral and

aesthetic advantages. The story of Pocahontas (or “Pocahonta”) is also told, well before it became the cultural touchstone of Indigenous benevolence and self-sacrifice for the early European settlers. While Goadby inserted Oldmixon's text verbatim, the material sets up Carew's encounter with the friendly Indians and historicizes their kindness and favour to the individual European men who go among them.

With the knowledge of good and bad Indians in mind, Carew flees in search of the friendly Indians. He eventually finds their tracks, and spies five Indians in the distance; he thinks at first that their foreheads are flat, but sees as they approach that they are bearing guns. This, he realizes “was a sure Sign to him they were the friendly *Indians*” (53). While their racial traits are subjective and open to the interpretation of the wary European eye, their accoutrements guarantee their identity. It is the recognizable European weapon that ensures these Indians are integrated into the networks of trade which define their relationship to the British. While Bampfylde may be a rogue and impostor, he is nonetheless dependent upon the colonial activity of his nation to make the world a more cosmopolitan and hospitable place. The irony that this hospitality is represented by a weapon of violence is no doubt intentional, though Indian weaponry such as tomahawks and scalping knives were seen as much more brutal than the more efficient European firearm.³¹

The Indians note that Bampfylde is a runaway upon observing his collar,

³¹ See the discussion of Burke's speech on Indian warfare below.

and their king takes him into a “wigwam.” Using some steel from Bampfylde's tinderbox, the king personally removes his collar with great effort, “his Majesty sweating heartily at the Work,” and takes him to his own elaborately decorated personal wigwam where he gives him food and refreshments. The king introduces himself as George Lillycraft, and claims his father was one of the Indian kings who visited Queen Anne. He shows Bampfylde “some fine lac'd Cloaths, which, he said, were made a Present of to him by the last King *George* of *England*, (meaning his late Majesty King *George* the First)” (54).³² The relation to the lineage of the Indian kings, as in the case of the *Universal Spectator* essay, ties King Lillycraft's voice and subjectivity to the important role of British self-imagining through Indian royalty.

With his decidedly Anglophone name and finery, King George Lillycraft is set in contrast with England's own King George. He questions Bampfylde about “his Brother Kings of *England*,” and in this conversation reveals that the “noble” aspect of the noble savage is more in keeping with the bourgeois social values of meritocracy and the dignity of labour than either a defence or outright rejection of nobility itself. Upon hearing that the king of England never walked among his people without a contingent of armed guards, King Lillycraft questions who the king fears, supposing that he must be in a constant state of war with neighbouring kings. Bampfylde assures him this is not the case, and the king reflects that his whole people are his guard when they are at war, and when he is at peace he “can

³² Well-known Mohawk leader Hendrick was also said to have a similar set of clothes from the king.

fear no Evil from my own People, therefore have no need of armed Men about me” (55). When he hears that less than a thousandth of the populace of England have ever even seen the king in their lives, and that he spends most of his time sequestered in his palace, Lillycraft flies into a passion, declaring “[h]e was certain he deceived him, and belied his good Brother of England, for how, adds he, can he be the King of a People, whom he hath no Knowledge of?” (56). He adds, “*I know, and am known by all my Subjects, I appear daily among them, hear their Complaints, and redress their Grievances, and am acquainted with every Place in my Kingdom.*” Being told, the People of *England* paid their King yearly, vast Sums out of the Profits of their Labour; he laughed, and cry'd, *O! Poor King!* Adding, *I have often given to my Subjects, but never received any Thing from them.*” A footnote explains that “[t]he *Indian Kings are obliged to provide for the Subsistance of their People.*” This model of kingship exemplifies the natural rationality and liberty embodied by the modern regime of selfhood, and offers a critique of the king who is not answerable to his people. At the same time, it is not kingship *per se* that is being critiqued, since the institution is naturalized to the extent that it exists even among the Indians. Rather, King Lillycraft is inserting bourgeois values into the older institution, values which frequently found voice on the peripheries of empire, and were troubled and also reinforced by indeterminate figures such as Bampfylde-Moore Carew. The colonies often provide a space in British literature where people can make their fortunes outside of the confines of class, and as such these figures, like Moll Flanders and

Robinson Crusoe, embody similar critiques of Britain as the Indians they frequently encounter.

Carew is an elusive man while among Europeans, and is able to switch identities simply by changing his clothes. Among the Indians, however, he is unwilling or unable to dissimulate, and becomes quite esteemed by them. He hunts alongside them every day, and King Lillycraft offers him a close relative as his wife. Bampfylde, however, “notwithstanding these Honours, could not forget his native Country, the Love of which glow'd within his Breast” (57). While the European is able to switch identities, the narrative insists that he maintains a core identity loyal to his nation. The limitations of fluidity at this point lie at actual miscegenation, which poses a greater threat to the loss of identity than cultural exchange, and which becomes the site of satire in the case of William Johnson discussed below. Despite his freedom and esteem among the Indians, Bampfylde seemingly cannot leave of his own free will, and so must plot his escape. He is not a captive, but a free citizen, and yet presumably the hold of Indian society is so great that one cannot simply walk away. One day while he is out hunting with his brethren, they come across another group of Indians. They “got some Rum amongst them” and begin to drink together, and eventually “fell to Singing and Dancing after their Country Fashion” (58). It is only through the introduction of a European trade good that the Indians' grip on Carew can be loosened, even though they still maintain their fundamental identities as manifested by their cultural practises. Bampfylde slips off with one of their canoes and eventually makes his

way to Newcastle, Pennsylvania. Here he “transform'd himself into a *Quaker*, pulling off the Button from his Hat, and flapping it on every Side, put on as demure and precise a Look, as if his whole Family had been *Quakers*, and he had never seen any other Sort of People” (57-58). As soon as he leaves the Indians, Bampfylde again finds the fluidity of self with which he has thrived to this point in his life. The narrator notes,

Here Reader, it will be necessary to remark, that as our Hero is no longer among the simple and honest *Indians*, who are not enough polish'd to forget the Dictates of Nature, but follow her in all their Ways, who have not Art enough to deceive, but speak what they think, and act what they say; as he is no longer amongst such, but amongst a polish'd People, whose Knowledge has taught them to forget the Ways of Nature, and to act every thing in Disguise; whose Hearts and Tongues are almost as far distant from one another, as the North from the Southern Pole, and who daily over reach one another in the Occurrences of Life: We hope it will be no Disgrace to our Hero, if among such he appears as polish'd as the best, and puts on a fresh Disguise as often as it suits his Conveniency. (58)

The Indians are the natural progression beyond social limitations, and present an alternative to the uneasy British self caught between social graces or transculturation. The “polish'd” Europeans have no stable core in terms of their social behaviour, and switch ideas at their “conveniency.” Though it was printed several years later, Burke makes a similar observation in *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757); he notes that the languages of “most unpolished people . . . have a great force and energy of expression,” since “[u]ncultivated people are but ordinary observers of things, and not critical in distinguishing them” (261). Burke does not go so far as to suggest

that this is a superior condition, but argues that people from these cultures “express themselves in a warmer and more passionate manner” as compared to the “polished languages” which “are generally deficient in strength.” Hugh Blair, in *A Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian* (1763), notes the “serious” condition of those less cultivated, and that the “American tribes . . . have been noted by all travellers for their gravity and taciturnity” (23). During the “infancy of societies” and in contemporary societies not in the “refined state,” he writes, people “display themselves to one another without disguise,” and, because they lack the linguistic refinement to control their passions, “[a]n American chief, at this day, harangues at the head of his tribe, in a more bold metaphorical style, than a modern European would adventure to use in an Epic poem” (2). While both Burke and Blair view Native North America as representing an earlier or less refined state of society, they both point to the potentially liberating and alternative ways of expression and identity embodied by their lack of “polish.”³³

If the case of Bampfylde Moore-Carew is an instance of a figure of the so-called *ancien régime* of identity encountering Indians in their homeland, the *Universal Spectator* and *London Magazine* essay explores the possibility of an Indian encountering British cultures in their place of nativity. While it poses as a continuation of Addison's *Spectator* letter, which was meant to be written by one of the Indian kings who visited London in 1710, the essay begins with the editor's

³³ Paul Goring notes that politeness, long associated with the culture of eighteenth-century Britain, “could never achieve any settled or secure hegemony,” and it was challenged even within the culture by “frenzied Methodist preachers” and others (26). In *The Rhetoric of Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

reflections on the curiosity of Britons to observe other cultures and judge them inferior to their own. This is particularly the case with people who are “govern’d and directed by Nature,” whose “blunt Simplicity shews them to be utter Strangers to that Politeness we value ourselves so much upon” (1). Politeness is, to the author of the article, a means of maintaining the artifice of the social order. He thus wonders “what would be their Opinion of us, were they to inspect our Manners and Customs,” and claims to have obtained the continuation of a letter by “that Serene Monarch, *Sa Ga Yern Qua Rash Tow*, one of the *Indian Kings*, who was here in the Reign of Queen *Anne*.” The author hopes the Indian’s observations can reveal the faults which self-love and “the Prevalence of Custom have long made [the reader] blind to,” and that women in particular can look past the “*hideous, hideous Indian*” to “view herself in the Glass he presents, and discover her own Likeness in the Picture he draws of *Affectation*.”

Wahrman suggests that “[i]t is hard to overestimate— though easy to forget— the cultural significance of the masquerade in eighteenth-century England” (158). Terry Castle’s *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction* (1986) makes a similar claim, arguing that the masked assembly was “a social phenomenon of expansive proportions and a cultural sign of considerable potency” (2). Castle writes that these events were “in the deepest sense a kind of collective mediation on self and other, and an exploration of their mysterious dialectic,” which resulted in a

“material devaluation of unitary notions of the self” (4).³⁴ It was at the masquerade that social distinctions collapsed, or at least had the potential to do so; the *Country Journal* for July 30, 1737 reports that the English masquerade is “a *Comedy of Mankind*,” in which “a confused Jumble of all Ranks, Ages, Sexes and Conditions . . . mix together.” The numerous, competing advertisements for masquerade habits indicates the massive popularity of the events, and costumes could be let to those who could not afford to buy. An ad in the *London Daily Post* in 1740 for “Lee’s Masquerade Habits,” one of several ads in the same issue, boasts costumes such as “fine peasants,” “running-footmen’s habits,” “a fine Morocco Dress,” and “fine Indian habits, for Men and Women, with feather’d Lamberkeanes.”

The Indian kings are taken by their landlord “about Midnight” to a large room lit by candles. The king writes that “we had no sooner enter’d it than we were seiz’d with a mortal Fright: We saw, on every side of us, the most monstrous, ghastly, horrible Figures that Imagination can form.” When these figures begin to speak like humans, the kings are calmed, but “[w]hat gave us the more Courage was that we saw several of our own Countrymen (as we thought by their Dress) not in the least terrified at these deform’d figures, but walking amongst them with great Intrepidity.” The kings are dismayed to find out, upon speaking to these Indians, that “they were not our Countrymen, but Cheats and Counterfeits, that

³⁴ For a discussion of the ways in which masquerades were potentially less liberating for women, see Craft-Fairchild, Catherine. *Masquerade and Gender: Disguise and Female Identity in Eighteenth-Century Fictions by Women*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 1993.

had assum'd our Habit, and would have pass'd upon the Company for us." They are angered, and are about to "lay Hands on them in order to punish them for their Villainy" when their landlord intercedes, explaining that they "only chose that Habit to disguise their real Persons, as it was always customary for those to do who frequented such Assemblies." The Indian does not initially understand why this custom is practised until he sees "one of the pretended *Indians* make a Sign to a Female, who follow'd him into a private Room." He concludes that these events are meant for lovers to "gratify their Inclinations . . . and to avoid the Notice of the Publick Magistrate." Dissimulation is here represented as an act meant to conceal more base desires, and identity play collapses under the scrutiny of the Indians. Wahrman cites the marked decline of masquerades near the end of the century as evidence of a shift to more essentialized, modern notions of human identity and difference, yet already here the Indian is performing the work of modernity.

The Indian king finds little to admire in Britain throughout the *Universal Spectator* essay. Following the masquerade he attends a play and observes in the audience the "beaus," who are "the most tawdry, conceited, ridiculous Animals I ever saw," but are nonetheless admired by "coquets," who "took abundance of Pains to spoil that remarkable Beauty which Nature had bestow'd upon them." The "beaus" speak in "an effeminate tone of voice," shave their beards too closely, and wear too much "borrow'd Hair upon their Heads," in contrast to the masculine king, who is the "[v]oice of Nature and Reason." The first part of the

essay ends after his encounter with these people, and the next issue continues with the kings being escorted to a musical entertainment. The “[c]ommon People,” the king writes, do not come to such events because it is too expensive and “above their Taste.” He marvels at the changing scenery on the stage, which replicates the natural seasons, and watches as two men come onstage, “with high Plumes of Feathers on their Heads, higher and more grand than that wore by *Te How Bash Ban Ka Kochee*, King of the *Nine Nations*.” The king is mesmerized by their “majesty” and longs to hear “their rough, manly Voice, worthy their Mein and Figure,” but is dismayed to hear their voices sound “like the Notes of our Birds,” which would be pleasing “had it been more natural.” After discussing the non-English origin of these castrati, who “had an outward human Form, but were not *Men*,” and the rapturous response of the audience, the king concludes that the English “have a strange Love for *Novelty*, and will prefer whatever is *Foreign* to that which is the Produce of their own Nation, even though their own is much more valuable.” The author's use of an exotic subject to articulate this critique is ironic, but it is also significant that this subject is a North American Indian, who provides a less ambiguous model of masculinity and subjectivity more broadly. Further, the reader is asked to occupy the gaze of the Indian as a means of revealing the disturbing emptiness underlying European dissimulation.

The Indian king concludes his critique with his observations on coffee-house culture, British law and governance, commerce, and speculative capital. He is disturbed by the politicians who seem more concerned with foreign affairs

than their own, by the existence of a standing army even during times of peace, and the countless laws which most people do not understand. While he admires the vast amount of trade which the nation carries on, he notes upon observing the countless goods at the custom house, "*This, the People say, is the Effect of Liberty; how careful ought they then to be, to preserve so inestimable a Treasure!*" The reduction of liberty to the availability of goods will be discussed in the following chapter, but here the Indian is criticizing the conflation of consumer power with political freedom. His final stop is at the nearby stock exchange, where he is troubled by the merchants "with a kind of fierce Madness in their Eyes" and who "all made hideous Outcries to something or other, call'd *Stock*: -- This, we were inform'd, was the *Idol* of the Place." He concludes that he "[does] *not care for staying in so odd a Place, where savage Brutes bore the Resemblance of a human Form.*" Here the Indian king takes on the arrogant voice of the colonial official or the authors of manners and custom texts, while the modern trappings of Britain in effect reduce the humanity of its citizens to a lower state.

Cleland's play, like the *Universal Spectator* piece, is based on both an earlier precedent and, most likely, an actual First Nations visitor to Britain. The title, *Tombo-Chiqui*, is presumably taken from the Creek leader Tomochichi (or "Tomo Chachi," as he was widely known in Britain at the time) who visited London in 1734,³⁵ while the content is mostly a translation and adaptation of the popular French play *Arlequin Sauvage*. Tomochichi was widely known at the

³⁵ For an account of his visit, see Vaughan, 151-162.

time of his visit and in the years following, and was the subject of various poems and articles including Oglethorpes' "Tomo Chachi: An Ode" (1736) and Hawling's "A Discourse from King Tomo Chichy, to his Nephew Prince Tonahohy"(printed in 1751).

The play was never performed, but was reviewed favourably by Smollett in the *Critical*, who excerpted several scenes and concluded that it "is written with a spirit, which no where flags," and that "there is a strain of pleasantry [which] runs through the whole, which, in our opinion, would have ensured it success on the stage under the conduct of a Garrick" (206).³⁶ While Smollett believed that scenes from the play tended to run too long at times for the stage and would need to be cut, he noted that the "American savage . . . talks very rationally: his character seems to be that of uncorrupted integrity, such as Adam was before the fall. His ignorance and innocence are well pourtrayed" (199). Smollett's focus on the subjectivity of the Indian points to Cleland's central concerns in the play, which is not so much the plot as the cultural encounter between an Indian and the metropolis.

The plot of the play follows a young "American savage" (the historical Tomochichi was an old man at the time of his visit) who has been brought to London by Captain Clerimont. Clerimont was rescued by the Indian in a shipwreck, and, while his main purpose is to claim his fiancé Sylvia, he hopes to

³⁶ Cleland and Smollett were friends, so the positive review is not surprising; see Donoghue, Frank. *The Fame Machine: Book Reviewing and Eighteenth-Century Literary Careers*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1996. 127

be entertained by the observations of Tombo-Chiqui: “[T]he quickness of his perception, and the native shrewdness of his answers, gave me the first idea of bringing him to Europe in all his ignorance. I had a notion it would divert me to observe pure simple nature working in him, in comparison with the laws, arts, and sciences amongst us. The contrast will doubtless be singular” (6). The rest of the plot primarily follows Tombo-Chiqui as he is repeatedly mystified by the laws and cultural practises of Britain, and attempts to gain the affections of Sylvia’s friend Violetta. At one point he runs into a “Jew Pedlar,” who offers Tombo-Chiqui some of his wares.³⁷ The Indian takes all the pedlar offers gratefully, but is confused and angered when the man demands payment, since he has no concept of money. They argue, and the pedlar tells Tombo-Chiqui that he will complain to a Justice of the Peace, who has the authority to have him hanged. Tombo-Chiqui notes that “the honesty of these people is not voluntary, it goes against the grain; they would not be honest but for fear of these same laws” (21). They proceed to argue and Tombo-Chiqui resolves to “scalp the dog,” but is left with only the man’s wig in his hand. In the next scene the young American reflects that “as far as I can see, the people here are nothing of what they appear to be, and every thing is artificial amongst them, goodness, wisdom, wit, and even to the hair of their head” (21-22). As in all the examples above, the Indian represents the authentic expression of identity, what we might consider the modern self

³⁷ For a history of Jewish peddlers and hawkers in eighteenth-century Britain, see Endelman, Todd M. *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714-1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1999. 166-191

projected onto the uncivilized, North American Indigenous subject. While Cleland tempers his critique of commercial society by making its representative a racialized other, he condemns the arbitrary nature of its enforcement in the following scene when the constables believe Tombo-Chiqui is the one who has been wronged because “he has cried rogue first” (23). However, when he admits he beat the man and took his wares, thinking he is in the right, they realize what has occurred and insist on taking him to a judge. Not understanding the authority of the law, he insists that he must first go to meet a “pretty girl.” They seize him, and at that point Clerimont enters. Clerimont explains that it is his fault for not explaining the law and currency of the land to the “savage,” pays his debt, and has him released.

Following this event, Tombo-Chiqui is profoundly disenchanted with both Clerimont and his countrymen, complaining that “every thing is false and hollow amongst you” (27). Clerimont explains the concepts of private property, credit, and money to the young man, who responds

[Y]ou are poor, because you confine your notion of riches to money, or to the trash that money can procure, instead of enjoying pure nature as we do, who desire nothing, that we may freely enjoy every thing. You are slaves to your possessions, which you prefer to your liberty, and to your fellow creatures, whom you would hang, were they to take any the least part from you, of that which is useless to you. In short you are ignorant, because you make your wisdom consist in knowing the laws, at the same time that you are strangers to reason, which would teach you to do without laws as we do. (31-32)

The collective law produces the shallow individualism of consumerism, as opposed to the individual reason of the Indians, which is seen to erase the

artificiality of social distinction and private property. While this critique does not stray from the already established French tradition of the noble savage, it clearly demonstrates that this trope existed in British texts. Though the historical Tomochichi could be understood as a king in British eyes, Cleland's Tombo-Chiqui does not occupy a similar claim to royal lineage. As such, his dissection of British culture is not tempered by his own lofty social position; he is not a “noble” savage in the literal sense, but is instead an “American savage,” offering an alternative vision of social and political governance enjoyed by all the Indigenous people of North America.

While the logic of the consumer market so adeptly exploited by Cleland in the case of *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1748-49) somewhat effaces the ideological connections between the pornographic and the (post?)colonial, and the novelistic form of *Fanny Hill* and the dramatic presentation of *Tombo-Chiqui* carry with them distinct implications, there is nonetheless a relation between the prostitute and the “American savage.” Felicity Nussbaum has shown that *Fanny Hill* “relocates England's colonialist agenda to the human geography of the female body which is characterized as a ship that travels from man to man, country to country” (16). Cleland was himself invested in the colonial project, serving with the British East India Company for twelve years, from 1728 to 1740. Nussbaum notes that he likely wrote part of the *Memoirs* while in Bombay, engaged primarily in commercial activities; she speculates that Cleland's depiction of the prostitute's body as both a means of exchange by comparing it to a ship, and as

territory to possess, can be connected to the large amount of “[b]uying and selling, trading and shipping” which he conducted while in India (15). While *Tombo-Chiqui* was written significantly later, and the author's days with the East India Company were long behind him, he began planning the play at least four years earlier. In a letter to David Garrick from 31 July 1754, Cleland discusses a play he has just begun called *Clown Polished by Love*, in which “[t]he principal character is . . . a young, raw, untutored rustic, with good sense at bottom; a diamond in the rough” (59). He does not expand on the plot beyond the comparison between the “rustic” and his rival, “one of those detestably gay, double-refined fops, one sees daily and pesterably swarm about town and Court” (59). This play, still a “barely yet embryo of a production,” in all likelihood became *Tombo-Chiqui* over the next several years. Cleland's specific interest in North America and Indians was no doubt, like his interests in Bombay, primarily commercial, though *Tombo-Chiqui* does not become objectified or instrumentalized in the same way as the “woman of pleasure.” And yet the Indian, like the prostitute, is an object of desire for both the reading and viewing audience, and also functions as a critic of moral and political hypocrisy. Further, the Indian, like the prostitute, provides a more fixed and defined sexuality from which to offer critique.

What makes *Tombo-Chiqui* unique is that the eponymous Indian visitor is not, as I have already noted, meant to be a king or other form of savage royalty, despite the high status of his namesake. While Berkhofer claims that “[n]either

the rational nor the sentimental Indian ever achieved the popularity in England that he did in France, perhaps because that country had already had its revolution in the previous century” (76), Cleland's play presents one of the more influential noble savages from France in an English context. Indeed, Rousseau believed the original play was important for its depiction of the contrast between nature and culture, and admired the way it “encourages [the audience's] way of thinking, which is to search and love new and unusual ideas” (qtd in Cro 413). Laura Brown defines the “fable of the Indian prince,” one of the key “fables of modernity,” as a narrative in which “the non-European becomes an influential model for the European man of feeling” (14). In Brown's description, however, “[t]he native visitor to London is . . . decisively a 'prince' in contemporary English parlance: the natives who attract the attention of the London population in the eighteenth century are consistently understood in terms of European categories of elite status” (180). While this is generally true in the case of actual visitors and the public spectacles surrounding their visits, it is also usually more broadly the case in fictional visits, which themselves are generally based on actual accounts. Cleland's departure from this trope hints at a potentially unstable moment of identification for the British reader and audience, a rupture in sentimental identification that challenges elite sentimentalism.

These texts were produced well before Wahrman's quite precise location of the emergence of the modern self following the American Revolution, but they already contain key elements of modern subjectivity; their distrust or

bewilderment over disguise and dissimulation, their confidence in national origins, and the assumption of essential identities and natural rights and liberty. The idea of the noble savage has often been understood as a morally superior alternative to or critique of Western life; but if placed within the context of the history of personal identity, in a way similar to Said's description of Orientalism as an enabling discourse for Western nationalism and empire, the figure of the Native North American plays a much more significant role in eighteenth-century British literature and culture than has previously been granted. Finally, while the well-documented effects of colonialism on First Nations subjectivity and culture were profound and continue to be negotiated, I am interested in the other side of colonial domination. As part of the postcolonial exploration of eighteenth-century British literature, I believe it is important to explore and assess how representations of Native people, however abstracted, commodified, or circumscribed, determined and undermined aspects of British identity.

Britons in the Savage Gaze

Johnson. 'When we talk of pleasure, we mean sensual pleasure. When a man says, he had pleasure with a woman, he does not mean conversation, but something of a different nature. Philosophers tell you, that pleasure is *contrary* to happiness. Gross men prefer animal pleasure. So there are men who have preferred life among savages. Now what a wretch must he be, who is content with such conversation as can be had among savages! You may remember an officer at Fort Augustus, who had served in America, told us of a woman whom they obliged to *bind*, in order to get her back from savage life.' Boswell. 'She must have been an animal, a beast.' Johnson. 'Sir, she was a speaking cat.'

-Life of Johnson

Samuel Johnson's antipathy towards "savage life" is a recurring topic in both his own work and in Boswell's accounts of their conversations, so it should

come as little surprise to see him disapprove of the white people who choose to live “among savages” in the epigraph above. Given his well-known love for his cat Hodge, it is hard to say exactly what the connotation is of him calling this European woman a “speaking cat,” but we can assume he sees her as less than human, a “wretch” who prefers the “animal pleasure” of savage conversation. Donald Cornu notes that Johnson’s argument in this instance is to show that the choice of this white woman to live among Indians “argues no virtues in the savage life,” but showed instead that she had “surrendered her humanity and had thus impeached the testimony of her action” (358). The white person who “goes native,” whether out of coercion as a captive or by choice, is not to be seen as proof of the superiority of life among Indians, away from the temptations and corruptions of civilization, but as a personal failing of that individual. William Smith witnessed an event similar to that described by Johnson, or indeed perhaps the same event, in which white people living among Indians had to be bound in order to stay among the English during Colonel Henry Bouquet’s expedition to repatriate captives in 1764. He notes that “some women, who had been delivered up, afterwards found means to escape and run back to the Indian towns.” Smith continues,

[f]or the honour of humanity, we would suppose those persons to have been of the lowest rank, either bred up in ignorance and distressing penury, or who had lived so long with the Indians as to forget all their former connections. For, easy and unconstrained as the savage life is, certainly it could never be put in competition with the blessings of improved life and the light of religion, by any persons who have had the happiness of enjoying, and the capacity of discerning, them. (29)

That Boswell, Johnson, and Smith should be so distressed by the seemingly willing transculturation of a white woman points to the uneasy relationship between racial mutability and sexuality, and the allure of savage life for these British men is tied to the moral degradation of some women. Unspoken by these men is the anxiety that life among savages offers a fulfillment for women which the refined and emasculated British male cannot offer, and the Indian's masculinity lures them away from civilization. Cornu suggests that “the cohabitation of a white man with an Indian woman has never aroused undue attention, [while] eyebrows are raised when the sexes of the pair are reversed,” and “[t]he theme of the white woman 'gone native' has attracted many writers and even more readers” (368). While he is correct in the broader significance of his remarks, there was in fact relatively little specific mention of white women among Indians in British literature, with the exception of some Puritan captivity narratives, until the nineteenth century. More common was the representation of cohabitation and intermarriage by white men, as in the case of William Johnson and others, as well as male captives.

This section will discuss the representations of British subjects engaging with Indian ways of life, or, to use Mary Louise Pratt's popular terminology, representations of “transculturation.” In *Imperial Eyes*, Pratt borrows the term from ethnography, where it is meant to describe “how subordinated or marginal groups select and invent from materials transmitted to them by a dominant or metropolitan culture” (6). Pratt asks, in addition to the dynamic of subjugated

peoples integrating other cultural materials into their lives, “[H]ow does one speak of transculturation from the colonies to the metropolis?” (6). How, in other words, can we describe metropolitan subjects being shaped by their engagements with the colonial cultures encountered on the frontiers of their empire? Further, how can this discussion be productive when the colonial cultures are abstracted, commodified, or even invented by British authors and travelers? As this and the fourth chapter will suggest, these sites of interaction changed greatly during the gradual shift from the *ancien régime* to modern forms of identity.

These accounts and descriptions of Britons “going native” represent the British subject attempting to appropriate Indian ways of life and culture for reasons ostensibly outside of simply exploring other forms of subjectivity. Whether for reasons of self-preservation, commercial gain, or diplomatic strategy, their forays into new identities are tempered by external circumstances and motivations. At the same time, in these accounts these men find themselves unable to cast off their new way of being and find themselves entangled in their hybrid subjectivities.

One of the more obvious sites of Britons interacting in a visceral way with Indigenous cultures is in captivity narratives, texts which became increasingly popular in Britain in the 1750s and '60s, as the conflict in North America between the English, French, and Indians allied with each side escalated.³⁸ The narratives

³⁸ See my chapter “The Site of the Struggle: Colonialism, Violence, and the Captive Body.” In *Native Americans and Anglo-American Culture, 1750-1850: The Indian Atlantic*. ed. Tim Fulford & Kevin Hutchings. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 39-55

of this time were mostly written by men who served as low-ranking soldiers and tradesmen in the British colonial project, who in the end are left without pensions or any means of survival following their escapes from life among Indians. Here the British subject is forced to live among savage people, enduring physical hardship and the constant threat of death. It is only by pretending to be an Indian that the white captive can survive her or his ordeal. Most captives beginning mid-century do not fail to mention that their captors force them to adopt their customs, or they will be killed. Ojibwa captive John Rutherford writes in his narrative, "I found it was absolutely necessary for my safety to affect a relish for their savage manners, and to put on an air of perfect contentment" (232), while Thomas Brown writes that "[l]ove of Life obliged me to comply" with Indian demands, and he admits, "I feigned myself merry" (15). Crossing the cultural divide becomes part of the drama of survival, a necessary but nonetheless ambivalent aspect of captive life. That the soldiers are left without the trappings of their former identities following their captivities suggests that transculturation among Indians is inevitable for the European captive, and can in fact have enduring and dangerous effects.

The most well-known redeemed Indian captive in eighteenth-century Britain was Scotsman Peter Williamson.³⁹ The first edition of Williamson's captivity narrative *French and Indian Cruelty* was printed in York in 1757, and it proved to be a very popular text. By 1762 it had already reached its fifth edition

³⁹ Douglas Skelton provides a non-academic biography of Williamson in *Indian Peter: The Extraordinary Life and Adventures of Peter Williamson*. Edinburgh: Mainstream, 2005.

and had received significant revisions from its author. The general narrative, however, remained primarily intact: Williamson was born to humble yet “reputable” parents a few miles outside of Aberdeen, and as a young child he was sent into that city to live with his aunt. When he was eight, he was spotted by two men “employed . . . by some of the *worthy* Merchants of the Town, in that villainous and execrable Practice, call'd *Kidnapping*; that is, stealing young Children from their Parents and selling them as Slaves in the Plantations abroad” (3). Williamson is sold to a Scotsman, who was himself captured as a child, and brought to Philadelphia. His master allows him to attend school in the winters, and, upon his death when Williamson is sixteen, leaves him a small inheritance. Williamson, now a free man, marries the daughter of a successful planter and settles with her on land his father-in-law gives them on the Pennsylvania frontier. They live there happily until 1754, when Indians “in the *French Interest*” begin terrorizing the colonial settlements. This increased activity was due to the beginnings of the French and Indian War, which began in 1754 and led to the Seven Years' War in Europe. While Williamson primarily blames the French and the lack of loyalty of the Indians who at first appear allied with the British, or “*French Chicanery and Savage Cruelty*” (10), he admits that some Indians were easily won over to the French side because they had been “cruelly treated by those who pretended to be their Protectors and Friends” (10).

As an abducted child and indentured servant, Peter Williamson is caught in the transatlantic trade in bodies, already instrumentalized by the colonial

apparatus before his role as a settler on the disputed frontier. He is, in his story, just as victimized by European expansion and ambition as the Indians whose land is increasingly encroached on by North American colonists. His depiction of the exploitation of poor British children by greedy merchants had much larger significance at home than his vivid descriptions of Indian cruelty; he was sued by Aberdeen merchants after the initial printing of his narrative, and all copies were ordered burnt. He successfully appealed the decision and was given a settlement, and he included the court proceedings against him and a “Discourse on Kidnapping” in later editions. These materials shifted the focus of the text away from the “French and Indian cruelty” promised in the title, and he ends the fifth edition with the promise to those “groaning under the yoke of tyranny” that “Providence will throw friends in their way, their oppressors shall hide their heads, and the cruelties they have committed be retaliated upon” (147). Merchant greed, not colonial violence, is the broader issue in the end, and it is possible that Williamson's subsequent transculturation, which will be discussed below, can be seen as not simply a crass commercial move or colonial appropriation, but at least in part as a strategic occupation of a colonized subjectivity meant to draw attention to the wages of empire.

In his narrative, Williamson's transformation from newly freed colonist to captive occurs in October of 1754; while his wife is out visiting relatives, Williamson is captured by twelve French-allied Indians, who announce their arrival with “the dismal War-cry, or War-whoop”: “*Woach, woach, ha, ha, hach,*

woach” (10-11). After raiding his house, they set fire to it and his and barn and stable, and he loses “200 Bushels of Wheat, six Cows, four horses, and five Sheep” (12). They then threaten Williamson “with the worst of Deaths if I would not willingly go with them, and be contented with their Way of Living. This I seemingly agreed to, promising to do every Thing for them that lay in my Power” (12). Like many other captives, Williamson claims his initial capture involves a level of forced transculturation, which he cannot refuse lest he be savagely tortured and killed. Following a night of exhausting marching, he is tied to a tree and a fire is lit nearby. This is an iconographic scene of Indian captivity, as seen on the frontispiece of Chetwood's *The voyages, dangerous adventures and imminent escapes of Captain Richard Falconer* (1720; figure 8), where the protagonist is similarly tied to a tree, with a pile of wood set at his feet in preparation for a fire. In Williamson's case, the Indians begin to dance around him, “whooping, bellowing, and crying, in a frightful Manner, as is their Custom” (13). They then proceed “in a more tragical Manner,” burning him with coals and sticks from the fire, “and at the same Time threatening to burn me intirely, if I made the least Noise or cried out” (14). He can only shed silent tears, which the Indians observe “with a shocking Pleasure and Alacrity” and “take fresh Coals, and apply near my Eyes, telling me my Face was wet, and that they would dry it for me, which indeed they cruelly did” (12). This brutal rite of initiation constitutes another key event in representations of transculturation among North American Indians, described by Charlotte Sussman as “running the gauntlet”

("Lismahago's," 603). Sussman notes that "[t]hese rituals, although violent, were seen by eighteenth-century observers as the means by which Native American tribes appropriated and transformed foreign cultures" (600). She suggests that "Europeans saw these rituals as evidence of a tribe's ability to retain its social coherence in the face of a colonizing invasion — a quality they found admirable as well as threatening" (600-601).⁴⁰ This type of "corporealizing cultural change" (605) is seen also in Smollett's *Humphry Clinker*, which in turn borrowed its scenes of colonial violence from earlier sources such as Cadwallader Colden's *History of the Five Nations* (1727). Sussman notes that in Smollett's novel the focus on torture and dismemberment is meant to literalize, in an attempt to neutralize, "the cultural anxiety surrounding transculturation" (598). While Williamson does not explicitly acknowledge that this torture is meant to bring him into the society of his captors, he writes that, following his cruel treatment, the Indians feasted and offered him food which he "was . . . forced to seem pleas'd with" (14). Thus the process of becoming other is accounted for as a performance necessary for survival, and as an inscription of corporeal cultural signifiers accomplished through torture.

While Williamson escapes the most brutal tortures, he describes other victims who are dismembered and otherwise taken apart by his captors. Whole families, including infants and children, are arbitrarily scalped, one family is cut

⁴⁰ For an historical account of adoption and torture practises among northeast First Nations, see Haefeli, Evan & Kevin Sweeney. *Captors and Captives: The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield*. Boston: U of Massachusetts P, 2003. 145-163

to pieces and fed to pigs, and in one particularly gruesome scene,

two of [the prisoners] were tied to a Tree, and a great Fire made round them, where they remained 'till they were terribly scorched and burnt; when one of the villains with his *scalping* Knife, ript open their Bellies, took out their Entrails, and burnt them before their Eyes, whilst the others were cutting, piercing, and tearing the Flesh from their Breasts, Hands, Arms, and Legs, with red-hot Irons, 'till they were dead. (19)

The third prisoner is “if possible, sacrificed in a more cruel Manner,” when he is buried neck-deep in the ground, scalped, and left for several hours “in the greatest Agonies.” The Indians then light a fire near his head and he pleads for them to kill him, “for his Brains were boiling in his Head” (19). However, “[i]nexorable to all his Complaints they continued the Fire, whilst shocking to behold! his Eyes gushed out of their Sockets” (22). They then cut off his head and bury him alongside the other bodies, with Williamson being tasked to dig the graves. Sussman describes scenes such as these as a “nightmarish version of social absorption” (“Lismahago's,” 602) in which the European is either adopted or consumed (though Williamson does not focus on instances of cannibalism per se, but rather on annihilation).⁴¹

Even amidst Williamson's diatribes against his captors, in which he vividly describes scenes of pornographic violence, he expresses an admiration for the Indians; he notes at one point that some nations “might be more happy, if, in some Instances, they copied them, and made *wise Conduct, Courage, and personal*

⁴¹ David McNeil discusses violent depictions of military life and conflict in other contexts in *The Grotesque Depiction of War and the Military in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1990.

Strength, the *chief* Recommendations for War-Captains, or *Werowances*, as they call them” (26). In the first edition of his narrative, Williamson's depiction of Indians is irreconcilably ambivalent; the inconceivable savagery of the “noxious creatures” who capture him and the gentle humanity of the Iroquois chief Scarrooyda, alias Monokatcathy, who speaks in an “affecting manner” when pleading for military aid from the Quaker colonists in Philadelphia, present a radically different picture of Native people. This ambivalence suggests that the savage acts can be understood as an aspect of resistance to invasion, and not a determining characteristic of Indigenous cultures. Indeed, despite the ritualistic torture, Williamson himself would choose to adopt an Indigenous identity as his text grew in popularity.

The fourth edition (1759), the first printed in London, was sold by *Monthly Review* editor Ralph Griffiths and dedicated to William Pitt, thus allying it closely with the Whig agenda of focusing on the war in North America. This dedication also signalled Williamson's ambition to move from abject soldier to legitimate statesman. The frontispiece of the book contains an image of Williamson “in the Dress of a Delaware Indian with his Tomohawk, Scalping knife, &c” (fig. 1). Given the brutal nature of Williamson's depiction of “Indian cruelty,” it is surprising to see his supposed transculturation foregrounded. Nowhere in the text does he hint at this transformation, yet, like Crusoe in his motley dress, Williamson begins the text with his own body depicting the drama of survival in a colonial setting far away from Britain. Indeed, it is worth

comparing the image of Crusoe in the frontispiece to the 1719 edition of Defoe's novel (fig. 2) with that of Williamson dressed "en sauvage," as his contemporary captive John Rutherford described his own dress.

The portrait of Williamson is, according to Timothy J. Shannon, "the first image of a British subject dressed in Indian clothing published on either side of the Atlantic" (27). While this is not strictly true, if we consider theatrical images such as Anne Bracegirdle dressed as "the Indian Queen" Semernia for her role in Aphra Behn's *The Widdow Ranter*, Williamson's portrait does appear to be the first image in which an actual British subject is supposed to have "gone native" among North American Indigenous people. Williamson stands in the foreground, with the blank expression of the ethnographic subject. He is dressed, according to Shannon, in an accurate rendition of the "Indian fashion," including a mix of Native objects and European trade goods. He is clutching a "scalping knife" in one hand and a pipe-tomahawk in the other, from which he is smoking, while his gun hangs on his back. While the headdress and palm trees speak to earlier methods of exotic representations in British art (see Shannon 27), the costume which Williamson is wearing is contemporary. Indeed, the pipe-tomahawk is an especially current accoutrement, and this portrait contains one of the first pictorial representations of this generally English-manufactured weapon.⁴² In the background we see a tropical setting decidedly unlike the backwoods of

⁴² The pipe-tomahawk was itself a transcultural object, symbolic of both war and peace for both Indigenous people and Britons; Shannon, Timothy. "Queequeg's Tomahawk: A Cultural Biography, 1750-1900." *Ethnohistory* 52.3 (2005). 589-633

Pennsylvania where he was supposedly captured, and groups of Indians paddle in a canoe, perform a “war dance” around a palm tree, and engage in “bush fighting.”

In the first edition of *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), Crusoe strikes a similar figure to Williamson; his eyes are cast down to the right of the viewer, his expression is difficult to read, his objects of survival evoke battle and violence, and the scene is not an especially faithful representation of the narrative despite its use as the frontispiece (fig. 2). This portrait, which David Blewett describes as “strangely evocative,” depicts an uncertain moment in time for the castaway, and the intact ship in the background heading out to sea is a detail not mentioned in the narrative itself. According to Blewett, this “haunting” engraving is portraying the “‘theatre’ of Crusoe’s mind,” and we see Crusoe “not at an actual moment in time but as the timeless figure of the castaway, strangely dressed, thinking about his fate and his deliverance, symbolized by the background ship” (30). This kind of “synoptic illustration” depicts several different moments in time simultaneously, to emphasize the unity and meaning of the text (29).⁴³

The illustration of Williamson disrupts the unity of the text; the narrative trajectory in terms of transcultural contact runs from fearful captive to vengeful soldier, and nowhere is there a moment in which Williamson lives as an Indian during his brief captivity. However, the image makes sense in a broader context; upon his return to Britain, Williamson had begun to perform publicly as “Indian

⁴³ Blewett provides a history of the novel’s various illustrations over time; see works cited.

Peter” shortly after the first edition of his narrative, and had gained a modest level of fame and fortune. He would dress in Indian regalia and perform his “war whoop” for crowds of people, travelling as far afield as Dublin, London, and elsewhere to entertain people in private homes and coffeeshops. He would later open his own coffeehouse in Edinburgh in the Scottish Parliament building in the early 1760s, where he continued entertaining patrons with stories and performances. The fourth edition of his narrative was the first printed in London, and coincided with Williamson appearing in the city. The *Gentleman's and London Magazine* for June of 1759 also printed the image and reported that his performances involved “displaying and explaining their [the Indians'] method of fighting” (qtd in Shannon 29). The image of him in Delaware dress can therefore be seen as a promotion of his public performance, and more importantly as a dissemination of the character of “Indian Peter,” the transculturated subject.

If the scene of Williamson stoically posed among the Indians is not synoptic in the proper sense, since the moment of time it is chronicling does not occur in a symbolic or literal way within the text, it can nonetheless be read as reflecting, on the one hand, the universal experience of the white captive as being connected to performing a foreign subjectivity and, on the other hand, as a projection of Williamson's own desire to become an Indian or at least look like one to profit from his experience. Yet while Shannon suggests we might gain insight into what Williamson's performances in racial drag consisted of by looking at this image, it turns out that this image, itself a fantasy projection with no real

constitutive matter in relation to the plot machinations of *French and Indian Cruelty*, is pilfered from another source. His own self-representation of his hybrid identity is itself a hybrid of sorts, borrowing from other sources to manufacture a commodified version of transculturation.

In the *General Magazine of Arts and Sciences*, written and printed by inventor, showman, and scientific lecturer Benjamin Martin,⁴⁴ an article for January 1759 contains an image of a “Mohawk Indian Warrior, with his Tomax, Scalping-Knife &c” (fig. 3). The article explains that this unnamed warrior “is lately arrived from *America*,” where he was one of William Johnson's guards and was renowned for his “singular Valour in taking the *French* General, *Monsieur Desseau* [Dieskau], Prisoner” (1). This Mohawk man “(for the Gratification of the Curious) is expos'd to public View, dress'd in the same Manner with his native *Indians*, when they go to War, with his Face and Body painted, his Scalping-knife, and Tomax, or Battle-axe, and all the other Implements that are used by the *Indians* in Battle.” The *Public Advertiser* carried an ad for his appearance at the “New York and Cape Breton Coffee-house” at a cost of one shilling per person, almost every other day for all of January, until he had to “embark for America” in early February. It notes that this warrior, who was instrumental in a significant British military victory, is “[a] sight worth the curiosity of every true Briton” and

⁴⁴ Martin was self-educated, but nonetheless opened a school where he taught a variety of subjects. He sought entry into the Royal Society to increase his credibility, but was not admitted. John R. Millburn. “Martin, Benjamin (*bap.* 1705, *d.* 1782).” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/view/article/18175>, accessed 26 Nov 2010]

he is “[t]he only Indian that has been in England since the Reign of Queen Anne.” Of course, this is not true, since there were numerous delegations following the 1710 visit by the Iroquois “kings,” but clearly none had the same cultural effect. And as Samuel Johnson notes in his *Idler* number 41 for January 20, 1759, advertisers recognize that “[w]hatever is common is despised,” and so they need to “gain attention by magnificence of promises” (121). Johnson read the advertisement for the Mohawk warrior in the *Public Advertiser* and noted that it “is a very powerful description; but a critic of great refinement would say that it conveys rather horror than terror. An Indian, dressed as he goes to war, may bring company together; but if he carries the scalping knife and tomahawk, there are many true Britons that will never be persuaded to see him but through a grate” (122). This is far from the sublime experience of managed terror, and he adds, “I could not but feel some indignation when I found this illustrious Indian warrior immediately succeeded by ‘a fresh parcel of Dublin butter’” (122). The crass leveling effect of the classified advertisements page is no place for the fierce dignity of the Indian warrior, though Johnson sees this Mohawk man as equally constructed by the “masters of the publick ear” to appeal “too wantonly to our passions” (123).

The image of Williamson is clearly based on the print of the Mohawk man from the *General Magazine*, done by well-known engraver Anthony Walker.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Among Walker's admirers was Horace Walpole, who wished the artist would tackle more ambitious subjects because of his obvious talent. Worms, Laurence. “Walker, Anthony (1726–1765).” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/view/article/28469>, accessed 26 Nov

The man holds the same objects as Williamson, and the background is only marginally different. The main distinction between them is in their clothing; the Mohawk man is attired in more obviously European clothing, from the billowy linen shirt to what appears to be a laurel in his hair. His heart-shaped gorget is clumsy and over-sized, while the one that Williamson is wearing more accurately reflects those known to be worn by contemporary Native people such as Joseph Brant as well as British soldiers. Coupled with his painted face and feathered headdress, which was an icon of Indian difference based on the appearance of the central and South American Tainos of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it is Williamson who more closely resembles the British conceptions of Indianness than the Mohawk man himself. The Mohawk man needs to conform more to European conceptions of Indians as embodying elements of classical civilizations, while Williamson needs to appear in the more “authentic” style of dress to lend credibility to his story. In part this is due to the contradictory demands on the Indian of being similar to classical Europeans yet also exotic and authentic.

The circulation of this image does not begin with the Mohawk and end with Williamson’s frontispiece; the first depiction of Williamson, with his “warlike and hunting implements,” appears in the *Grand Magazine of Universal Intelligence* for June 30, 1759. This is months before the printing of Williamson’s London edition, and the *Grand Magazine* was, like the London edition of *French and Indian Cruelty*, printed by Ralph Griffiths. Presumably Griffiths included

this portrait to build publicity for the forthcoming narrative. Williamson's portrait in his own text, however, most likely reached the widest audience, and it appeared in subsequent editions of the narrative. Its quality degraded over time (see the 1792 edition, fig. 7), but the main characteristics remained intact. What is more interesting, however, is the way that it circulated during the latter half of the century, becoming something quite different from either the Mohawk man or the costumed Scotsman.

In the 1766 Dublin edition of Charlevoix's *A Voyage to North America*, the frontispiece features a by now familiar sight: "A Delaware Indian, with his Tomohawk, Scalping knife, &c" (figure 4). The same year, Williamson was in Dublin to promote the seventh edition of *French and Indian Cruelty*, the first printed in that city, and to address the appearance of a counterfeit edition of his work (Shannon 29). It appears as though the printers of the Charlevoix text simply traced the Williamson engraving, since it is an exact mirror image of the "original."⁴⁶ And so, though he could never become one in life despite his desire to, Williamson circulated in print as a genuine Indian. And the Charlevoix text was not the only place; other British texts claiming to provide illustrations of Delaware Indian costumes also based their images around Williamson. In the fourth volume of *A Collection of the Dresses of Different Nations, Antient and Modern* (1772), the image of the Delaware is, once again, "with his Tomohawk,

⁴⁶ See Leslie Tobias Olsen. "A tale of two Indians." The John Carter Brown Library. June 2008. Brown University. 26 November 2010. [http://www.brown.edu/Facilities/John_Carter_Brown_Library/1%20found%20it%20JCB/June08.html]

Scalping knife” (202, fig. 5). Finally, in volume 5 of *The Historical Pocket Library*, printed in Bath in 1790, there appears a small print of a Delaware Indian who, though unlabelled, is clearly holding the ubiquitous pipe-tomahawk and scalping knife (5.123, fig. 6).

The circulation of this image of Williamson suggests, on the surface, that printers were not particularly concerned with the sources of their images, and it was easier to copy or adapt a picture than to find one's own. This is of course true, but it also points to the slippery means of signification in identity; the image, like Williamson himself, circulated through various texts, and would be redefined depending on each context. It was not until years after his captivity that Williamson fully appropriated his identity as “Indian Peter,” raised from infancy among Indians. This is due in part, as the fourth chapter will argue, to the enabling shift to a modern way of identification during and following the 1770s. His ostensible portrait in Native garb accomplished this much sooner; while he meant it to enforce his own transcultural identity, the reliance of the *ancien régime* on performance and external dress for the assertion of identity (or non-identity) transformed his portrait into an actual Indian, which it was likely meant to be all along. The Indian subject did not possess the fluidity of the Briton, and as such Williamson's attempted appropriation in print becomes reclaimed by the stable Indian.

Williamson is in some ways an idiosyncratic case for his time, but many people following him historically have similarly taken on Native identities; Linda

Colley places him in the tradition of Englishman Archie Belaney, more widely known as Grey Owl, who became a popular environmentalist in the first part of the twentieth century after he took on a First Nations identity (*Captives* 192). Shannon, for his part, suggests that Williamson falls within the discourse of British imperialism, demonstrating “the irresistible expansion of the British Empire and its inevitable incorporation of distant peoples and distant lands around the globe” (44). Given Williamson's own unstable social position, this seems to be an overstatement. More generally, Williamson is an example of the more fluid notions of race evident in the eighteenth century, which differed radically from the scientific racism and social Darwinism prevalent in nineteenth-century articulations of British empire. His transformation into the spectacle of “Indian Peter” in his own life and into an actual Indian in the circulation of printed images reveals the complex and at times arbitrary distinctions between races and cultures in consumer and print culture of the eighteenth century.

In North America, figures on the periphery of national and cultural identities were not uncommon, and those on the frontier experienced transcultural exchanges frequently.⁴⁷ As Wahrman notes, the colonies “became the setting for conspicuous figures who in their very persons and lives embodied the limitations of familiar categories of identity on this permanent cross-cultural frontier” (214-15). Wahrman cites people such as Mohawk leader Hendrick and William Johnson as examples of this blurring of lines between English and Indian;

⁴⁷ James Axtell has documented many instances of whites living among Native people; see *White Indians of Colonial America*. Fairfield: Ye Galleon P, 1979.

Hendrick was a Bear clan sachem who was an important English ally and who often dressed in the British fashion, while Johnson regularly dressed in full Mohawk regalia and had a Mohawk family, but was also a baronet and important official for the British empire,

Though portraits of Johnson tend to depict him dressed in clothing suitable for a British merchant and colonial official, Cadwallader Colden reports seeing him in 1746 at a Covenant Chain treaty conference “riding at the head of the *Mohawks*, dressed and painted after the manner of an *Indian War Captain*” (qtd in Shannon “Dressing” 14). It was widely known in British print that he had been adopted by the Mohawks in the 1740s and given the name “Warraghiyagey,” and a large part of his success as the head of Indian Affairs was attributed to his ability to speak to Indigenous allies in their own language. At the same time, his immersion in Mohawk life and marriage to Molly Brant, Joseph Brant’s older sister, was seen by some as a problematic, even morally questionable, choice of lifestyle.

In Charles Johnstone’s *Chrysal; or, The Adventures of a Guinea* (1760), Johnson’s transcultural brotherhood is satirized as a licentious and egotistical foray meant to satisfy his carnal desires. This popular novel, which has received increased attention in recent years as part of the resurgence in studies on “it-narratives,”⁴⁸ tracks the circulation of a gold coin as it changes hands across

⁴⁸ See especially Blackwell, Mark, ed. *The Secret Life of Things: Animals, Objects, and It-narratives in Eighteenth-Century England*. Cranbury, NJ: Rosemount Publishing, 2007. 147-161, 242-264

countries and oceans. The coin narrates its adventures among various people, and in the second book of the novel it enters the hands of a British commander in North America. This man (Braddock or Amherst perhaps) is governed solely by his “pride and avarice,” and wants only to accumulate wealth without regard to public interest now that he has been given a position in the colonies. He meets a British general whose “whole deportment was in the unaffected ease of natural liberty, above the hypocritical formality of studied rules of behaviour devised only to deceive” (139). This general tells the other British officer that he has adapted the “common sense” and “natural reason” of the “native *Americans*,” and that they are “in general above our level, in the virtues which give real preheminance [sic], however despicably we think of, and injuriously we treat them” (II, 141-143). He has “become quite a stranger to that *dissimulation*, which is called *politeness*, among *civilized* nations; and must make use of words, in their original intention of conveying my thoughts” (II, 145). It becomes clear by his loyalty to and high opinion of the Indians that this is meant to be William Johnson, and the coin follows him to his home among the Indians, where he rules as a sovereign but at the same time is welcomed “with sincere joy and respect” (II, 147).

Johnson is a stark contrast to the other British officer, who believes, like Amherst, that “it would be an advantage to the world, if the whole race of them was exterminated” (II, 142). Johnson instead believes that the Indians who “converse much with *civilized Europeans* . . . learn many things from them, which are a disgrace to their own *Savage* nature, as you call it” (142). Yet if the other

commander is the ultimate articulation of the bigotry and greed of colonialism, Johnson represents a different kind of self-interest. The coin notes that while the general's authority over his American subjects comes in part from his treatment of them with respect and honesty, it also, "like that of the first rulers of the earth, was founded . . . on the relations of nature, and supported by its strongest ties, he being literally the father of his subjects, the king of his own family" (II, 147-148). The narrator explains that, in order to gain esteem among these people he decided to set aside "all such rules of conduct as seemed to him to be contradictory to natural reason, and the publick good" (II, 148). Key among these rules of conduct which Johnson set aside was "the custom of restraining the commerce between the sexes, and confining individuals to each other, after the desire which first brought them together had ceased" (148). The coin does not speculate on whether this decision came from reason or "(as is often the case) whether he sought for reasons to support the dictates of inclination," simply noting that in either case, "the effect was the same"; his subjects grew in numbers and "there was scarce an house in any of the tribes around him, from which he had not taken a temporary mate, and added a child of his to their number" (149-150).

By the 1750s Johnson had become the most widely known British colonial officer serving in America, and his interest in Native women became equally established among colonists. One friend noted that "Sir William like Solomon has been eminent in his Pleasures with the brown Ladies," while a colonist observed that Johnson "knew that Women govern the Politics of savages as well

[as] the refined part of the World and therefore always kept up a good understanding with the brown Ladies” (qtd in Taylor 48). In Britain, however, his reputation remained strong in contrast to the failed campaigns of officers such as Braddock, and his success was attributed by some to his ability to accommodate himself to the customs of the Six Nations. Thus Colden remarks that he “was indefatigable among the *Mohawks*; he dressed himself after the *Indian Manner*, made frequent Dances, according to their Custom when they excite to War, and used all the Means he could think of, at a considerable Expence, (which his Excellency had promised to repay him) in order to engage them heartily in the War against *Canada*” (126). While his transcultural inroads were clearly done in the service of the British and colonial governments, Johnstone's satire points out the slippery nature of Johnson's colonial enactments, and the suspicion that, while Indians were widely seen as virtuous, the Europeans who chose to live among them were decidedly not. For his part, Johnson enjoyed the tales of his sexual prowess, and owned a copy of *Chrysal* himself.⁴⁹

Following his return to the village in which he is connected to most families through his productive relations with the women of the community, Johnson asks his subjects to join the British army in a campaign, which they “readily and sincerely assented to” (150). He then returns to his “domestick concerns,” and the coin describes his new master's family life. Johnson has a small compound with a number of cottages, where “the females of his present

⁴⁹ For a biography of Johnson which includes this and other personal stories, see O'Toole, Fintan. *White Savage: William Johnson and the Invention of America*. State U of New York P, 2005.

family” live. He does not in any way prevent them from leaving him for other men, and in fact keeps in contact with them, even giving them presents when they leave. His wives raise their children with him in these cottages, and while the women lack the “delicate sensibility” of European women, “custom, that reconciles all things, had made them agreeable to him, especially as no comparison could there be made to their disadvantage” (152).

It turns out that even when there is a European woman available, Johnson opts for his new group of women. When his people discover a “*European* lady, whom they found wandering in those unfrequented wilds” (159), Johnson, feeling a strong sense of patriotic attachment and duty to the woman, makes her comfortable and makes sure that all of her possessions are accounted for. Once she is settled, Johnson asks her how she came to be in “the midst of those deserts so far away from every *European* settlement” (160). She explains that her husband was a high-ranking English officer who was killed near the beginning of the war, “before *England* had exerted herself in such a manner, as to intitle her to success” (160). The widow was so distraught by the news of her husband’s death that she travelled to North America “for the melancholy pleasure of one last view of his dear remains” (160). She manages to accomplish her goal, but “not so much to her satisfaction as she could have wished,” since

the body being in a state of putrefaction, [it was] not possible to be approached without disgust and abhorrence; nor to be distinguished from any other mass of corruption, when she had caused it to be dug out of the grave, in which it had been buried on the spot where he had been killed, among the other victims of the day[.] (161)

While Johnson has managed to accommodate himself and even thrive in the colonies by appropriating ostensibly Indigenous practises, the British officer is consumed by the earth, losing any sign of individual signification. Further, as Tim Fulford suggests in relation to Smollett's depiction of conflict in the colonies in *Humphry Clinker*, “[c]olonial war . . . is more grotesque than epic” (108). The mouldering body of the English soldier, unable to be looked on “without disgust and abhorrence,” is a reminder of the hidden and ignoble aspects of colonial conflict, and the ways in which colonialism corrupts the British subject is literally represented by the soldier's rotting corpse. His widow's attempt to memorialize him with “melancholy pleasure” uncovers the failure of sentiment in the face of colonial reality.

Johnson sees the woman's actions as indulgent, demonstrating “immoderate grief,” but offers nonetheless to help her, telling her she can stay in his home “and have the conversation and attendance of his women” (161). She is grateful, but is concerned by his reference to “his women,” and so inquires whom he means, and “in what capacity they served him?” While he is not pleased with the question, he answers honestly, though it takes a few more inquiries for the woman to grasp that he sleeps with and has children with all these women, outside of marriage. This offends the sensitive widow, but she tries to reconcile herself to the situation by asking, “And pray, Sir, are these ladies *Europeans*?” To put an end to her questions, he tells her “they are all native *Americans*, by whom I have had children; and in whose unfeigned affection, and easy complying tempers

I find such satisfaction, that I never shall quit them to attach myself solely to any one woman, however superior to them in the advantages of beauty and education” (163-164). The woman can no longer pretend not to understand the arrangement, and declares to Johnson, “I have not the least desire for the conversation of *Squaws*, and am in haste to leave this savage place” (164). It is at this point that the coin changes hands, as Johnson gives the widow some gold “to defray any accidental expence” on her journey home (165). Following her reflections in the next chapter on her simultaneous repulsion and attraction to Johnson, the coin moves on to England.

The widow's desire for one last site of her beloved husband is met with a putrid mass of human remains, and her encounter with Johnson's frontier family is an unsettling reminder that the British self is unable to remain uncompromised in the “desarts” of America. Consumed by the violence of war or the temptations of life among the Indians, British bodies occupying colonial space in *Chrysal* cannot resist the forces operating in the contact zone. Only the coin, the object-narrator of the novel, is able to circulate unmarked by the various sites and cultures it encounters.

The most well-known transculturated British subject in eighteenth-century studies is no doubt the fictitious Captain Lismahago in Smollett's *Humphry Clinker* (1771). While much has already been made of his role as a redeemed but scarred captive in criticism, most notably by Charlotte Sussman, it is important to mention him in relation to the men discussed above. Like Williamson, Lismahago

is a Scotsman who is violently captured by Indians. In his captivity, however, he is formally adopted by the Miami Indians who take him. Initially both he and Murphy, another soldier, are captured, and the tribe intends to adopt Murphy, who is “the younger and handsomer of the two,” and to “sacrifice the other to the custom of the country.” However, following their torture, which is a rite of initiation, Murphy is “rendered unfit for the purposes of marriage” while Lismahago's torture “had not produced emasculation.” He is, however, brutally tortured in a scene reminiscent of many contemporary captivity narratives:

A joint of one finger had been cut, or rather sawed off with a rusty knife; one of his great toes was crushed into a mash between two stones; some of his teeth were drawn, or cut out with a crooked nail; splintered reeds had been thrust up his nostrils and other tender parts; and the calves of his legs had been blown up with mines of gunpowder dug into the flesh with the sharp point of a tomahawk. (193)

Sussman suggests that this emphasis on the physical mutilation of Lismahago's body is meant to emphasize the corporeal nature of transculturation in North America, and thus “the diffuse operations of cultural change are reduced to discrete, physical losses” (“Lismahago's,” 603). Tara Ghoshal Wallace argues that Smollett's inclusion of the gunpowder and the “crooked nail” are meant to evoke “artifacts of the industrial world brought to America by Europeans,” and the scene is therefore “a monstrous reenactment of European incursions into American territories [in which] Indians use the invader's weapons to penetrate and destroy them” (100). At the same time, this violation of Lismahago's body is a literal act of transcultural exchange; the European goods are not used on their own, but

alongside Indian objects. Thus the gunpowder is dug into his legs “with the sharp point of a tomahawk,” combining the two iconic weapons of European and Indian warfare. While his mangled body forever displays his cultural adoption, the tools that bring about this transformation suggest that European efforts to transform Indigenous cultures only create a menacing hybridity.

Following their running of the gauntlet, Murphy is devoured by the tribe, while Lismahago is married to Squinkinacoosta. Both these fates, as Sussman has shown, present positive and negative visions of the same act of incorporation. Tim Fulford argues that Smollett emphasizes Lismahago's survival as being a product not of his heroic fortitude, but his adaptability. As such, “colonial encounters empower the man of few principles rather than the chivalric hero” (108). The same can be said for the depiction of William Johnson in *Chrysal*, who thrives only because he has shed conventional European standards of morality. For Lismahago, the cultural transformation that allows him to thrive among the Miamis, where he becomes a sachem, also allows him social mobility in Britain when he is able to broker his experience into a marriage to Tabitha Bramble (see Fulford 110).

Subsequent visions of heroic transcultural subjects began to appear in Britain in the late eighteenth century, as in Robert Bage's *Hermesprong* (1796), but this significantly comes after the Revolutionary War, when Britain was less invested in the North American colonies. Prior to this time, during the *ancien régime* of identity, Britons among Indians challenged assumptions of cultural

superiority and the inevitable expansion of British culture and territory. Their forays into Indian lives are always already compromised, and fail to produce the heroic subjectivity they perhaps desired. While it may be an overstatement, it is worth noting that only after the American Revolution, when Indians became much more abstract than real to most Britons, did the confident British subject emerge. Thus, in another act of transcultural incorporation, the image of cultural strength and resistance embodied by Indians in eighteenth-century British culture became a foundation for the hegemonic vision of empire and expansionism.

Figure 1-- Peter Williamson, 1759



Mr. Peter Williamson in the Dress of a Delaware Indian
with his Tomahawk, Scalping knife, &c.

Figure 2-- *Robinson Crusoe*, 1719



Figure 3-- Mohawk warrior, 1759



A. Walker Del. et Sculp.
The MOHAWK INDIAN Warrior .
with his Tomax , Scalping - Knife &c .

Figure 4-- Delaware Indian, 1766



A Delaware Indian.
with his Tomahawk Scalping knife &c

Figure 5-- Delaware Indian, 1772



Habit of a Delaware Indian with his Tomahawk & Scalping Knife.

Indien de la Rivière Delaware armé de la Hache & du Couteau pour lever la chevelure.

Figure 6-- Delaware Indian, 1790

O F A M E R I C A. 123

P E N S Y L V A N I A.



A DELAWARE INDIAN.

Figure 7-- Peter Williamson, 1792



PETER . WILLIAMSON .
In the Dress of a Delaware Indian
1 Tomohawk . | 5 Powder-horn .
2 Scalping Knife . | 6 Indian Canoe .
3 Shot-Boag . | 7 Bush Hoig-ling .
4 Pucel-Bel of Wampum . | 8 War Dance .

Figure 8-- *Richard Falconer*, 1720



J. Cole. Sculp.

Chapter 3

Consuming Indians: *Tsonnonthouan*, Colonialism, and the Commodification of Culture

I hope our happy constitution is too well founded to be in the smallest degree shaken by any wind of Indian doctrine.

-Anonymous, *Memoirs of the life and adventures of Tsonnonthouan*

In Benjamin Bissell's study on American Indians in British literature of the eighteenth century, still often cited as the definitive volume on the topic, Bissell claims that John Shebbeare's *Lydia, or Filial Piety* (1755) is significant because "[i]n no other novel of the century does the Indian figure so conspicuously" (96). However, in 1763, the anonymously written satire *Memoirs of the life and adventures of Tsonnonthouan, a king of the Indian nation called Roundheads* was published in London, and, though all but forgotten by contemporary scholarship and not even mentioned by Bissell, this novel displaces *Lydia* and all others for its singular devotion to First Nations people.⁵⁰ In this chapter I will look at the important intervention which *Tsonnonthouan* makes into the culture of its time; using ethnographic texts, "it-narratives," and *The Life and Opinions of Tristram*

⁵⁰ Anonymous. *Memoirs of the life and adventures of Tsonnonthouan, a king of the Indian nation called Roundheads*. 2 vol. London: J. Knox, 1763. There has historically been very little critical discussion of this book; James R. Foster complained in 1953 that "the attention paid to *Tsonnonthouan* by modern scholarship is not very flattering" (348), and this is still the case. See Foster, James R. "A Forgotten Noble Savage, *Tsonnonthouan*." *Modern Language Quarterly* 14 (1953): 348-359. The authorship is difficult to track, but Foster suggests it could be Charles Johnstone, author of *Chrysal; or, The Adventures of a Guinea* (1760); another possibility, based on an attribution in a gentleman's book catalogue and a shared sense of humour, is satirist Archibald Campbell, whose *Lexiphanes* (1767), a satire on Dr. Johnson, had the same bookseller as *Tsonnonthouan*. Another catalogue lists the author as "Dr. Kenrick," presumably referring to the infamous pamphleteer and playwright William Kenrick, but, based on stylistic differences, this seems less likely.

Shandy as source material, the novel constructs its eponymous North American Native character not as a stoic Indian chief or cruel savage, but rather as an enthusiastic consumer of foreign commodities, namely brandy, and a ready convert to various religions and sects. This book therefore both mocks British colonial endeavors and projects some of the fears and fantasies associated with the newly emergent cultural force of capitalism onto the Indigenous people of British North America.

Tsonnonthouan in part reveals the ways in which the trope of the North American Indian functioned as a construction of imagined, “modern” subjectivity, which is explored in the previous chapter in a different context; Peter Weston suggests that “[w]e might . . . see the story of the noble primitive as intimately connected with that critical point of bourgeois ascendancy in the late seventeenth century,” since “[t]he concept of a free, unitary bourgeois subject, source and origin of meaning and morals, legitimator by free choice of 'society', was a radical concept which powerfully subverted social values based on inheritance and tradition” (60) Various European writers and philosophers explored the limits of their cultures using what has been traditionally labeled primitivism, beginning at least with Montaigne's “Of Cannibals” in 1580. Moreover, the myth of the “Golden Age” was often re-deployed in eighteenth-century Britain through the figure of America, and “directed both against the restrictions resulting from inherited rank and against the destructive effects of the so-called free market” (61). And yet, paradoxically, while the spread and influence of gentry capitalism

and luxury in Britain produced an ideal cultural milieu for a corresponding primitivist response, the conventions of the eighteenth-century British novel, Weston notes, are not conducive to an articulation of a primitivist critique of social values. As a result, texts such as Shebbeare's *Lydia* relegate the potentially radical critique of landed property and inherited privilege to the margins of the text; the romanticized Indian chief Cannassatago, whose observations while in Britain condemn the poverty and toil which the labouring classes are forced to endure, is effaced from the novel in favour of the British heroine Lydia's marriage to a benevolent nobleman (Weston 66-67).⁵¹ He also represents a drastically different kind of Indian than Tsonnonthouan because of his uncomplicated sentimentality and moral superiority, much more in keeping with the Indians who offer visions of modern subjectivity uncorrupted by affectation and consumerism. Further, the noble primitives who do appear in literature are often meant to be kings, queens, princes, and so forth, which limits their critique and domesticates the image of uncivilized egalitarianism.⁵² The more radical noble savage evoked by French thinkers such as Lahontan, Rousseau, and Voltaire, whose Indians embody their critiques of inherited title, does not find a popular voice in English literature until near the end of the century.⁵³ While there are novels that represent

⁵¹ Shebbeare, John. *Lydia, or Filial Piety*. 4 vol. London: J. Scott, 1755.

⁵² See Brown, Laura. "Spectacles of Cultural Contact: The Fable of the Native Prince." *Fables of Modernity: Literature and Culture in the English Eighteenth Century*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2001, 177-220. For a slightly different view of noble savages as bourgeois critique, see White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1978. 183-196.

⁵³ See Fulford, Tim. *Romantic Indians: Native Americans, British Literature, and Transatlantic Culture 1756-1830*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. 30-34, 101-119, and Weston, 68.

the potentially leveling effects of commerce and capitalism, such as Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and *Moll Flanders*, the eighteenth-century British novel prior to the 1790s generally affirms the preexisting, socially stratified society out of which it emerged.

Tsonnonthouan is an exception to this rule because, as in Bakhtin's well-known description of Menippean satire, it blends, or “devours,” genres and contains “an extraordinary freedom from plot”; through satire, the text is able to critique not only the subject matter of the novel, but also the genres from which it borrows (114-119).⁵⁴ While eighteenth-century texts such as Addison's letter from one of the Indian kings in *Spectator* 50 and the *Universal Spectator* article discussed in chapter 2 use Indians and other non-Europeans as vehicles for satire, they do not offer the multi-layered satire which *Tsonnonthouan* accomplishes by appropriating other genres in order to pillory the methods of narrative and ethnographic representation central to the construction of both Indians and Britons. Like Addison's letter and the *Universal Spectator* essay after it, the novel satirizes British culture by using the perspective of a naïve “natural man” to point out the “unnatural” and pretentious ways that Britons imagine themselves. At the same time, the book projects British culture outwards, on to the natural man, to examine the ways in which colonialism participates in and reproduces Britain's own cultural degradation. As such, *Tsonnonthouan* uses satire to mock the sentimental impulse which created the “romantic Indian,” and to deploy the

⁵⁴ See also Weinbrot, Howard D. *Menippean Satire Reconsidered: From Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2005. 6-7.

radical potential of the noble savage in narrative form. This is largely accomplished thanks to the eschewing of typical methods of novelistic representation. As Weston notes, “[t]he radicalism of this novel is more effective as a result of its formal rupturing of the conventions of expressive realism” (67), while Bakhtin similarly observes that Menippean satire deploys a “bold and unrestrained use of the fantastic.”

Hayden White and other critics of eighteenth-century primitivism suggest that the figure of the noble savage is more about the social and cultural developments of Europe than about an interest in or concern for actual First Nations people. This is, of course, true in the case of both radical and conservative philosophers and ideologues seeking to critique or protect the “civilized” values of European society, yet fails to account for the fact that many of the tropes informing noble savagery remain intact today. To an extent, Indigenous cultures have become a repository for values and practices perceived to be against the trends of global capitalism, such as matriarchy, a holistic relationship with nature, and a more egalitarian and participatory form of governance; as such, First Nations people, cultural objects, and customs are at times uncritically fetishized and appropriated by non-Native peoples in literature, film, new-age spiritual practices, and so forth. Even worse, new forms of conservative discourse claiming to defetishize Native cultures have arisen in recent years, attacking the so-called “Aboriginal industry” and feigning a concern for the oppression of First Nations people. Samuel Johnson unapologetically

attacked the elevation of savage life, and there is a startling historical resonance between his essay in *The Adventurer* number 67 from 1753 and the ideas expressed by editorialist Margaret Wente in *The Globe & Mail* in 24 October 2008 and Frances Widdowson and Albert Howard in their book, *Disrobing the Aboriginal Industry: The Deception Behind Indigenous Cultural Preservation* (2008). Johnson presents a picture of the life of a “rude Indian,” and suggests that this life “shews . . . how much society is to be desired”:

though the perseverance and address of the Indian excite our admiration, they nevertheless cannot procure him the conveniences which are enjoyed by the vagrant beggar of a civilized country: he hunts like a wild beast to satisfy his hunger; and when he lies down to rest after a successful chase, cannot pronounce himself secure against the danger of perishing in a few days; he is, perhaps, content with his condition, because he knows not that a better is attainable by man. (402)

Wente similarly argues that “North American native peoples had a neolithic culture based on subsistence living and small kinship groups,” and they “had not developed broader laws or institutions, a written language, evidence-based science, mathematics or advanced technologies.” She quotes Frances Widdowson as claiming “to say that aboriginal people were just as sophisticated as the Europeans [is] just nonsense.” Widdowson and Howard go to great lengths in their book to discredit the “traditional knowledge” of First Nations people as a constructed body of knowledge with no real legitimacy, propped up by the repressive “political climate” that supposedly silences its critique, functioning only to promote funding for unnamed “aboriginal” organizations. These writers all feign a concern for First Nations people, maintaining that the supposed

elevation of Native cultures enacted by scholars, as Wente argues, “dooms hundreds of thousands of native Canadians and their descendants to lives that remain isolated from the modern world, without the skills and aptitudes they need to make their way in an increasingly complex society.” Cherokee scholar Daniel Heath Justice rightly describes this concern as “wrapped in dismissive sanctimony,” masking a general disdain towards Native claims for autonomy and social justice, while Mohawk writer and activist Gerald Taiaiake Alfred, in his review of Widdowson and Howard's book, suggests that the attack on “cultural preservation” is, at its core, a racist dismissal of First Nations people. Either way, as Said suggests, despite a broader understanding of the “ideological fiction” of a so-called “Western civilization,” there are still those who maintain a grip on public consciousness that unproblematically celebrate “an exultant Western tradition” (347).

My point in visiting these sites of anti-Native sentiment is to stress the continuity of thought, and to show the contentiousness of the discourse around First Nations people. The moral superiority of the “noble savage” irks apologists for Western superiority, who, in the contemporary case, fail to separate the constructed discourse from the people being fetishized. They also circumvent any attempts by First Nations people to live, preserve, and celebrate actual cultural knowledge and practice, claiming that such a move would disenfranchise rather than empower Indigenous people. It is revealing that Johnson, often described as a bigot by the standards of his day, is far more sympathetic to Native people than

Wente, Widdowson, and Howard, and would in fact harness the trope of the noble savage to critique British colonialism in other writings, not to condemn the people targeted by it. For their part, the current peddlers of anti-Indigenous discourse show little awareness of historical process or sensitivity to the effects of colonization and systemic racism.

White argues that the noble savage “represents not so much an elevation of the native as a demotion of the idea of nobility” (191). He suggests that those who used the concept, such as Rousseau and Diderot, were more interested in attacking European power and privilege than in redeeming the savage, and those who opposed the elevation of savage life, such as Johnson and Oliver Goldsmith, were not necessarily racist, but were, significantly, politically conservative (191-2). White's argument is that if defending Native people was a goal of those who elevated them, they would have asserted their similarities to Europeans rather than their differences. The same can be said of the recent critics I have been discussing, though perhaps a significant difference lies in the fact that their conservatism does, in fact, mask a more pernicious ideological agenda. However, as appealing as White's paradigm is for understanding the discourse of primitivism, I will argue that not all eighteenth-century representations can fit comfortably into it; in *Tsonnonthouan*, the author neither elevates nor opposes Native North American life-ways, and his critique is more subtle because it is located in Native settlements in North America. As Gordon M. Sayre notes, White's description of the noble savage depends upon the perceived

egalitarianism of Native societies which radical thinkers exploited, and does not sufficiently explain the Native people represented as being kings and queens who likewise critiqued or affirmed European, and specifically Anglo-American, values (*Les Sauvages*, 9). Further, as this dissertation argues throughout, the relation between Indians and modernity in eighteenth-century representations is not oppositional, and the two are often deeply connected.

Tsonnonthouan tells the story of a clever though capricious member of the Roundheads, a fictionalized version of the Atikamekw people, known by the French as the Têtes-de-Boules because, according to Charlevoix, they “think a round Head to be a great Beauty; and it is very probable that the Mothers give this Shape to the Heads of their Children in their Infancy” (113). It is due to this round head that the title character can better grasp systems and ideas, since a sphere allows for a larger mass within it, yet it is also the reason why he cannot commit to one ideology: “In whatever figure [ideas] strike the pericranium, it is certain that they will affect a lesser space of the skull of a round head, . . . and consequently make a less forcible and lasting impression” (I, 32). Thus the narrator notes that “his mind seemed to be a mere *tabula rasa*, a sheet of white paper” (I, 9), which sounds indeed like what Weston calls a “paradigm of [the] bourgeois subject” (167). *Tsonnonthouan* is not quite, however, an ideal Lockean empiricist due to his “extreme mutability and inconstancy” in regard to his religious principles and his attraction to systems that are the most “improbable or incredible” (I, 10). While this trait is no doubt a jab at the ever-changing systems

of philosophy and theology being produced and adhered to in the period, it also speaks to the increasing role of fashion and novelty in popular culture and consumer practices.

The disjointed narrative of the novel tracks Tsonnonthouan's journey as he worships different manitous, converts to various faiths and sects, and encounters unsavoury people and situations. The way in which Tsonnonthouan circulates throughout the colonies, becoming, as Weston suggests, less a character than a “site,” and the absence of a central plot, is similar to the popular “it-narratives” of the period, which were fictional texts that created narratives for objects and commodities such as coins, pincushions, and coaches as they changed hands and masters.⁵⁵ While the targets of the book's satire are varied, the novel is interested in the effects of colonialism and consumerism on culture and subjectivity; like it-narratives, to borrow Aileen Douglas' phrase, *Tsonnonthouan* “mediate[s] the consumerism [it] exploit[s]” (149). I will argue that it subverts many of the most significant representational practices and Protestant missionary fantasies of British writers depicting First Nations people during the period, and is important because of its unique distillation of various developments in the commodification of culture itself during the mid-eighteenth century.

Indians and Consumers

Eighteenth-century Britain witnessed what Neil McKendrick describes as

⁵⁵ Examples include Johnstone's *Chrysal* and anonymously writtens texts such as *The Memoirs and Interesting Adventures of an Embroidered Waistcoat* (1751), *The Adventures of a Corkskrew* (1775), and *The Adventures of a Watch!* (1788). See Blackwell, Mark, ed. *The Secret Life of Things: Animals, Objects, and It-narratives in Eighteenth-Century England*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2007.

a “consumer revolution,” and the “birth of a consumer society” has become a well-mined field of inquiry. The “eruption of new prosperity,” McKendrick writes, in addition to “an explosion of new production and marketing techniques,” meant that more people than in any previous society were able to “enjoy the pleasures of buying consumer goods” (9). This “revolution” had, of course, its apologists and detractors, and others who both celebrated the expansion of trade and mourned the loss of rural simplicity. The figure of the North American Indian emerged during this time as a contradictory figure that mediated between the promise of colonial hegemony and the disappearance of the state of nature. Stephanie Pratt notes that the iconographic representation of Indians in European culture is “overwhelmingly concerned with [Indians’] existence outside any commercial or mercantile frame,” despite the “long-established inter-tribal trading networks and the successful colonial exploitation of this extensive North American economy” (“From Cannassatego,” 60). Indeed, for Samuel Johnson, the “rude Indian” is the other to the city-dwelling consumer, whose natural instincts have been dulled by the “labour of a thousand artists” (*The Adventurer*). He notes that those who dwell in London “have scarce an idea of a place where desire cannot be gratified by money,” and it is only by spending time “in a distant colony” that one can get a sense of the “artificial plenty” that city life allows (400). While Johnson believes that the labour of others allows one to find “leisure for intellectual pleasures, and enjoy the happiness of reason and reflection” (402), he also notes that there are negative consequences to the

“variety of merchandise and manufactures which the shopkeepers expose on every hand” (398). Despite the availability of all wants in the metropolis, happiness is still unattainable because “new wants likewise are easily created” as one integrates more “instruments and conveniences” into his or her life. Thus, Johnson remarks, “our desires always increase with our possessions; the knowledge that something remains yet unenjoyed, impairs our enjoyment of the good before us” (401). Yet this compromised happiness is still better than “a savage life,” in which the Indian must “provide by his own labour for his own support,” doomed to “preserve his existence in solitude” (401). Johnson rejects the radical critique offered by the “noble savage,” whom he sees as an isolated individual without the benefits of society. The fact that many of the “popular and modish trifles” overflowing the shops of London and propelling British consumer society originated in North America seems lost on Johnson here, and for him it is exchange value and consumer desire which transforms the elements of bare survival for the Indian into the “artificial plenty” of the metropolis. Thus the figure of the noble savage can, on the one hand, provide a critique of inherited title and luxury, but on the other hand can mask the source of colonial wealth.

The middle part of the eighteenth century witnessed a massive proliferation of texts about North American Indians, owing in part to the expansion of the print industry, but also to the increased involvement of Britain in affairs in the colonies.⁵⁶ Tim Fulford notes that twenty per cent of all writing

⁵⁶ *Tsonnonthouan* appeared just months after the Treaty of Paris ended the Seven Years War in

produced in Britain about Native people between 1640 and 1760 appeared in the 1750s. Horace Walpole wrote to Richard Bentley in 1754 that the war “has thrown me into a new study: I read nothing but American voyages, and histories of plantations and settlements.” He notes that, “Among all the Indian nations, I have contracted a particular intimacy with the Ontaouanoucs, a people with whom I beg you will be acquainted,” adding that he “was as barbarous as any polite nation in the world, in supposing that there was nothing worth knowing among these charming savages” (402-403). There was an increase in not only the quantity of information, but also, as Walpole's specific interest in one tribe suggests, in its content; Britons lived and died among Indians, had children with them, and engaged in other types of material and cultural exchange. Alexander Farquharson, for example, was a Scottish soldier who served in the Seven Years War as a Lieutenant from 1758 until he died in Havana of fever in 1762; during his time in the colonies, which began in New York, he regularly wrote letters to his family back in Scotland, telling them of his experiences among various Native nations. He also traded for and collected a large assortment of Native objects, such as clothing, dolls, and so forth, which still exists intact as a private collection. Farquharson wrote to his kinsman in 1760 that he and his fellow soldiers were “often amused in our passage by viewing the manner of life and

Europe and its North American offshoot, the French and Indian War. This ceded large portions of North America to the English, which forced the British government and its people to deal with Native populations more closely than they ever had. This lack of experience led, within a matter of months, to Pontiac's Rebellion, a widespread First Nations resistance to failed British policy that would last for three years. The Royal Proclamation of 1763, meant to slow white settler incursions into Native land, failed to end the rebellion. See also Bickham, 113-133.

oeconomy of several Indian Nations viz Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondages, Senekas etc.” (qtd in Phillips and Idiens 23). That he would bother to mention the specific names of some of these nations, all members of the Iroquois confederacy, to a relative in Britain suggests a more sophisticated level of contact than even a few years earlier. In Smollett's *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker*, published in 1771, Jerry Melford writes of the Duke of Newcastle mistaking him for Sir Francis and asking him to be sure to look after “[o]ur good friends of the Five Nations,” whom he lists as “[t]he Toryrories, the Maccolmacks, the Out-o'-the-ways, the Crickets, and the Kickshaws” (112). Anyone versed in foreign affairs by that time could have no doubt listed the members of the Five Nations, who were by that time Six Nations, and the Duke's comical failure to name them implies the actual knowledge most of Smollett's readers had of Native affairs.

During his travels among various First Nations, Farquharson sought out the family of one famous Mohawk man, telling his kinsman in a letter, “I did myself the honour to pay a visit to the widow and son of the famous old Hendrick, Sachem or King of the Mohawks. I found her Majesty setting on a Stool, mending shoes for the family” (qtd in Phillips and Idiens 23). The image of a royal Mohawk busying herself with day-to-day labour differs greatly from contemporary images of English royalty of the time, notwithstanding George III's subsequent interest in domestic and agricultural life, and this example, taken from an individual soldier's private correspondence, shows the extent to which the British were interested in the structures of other cultures as compared to their

own. This image of Hendrick's widow is in keeping with Johnson's depiction of the life of the consumer in London versus the life of those in the "distant" colonies, and the more immediate relation between production and consumption among the Indians extends even to their highest ranks. It also shows the persistence of certain First Nations people in the British cultural imaginary, since it was long been believed that this Hendrick, or Theyanoguin, is one of the four "Indian Kings" who visited London in 1710, whether Farquharson was aware of this or not.⁵⁷

Cadwallader Colden's *The History of the Five Nations of Canada*,^a a relatively sympathetic and sophisticated account of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, was first printed in New York in 1727, but was revised and reprinted in London in 1747, 1750, and again in 1755. It became the standard reference work on First Nations people and, as such, provides a key insight on British representations. Fulford suggests that Colden became "a primary source of one of the central figures of Romanticism-- the noble Indian" (41). Colden writes that

[t]he *Five Nations* are a poor, and generally called, barbarous People, bred under the darkest Ignorance; and yet a bright and noble Genius shines through these black Clouds. None of the greatest *Roman* Heroes have discovered a greater Love to their Country, or a greater Contempt of Death, than these People called Barbarians have done, when Liberty came in Competition. (v)

In comparing the Five Nations with ancient Romans, Colden places Native people

⁵⁷ There were, in fact, two different Hendricks. Alden Vaughan traces their conflation and the myths surrounding them in "American Indians Abroad: The Mythical Travels of Mrs. Penobscot and King Hendrick." *The New England Quarterly* LXXX.2 (June 2007): 299-318.

within a universalist historical narrative, writing them into a recognizable position in the scale of cultural evolution. Colden was not the only British writer to situate Native people alongside classical European cultures; upon arriving in Rome to study art, Benjamin West gazed upon the Apollo Belvedere and exclaimed, “My God! How like it is to a young Mohawk warrior!” (Pratt, *American Indians*, 28). Unfortunately, Colden notes, members of the Five Nations “greatly sully . . . those noble Virtues, by that cruel Passion, Revenge” (vi). This contradiction is key to representations of Native North American people, and, indeed, the term “noble savage” itself embodies this contrast, marking a tension between a virtuous life that is equally uncivilized and unconstrained.⁵⁸ Colden, however, makes this murkier, suggesting that the Indians have “become worse than they were before they knew us”:

Instead of Virtues we have only taught them Vices, that they were intirely free from before that Time. The narrow Views of private Interest have occasioned this, and will occasion greater . . . Mischiefs, if the Governors of the People do not, like true Patriots, exert themselves, and put a Stop to these growing Evils. (vi)

In other words, it is the effects of capitalism and commodity exchange that have corrupted and debauched the Native people. Their taste for European goods, specifically alcohol, threatens not only their way of life, but the stability of the colonies. The “narrow Views of private Interest” cannot be the basis for a successful colony, but instead the Indians, according to Colden, need to be civilized through sober Christian virtue. It is to this contradiction, between the

⁵⁸ For a recent discussion of the significance of the sentimental Indian to British culture, and Colden's contribution to it, see Fulford, 41.

corruption and redemption of European influence, that I will now turn, for it is the effects of religion and commerce that most interest the author of *Tsonnonthouan*.

Tsonnonthouan

The publication of *Tsonnonthouan* was noted in most of the major periodicals in London, while the Whig *Monthly Review* and the Tory *Critical Review* published widely differing assessments of the novel. The critic for the *Monthly* writes, notwithstanding its own extended review of Charlevoix three years prior, that “we imagine the generality of Readers know too little of the Indian manners and customs, to enter into the spirit and design of our Author.” The *Critical* heavily praised the novel two months earlier, and the ideological divide between the two rival periodicals could have informed the author of the review's dismissive language. Johnson claims in *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LLD*, following his conversation with George III, that the king believed, “[t]he Monthly Reviewers . . . are not Deists; but they are Christians with as little christianity as may be; and are for pulling down all establishments. The Critical Reviewers are for supporting the constitution, both in church and state” (60). For his part, Johnson suggests that the reviewers for the *Critical* rarely read the whole book they are writing on, and instead “lay hold of a topick, and write chiefly from their own minds,” while the *Monthly* reviewers are “duller men” who are content to read the books through (60). It is not surprising that the *Critical* would celebrate *Tsonnonthouan*, as the novel is clearly influenced by Tory satire and world-view, though some aspects of the novel, in particularly its critique of

religion and monarchy, extend too far even for the *Critical*. Regardless of political ideology, it is also the case that the particular reviewer for the *Monthly* happened to not be one of the many Britons interested in or knowledgeable of North American affairs by mid-century; this is suggested when he claims the book's depiction of bears as ferocious animals is lacking in realism, since

the best and latest Travellers from that part of the world assuring us, that the bears they met with, were none of them carnivorous animals. On the contrary, we are told, that, tho' when attacked, or insulted, these creatures will give rather a closer hug than is agreeable to delicate constitutions, they never set their teeth into human flesh living or dead. (493)

While the novel does not aim for realism, clearly the author of *Tsonnonthouan* was much more well-versed in North American accounts than the *Monthly* reviewer.

Smollett and Goldsmith's *British Magazine* excerpted one of the earlier chapters of the novel and praised the book as “witty and ingenious” and “a truly original performance” in the style of Cervantes and Swift.⁵⁹ It also appears in the catalogues of several booksellers, clergy, and gentlemen, as well as in the collection of circulating libraries such as that of bookseller William Earle in Soho. Among these men who owned the novel was Malachy Postlethwayt, economist, enthusiastic celebrant of British empire and commerce, and author of *The Universal Dictionary of Trade and Commerce* (1757). However,

⁵⁹ Its publication was noted in *Gentleman's Magazine* XXXIII (1763): 259, *London Magazine* XXX (1763): 452, though the title is mis-spelled. *Critical Review* XV (May, 1763): 378-388. *Monthly Review* XXVIII (June, 1763): 492-493. *British Magazine* IV (May, 1763): 257-259. It is possible, according to Foster, that Smollett wrote the favourable review in the *Critical*. See also Spector, Robert Donald . “Smollett's Use of *Tsonnonthouan*.” *Notes and Queries* 6 (1959): 112-113.

Tsonnonthouan seemingly did not reach a wide enough audience to warrant the continuation that the author promises throughout the book, though a re-issue, with the printer's name removed, appeared around 1781, and two French editions were printed in 1778 and 1787.⁶⁰ The translator viewed the novel, according to Foster, as “a demonstration of the wanton straying of the human mind and as evidence of what the freedom of the press made English authors dare to write” (350).

The author of *Tsonnonthouan* uses the preface to draw attention to the ways in which his text has become commodified; he explains the various interventions of his bookseller, who “has not as yet read a sentence of the following work, and in all probability never will” (v), but nonetheless composed the title page. The bookseller insisted that “memoirs” be added to the title to make it seem more fashionable, and that *Tsonnonthouan* be dubbed a king because “notwithstanding some late incidents,” it is a title which “has still some regard paid to it, amongst us” (vii). While the author insists that “such an office was entirely unknown among the Indians,” the bookseller believes that “an English reader would have a much greater curiosity about the adventures of a crowned head, than a private person” (vii). This detail shows an awareness of the radical potential of the noble savage, suggesting that the reading public prefer instead the more palatable and domesticated plot that affirms the class order. The author notes later in the novel that the Cherokees who visited London the

⁶⁰ A heavily abridged and cleaned-up French edition was printed in 1778 and a more faithful translation was printed in 1787 in Basel. See Foster, 348, 350-51. There is a Garland facsimile edition of the original novel from 1974.

previous year were also mistakenly described as “kings,” as was Tsonnonthouan when he visited England, but he could not fathom the concept of such a “preposterous” notion as hereditary rule (II, 76). Implicating both the bookseller and the English reader, the preface begins a sustained exploration of the effects of capitalism and consumerism by questioning the integrity of the text itself, ensnared as it is in a web of consumer desire, commodification, and compromising editorial concessions. The author is unmistakably complicit in this process, despite his protestations, which illuminates the otherwise uncontested authorial voice so important to both the narrative power of formal realism and the objective authority of manners and customs writing.

The printing industry was a key site in the development of capitalism and culture in eighteenth-century Britain; as Laura Brown notes, the economic changes wrought by the capitalist development of the bookselling industry “intersect with cultural production in a way that brings the power of capital into an unusually close proximity with the imaginative constructions of literary culture” (*Fables*, 142). Bookselling, which was an industry that developed under the scrutiny of the public eye, demonstrated in a visible way the power of capitalist development through the cultivation of a marketplace, the importance of consumer demand, advertising, and profit, the commodification of writing, and the increased professionalization of authors. Many authors responded anxiously to their positions as cogs in the machine of the print industry beginning early in the eighteenth century, as in Pope's *Dunciad*, which, as Brown suggests, “uses

Grub Street as a rhetorical springboard to assimilate a variety of contemporary responses to its analysis of the modernizing powers of capitalism” (137).

Tsonnonthouan foregrounds this response in its preface, despite the fact that in the body of the text itself there is little explicit mention of it. The author instead mimics and satirizes other popular forms on the literary market to explore the relationship between consumption and culture, and the mutual implication of author and reader/consumer in the commodification of the book.

One of the visible signs of the commodification of writing in the 1760s was the diffusion of Sternean stylistic elements throughout the fiction of the period, with an unprecedented number of *Tristram Shandy* imitations, commentaries, and forged continuations entering the literary marketplace shortly after the publication of the first volume in 1759.⁶¹ Sterne was himself concerned with the commodification of writing, and articulated this in many well-known ways, including typographical symbols, blank spaces, and tropes of emasculation. Christopher Flint suggests that Sterne's use of these devices, particularly his unusually large number of “typographical effects,” shows the author's desire to both “use and distance himself from print conventions” (634). René Bosch argues that the early imitators of Sterne provide a picture of how the reading public viewed the intentions behind *Tristram Shandy* and give important insight into the broader culture that shaped subsequent volumes. As Bosch suggests, it was

⁶¹ For an account of these texts and their broader implications, see Bosch, René. *Labyrinth of Digressions: Tristram Shandy as Perceived and Influenced by Sterne's Early Imitators*. trans. Piet Verhoeff. New York: Rodopi, 2007.

already evident by the end of 1760 that, while it was understood as a work with multiple layers of satire, “there was a tendency to incorporate [*Tristram Shandy*] in a more superficial culture of cynicism and commerce” (12, 56). Sterne would attempt to distance his work from these types of “contamination,” but remained interested in actions over intentions in his work, form and style over plot and narrative (56). The author of *Tsonnonthouan* nonetheless claims in his preface that the reason his book does not have a running title throughout all of its pages is that his bookseller tells him that, should the book not find success, he can simply insert a new title page into the already printed copies that reads, “*A Continuation of the Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy*”(viii). His bookseller also complains that there is too much “solid matter” in the novel, which, “if it had been properly managed, would have made four of *Tristram Shandy*'s volumes” (x). Thomas Keymer notes that Sterne's small volumes “soon became a byword for the deceptive packaging of slender matter” (61), a point not lost on the bookseller, who explains that, despite not having read the book, he has been told “a great deal of *Tristram Shandy*'s wit consists in the distance between his lines, in the shortness of his chapters and paragraphs, in the great number of his breaks and dashes, in his blank leaves, and even in misreckoning his pages” (x-xi). This was, in fact, what many authors did in the scramble to cash in on Sterne's rapid rise in fame and fortune, with books and pamphlets such as *Explanatory Remarks Upon the Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy* (1760), *Tristram Shandy's Bon Mots* (1760), and *Yorick's compleat Jest*s (1761), not to mention numerous productions

claiming to be the next volume of *Tristram Shandy*, all vying to satisfy the public desire for Shandean texts. It is therefore the use of unique typographic symbols, which in this text is the absence of the running title, that makes texts generic and interchangeable. The typographic effects used by Sterne are, for the author of *Tsonnonthouan*, a superficial and “irksome ostentation,” and while Sterne may have sought to differentiate himself through form, this is precisely what made his work so appealing to the market and so easy to imitate. Bosch notes that the number of Sterne imitations entering the literary marketplace was unprecedented even by the standards of the rapidly expanding print culture of the 1760s, and these texts, some of which claimed to be by Sterne himself, were by and large written by anonymous Grub Street “hacks” whose aims were mostly commercial (12-13). This large body of Sterne imitations has been mostly forgotten by scholarship, and, ironically perhaps, *Tsonnonthouan* has been counted among them; bibliographic entries tend to list it, as in the *English Short Title Catalogue*, as “an imitation of Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*,” while Joseph Sabin's sprawling nineteenth-century catalogue of “Americana” describes it as “[a]n imitation of Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*, then of course in publication. The scene of the story is laid among the Tetes de Boule of Canada, and its object was to parody Sterne, especially in his indecency.”⁶²

⁶² Joseph Sabin, Wilberforce Eames and R. W. G. Vail. *A Dictionary of Books Relating to America, from its Discovery to the Present Time*. 19 vols. Amsterdam: N. Israel, 1961. p. 556. It should be noted that neither the *Monthly* nor the *Critical* compared *Tsonnonthouan* to *Tristram Shandy*, favourably or otherwise. The *Critical* praises it as having a design which is “altogether *sui generis*,” and this “originality” distinguishes it from “those flimsy productions which appear every day, under the name of adventures, memoirs, or romances,” but are “a

While he insists the plot was conceived long before the appearance of *Tristram Shandy*, the author, unlike Sterne, accepts that his text will circulate within the world of the literary marketplace, and offers that if “any Grubstreet continuator should undertake it, he will find hints in the first chapter, to which he is heartily welcome, and if he does, I sincerely wish him all the success he may deserve” (xv). Indeed, the text contains a surplus of narrative detail, and it is filled with plot developments that do not occur directly in the book itself. Most of Tsonnonthouan's religious conversions, for example, do not happen until after the period of the novel, as is the case with his many travels. His trip to Briton is only tantalizingly alluded to, as well as the experience of his son, who eventually goes to London for education and lives with the narrator. The constant movement to background contextual material in Sterne becomes in *Tsonnonthouan* an anxiety to get the entire story out as soon as possible, even as the pages dwindle and the plot only narrowly moves forward. While this is meant to satirize the shallow literary culture among hack writers and booksellers, it also mirrors their practices by giving the reader an excess of narrative product.

The author of *Tsonnonthouan* closely read French ethnographic texts to provide the source material which was then burlesqued. The name of the novel and protagonist comes from the French name for the Seneca Nation, members of

sorry imitation of some successful pattern, supported by borrowed features, and pilfered scenes” (378). The review immediately before *Tsonnonthouan* in the *Critical* is of comedic actor George Alexander Steven's *The Dramatic History of Master Edward, Miss Ann, Mrs. Llwhuddwhydd, and Others*, which is described as a “hodge-podge, without head or tail,” whose “irregularity” can “certainly be compared even with the celebrated *Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy*, a book which seems to have given rise to this, and many other monstrous productions” (373).

the Iroquois confederacy, who are mentioned by Charlevoix (“Voyage,” 200). At times the book borrows so heavily from the ethnographic sources that there is little distinction between them, which implies that the author perceives ethnography itself as a contingent narrative construction.⁶³ The *Monthly Review* dismisses *Tsonnonthouan*'s ethnographic passages, complaining that, if this is what passes for a romance, then “Charlevoix himself may pass very well as a Romance writer for years to come” (492). However, such generic distinctions were often blurred, even in the pages of the *Monthly*. Three years earlier, in a review of Charlevoix's text, the *Monthly* noted that the Jesuit's Indians shared similar opinions to “the learned and profound Mr. Tristram Shandy's father” (425). The writer adds

Now, tho' Mr. Shandy may pretend, for the honour of his family, that this opinion was the native production of his father's genius and reflection, we cannot but think there is some reason to suspect he might have adopted it from the systems of some of the Iroquois, Algonquin, or Michillimakinac Philosophers. (425)

Both Walter Shandy and the philosophical “savages” of French ethnography are textual constructions mediating and criticizing the fruits of enlightened modernity. This is exactly what *Tsonnonthouan* suggests, with the added inference that, like fiction, ethnographic texts are constrained by the marketplace and other external forces, and hold no more claims to truth than a “humorous romance.” English writers frequently criticized French ethnography for its pro-Catholic bias, even as

⁶³ Foster notes that details on the killing of bears, corrupt medicine men, inept European doctors, and the meaning of dreams come directly from Lebeau's *Avantures* (352), while the contemporary piece in the *Critical* observed that the “game of the platter” and other details came from Charlevoix (385).

they depended heavily upon it as source material. Colden complains that “[h]istories wrote with all the Delicacy of a fine Romance, are like French Dishes, more agreeable to the Palate than the Stomach, and less wholesome than more common and coarser Diet” (xiv), and it is his intention to begin a British response by writing about “our Indians” for English consumption. Yet this effort is equally questionable for the author of *Tsonnonthouan*, whose narrator, an unnamed English physician, frequently compromises his own reliability as an objective voice. When he first meets Tsonnonthouan, for example, he is among the Miami Indians on an unspecified “commercial adventure” (II, 5) and, after treating Tsonnonthouan for an injury by giving him copious amounts of brandy, attempts to charge him “ten times the market-price, which I think is a very moderate surgeon or apothecary's profit” (II, 17). The authoritative yet effaced narrator of ethnography is revealed to be constrained and compelled by the same forces and desires as the Indians who consume their goods and the reading public who consume the Indians. *Tsonnonthouan* uses ethnography and, more specifically, North America, as a vehicle and site for imagining the effects of British culture on the (transnational) self.

Worshipping Objects

It is frequently argued, as I have discussed above, that the “modern subject” evident by century's end is a rupture from earlier modes of self-imagining; the self became individually rather than collectively defined, and this modern self, as numerous critics have stated, was shaped and imagined by the

consumption of commodities.⁶⁴ For the British, this was a problematic development since, as an island nation, part of its mythology was as a land of exception, free from the religious and political tyrannies of continental Europe. At the same time, there was a vulnerability and anxiety in this smallness that contributed to the rapid expansion of a vast empire, the fruits of which became essential products of British identity itself. Charlotte Sussman notes that the British fantasy of self-sufficiency was undermined by colonial commodities, whose consumption posed a transcultural threat to Britain (*Consuming*, 84). Further, in McKendrick, Brewer, and Plumb's analysis, consumerism was seen as a threat to the stratified society in which it thrived, and goods once only possessed by the rich descended down the social scale through the practice of social emulation. Thus the "artificial plenty" of Johnson's London, while providing greater leisure to those able to take it in, also threatened the society it propelled.

The love of objects takes a literal turn in *Tsonnonthouan*, and, in a distortion of actual Indigenous practice, the Indians each possess individual manitous or gods which they begin to worship when they are between eight and ten years old. Borrowing from Charlevoix (*Letters*, 250-251), as well as the large body of sources forming what Thomas Preston calls "the general storehouse of 'Indian matter'" available in Britain at the time (232), the narrator describes the process through which a young person chooses his or her manitou: after a period

⁶⁴ See Taylor, Charles. *Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989; Wahrman; Linda Colley, *Britons*. For the role of consumption on subjectivity see McKendrick et al; Brewer, John & Roy Porter, eds. *Consumption and the World of Goods*. London: Routledge, 1993; Charlotte Sussman, *Consuming Anxieties*.

of fasting for five days or more, the child worships the first object which they dream about, and, if they do not dream, they continue the fast until a manitou is chosen. Following the selection of a manitou, the child is given her or his name. When he was ten, Tsonnonthouan was asked to begin fasting so his manitou and name could be selected. Shortly before his fast began, his father accidentally killed a bear out of season, and set this “great delicacy” aside for the feast following Tsonnonthouan's fast. After only two days of fasting, the young Tsonnonthouan claimed he dreamed of sucking a bear's paw, and the right paw of the bear was cut off and hung around his neck. When the narrator questions Tsonnonthouan years later whether he had invented this dream to “put an end to this disagreeable ceremony,” the Roundhead claims that he can no longer remember (I, 41). His “virgin divinity,” which Tsonnonthouan nonetheless worshiped for ten years, was chosen to fill an immediate want. His name was chosen following this, and he was given his Iroquois maternal grandfather's name; the author notes that “it is remarkable that Tsonnonthouan, though he often changed his manitous, never once altered his name” (I, 40). Despite his fluidity and constantly shifting religious alliances, his own character remains stable; similarly, though Tsonnonthouan switches belief systems constantly, he adopts each one zealously. Thus, as Bosch suggests, “Tsonnonthouan's instability . . . does not temper his need of certainties” (133). While other Indians frequently change their names, Tsonnonthouan remains the same, confident in his own character even as he switches the systems that give it meaning. If, as in

Wahrman's analysis, the “modern self” as described by the political and philosophical discourse of the late eighteenth century can be seen as less fluid and more certain of its essential origins, the figure of the Indian during the mid-eighteenth century, as the second chapter argues, can be seen as a mediator between the less certain “*ancien régime*” of identity and the more unified personal identity of the Enlightenment.

Tsonnonthouan's next manitou enters his life following the introduction of an Indian trader, the transported Briton Diggory Bunce. Bunce is of humble origins, but was taken in by a countess dowager in London as her steward. This creates a scandal among the “honourable tea-tables in this metropolis,” and the gossip is encouraged by the dowager's numerous suitors. These suitors take him into their “select society,” where he proves no match to the skill and experience of his “noble adversaries in the mysteries of whist and piquette” (I, 55). He gambles away his lady's fortune, and he is forced to become a highwayman after she fires him. He is caught and sentenced to death but, after his lady's intervention, who fears he may expose embarrassing details about their relationship, his death sentence is commuted to transportation for life in North America and he becomes an Indian trader. Prior to his acquaintance with Bunce, whose name is appropriately slang for money or extra profit, Tsonnonthouan is faithful to his bear's paw for many years. However, while out walking one day, the two men encounter a bear “in pursuit of a beautiful Indian young lady” (I, 57). Tsonnonthouan shoves a brandy bottle into the animal's mouth and proceeds to

fight it. Bunce, who as a gambling man is an expert on boxing, enthusiastically circles the combatants as though at a boxing match in a “certain house in St. James street.” Tsonnonthouan beseeches the man for assistance, but Bunce declares, “The bear shall have fair play, damn me if he shan't” (I, 59). He accordingly cheers both fighters on, while taking bets from an imaginary crowd of “noble and honourable members of the worthy club” (I, 60). Fortunately for Tsonnonthouan, Bunce is unaware of the brandy bottle shoved in the bear's mouth, and does not take action to remove it. Eventually the bear suffocates when the cork of the bottle comes out and the brandy begins “gushing . . . into his lungs” (I, 61). Seeing that he owes his victory to this lucky bottle, which still contains ample brandy, Tsonnonthouan discards his bear paw since he suspects it aided its kin in the battle, and adopts the bottle as his new manitou. Thus Tsonnonthouan's impious journey through the worship of different objects into the “metaphysical or systematical sort of theology” (I, 63) begins with the providential assistance of a harmful European trade good.

The British response to luxury and excessive consumption was often the elevation of a simple life surrounded by regenerative nature; Romanticism, of course, is the most dominant manifestation of this tendency, yet Romantic primitivism has many precursors. However, the types of primitivism that arose earlier in the eighteenth century are often contradictory expressions, as in Thomson's *The Seasons*, which simultaneously celebrates British commerce and

industry with a longing for natural space and the idealization of rural life.⁶⁵

Thomson does not discuss life among the Indigenous people of North America, focusing instead on Britain's rural poor as a vessel for his depiction of natural life. Gaile McGregor suggests that the figure of the shepherd, which Thomson uses, derives from a similar origin as what has come to be known as the “noble savage,” but that the trope of the shepherd functions as a relative critique, whereas the critique the savage provides is absolute (14). In either case, both ways of life are threatened by the emerging forces of both mercantile and speculative capitalism, as well as the spread of luxury and the importing of foreign goods. Unlike the shepherd, however, the Indian is also an enabling trope for modernizing forces.

Alcohol is an important commodity in *Tsonnonthouan* because it is representative of the destructive effects of colonialism and trade. There are countless eighteenth-century texts that depict Indians being debauched by alcohol acquired from English traders; in captivity narratives, British captives frequently hide in terror while their Indian captors get drunk and fly into uncontrolled murderous rages, ethnographic accounts from mid-century rarely neglect to mention the deleterious effects of rum or brandy among the nations they visit, and missionary texts lament the physical and spiritual degeneration that professed Christians are introducing among the Indians.⁶⁶ Colden remarks in the second

⁶⁵ For an exploration of these contradictory strains of thought, see Whitney, Lois. *Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in English Popular Literature of the Eighteenth Century*. 1934. New York: Octagon Books, 1965.

⁶⁶ For an account of the alcohol trade and its destructive effects, see Mancall.

edition of his *History* from 1750 that the only vice among all Indian nations, which was unknown prior to their “[a]cquaintance with the *Christians*,” is drunkenness, and he writes “[i]t is strange, how all the *Indian Nations*, and almost every Person among them, Male and Female, are infatuated with the Love of strong Drink; they know no Bounds to their Desire, while they can swallow it down, and then indeed the greatest Man among them scarcely deserves the Name of a Brute” (13). This was not new knowledge, since British traders and colonists had long observed the effects of alcohol in Native communities; a newspaper report from London's *Post Man and the Historical Account* on October 11, 1701 similarly notes that the Native people who are “[n]eighbours to the Christians” are dwindling in numbers because the Christians “sell them a sort of liquor call'd Rum, which they love exceedingly, and so kill themselves by too much drinking.” It was, however, in many ways superior to material goods such as cloth and guns because, unlike those objects, it was in constant demand thanks to a regularly shrinking supply (Mancall 43). Many Native people demanded that colonial officials intervene on their behalf to put a stop to the alcohol trade; Charles Thomson wrote in 1759 that one chief complained during negotiations,

Your Traders . . . bring scarce any Thing but Rum and Flour: They bring little Powder and Lead, or other valuable Goods. The Rum ruins us. We beg you would prevent its coming in such Quantities by regulating the Traders [. . .] These wicked Whisky-Sellers, when they have got the *Indians* in Liquor, make them sell the very Cloaths from their backs. (75-76)

The reality was, as the colonial officials in Pennsylvania admit in Thomson's text, that traders had come to use rum and other liquors as “the principal Article of

their Trade.” Other Native voices, some real and some the ventriloquized thoughts of British writers, arose in objection to the spread of alcohol in their communities. One such example is the pamphlet *The Speech of a Creek-Indian, Against the Immoderate Use of Spirituous Liquors*, printed in at least two editions in London in 1754. The text of the speech, as well as the other compositions meant to be written by Indians in the same edition, is supposedly taken from a book printed in New York,⁶⁷ which, as we are told in the introduction, “being a Place of the greatest Commerce with the *Indian* Nations, we cannot doubt of their Authenticity” (iv). The words of the Creek man, whose name is given as Onughkallydawwy Garangula Copac, are meant to illuminate the vice of “immoderate *Drinking*,” which “rears its shameless Front, and reels from Street to Street in broad Day” (v-vi). He tells his brethren that there is a “*lurking Miscriant*” among them, which is “that pernicious Liquor, which our pretended *white Friends* artfully introduced, and so plentifully pour in among us” (12). He emphasizes the damage alcohol brings to not only the Creek nation as a whole, but to the “domestic bliss” of each individual's home. While the “authenticity” of this document is very much in doubt, there was undeniably a movement among various First Nations to rid their communities of alcohol and, even more dangerous for British colonizing efforts, all European goods. The Delaware (Lenape) prophet Neolin told his people in the mid-1760s to shed all European influence from their lives, but “above all, you must abstain from drinking their

⁶⁷ No copies of this text from New York have been located, if it in fact ever existed.

deadly *beson* [medicine], which they have forced upon us, for the sake of increasing their gains and diminishing our numbers” (qtd in Mancall 116). It is striking that Neolin's anti-colonial strategy is very similar to consumer boycotts of imported goods in Britain, with the shared goal of cultural preservation, purification, and drastic political change.⁶⁸ Samson Occom offered a more apologetic voice, but nonetheless encouraged his fellow Christian Native people to break free of the “destructive sin” of drinking, which was encouraged only by “develish men” (193).

The British wanted to integrate North American Indigenous people into the systems of commerce and religion. By ensuring Native people were producing and consuming goods, and practicing a rational Protestantism, the colonies could function more profitably and peacefully. These two overarching systems were fundamental aspects of British identity by mid-century, as Linda Colley and others have shown, and nowhere were they more inter-implicated than in the colonies. This can be seen most obviously in missionary texts, which urged Britons to invest financially in schemes to convert and “civilize” the Indians, making them into better trading partners. The pamphlet *A Brief Narrative of the Indian Charity-School* (1766), meant to raise money in Britain for Eleazar Wheelock's school in Connecticut, argues that “[i]f they can be civilized” there will be “an Increase of the Demand for British Manufacturies,” making the project vital to “the Commerce of Great Britain and the Colonies” and a “Source

⁶⁸ See Sussman, *Consuming Anxieties*.

of Opulence to the whole Empire!” (8). As both a trade good and a cultural force, alcohol threatened this vision of a productive future. It provided the counter-narrative to one of progression toward enlightened civilization, suggesting that with commerce and increased contact with the English came moral vacuity and degeneration. Historian and Virginia planter Robert Beverley writes in his 1705 text that the “harmless” Indians live “in their Simple State of Nature,” but have growing reason to “lament the arrival of the *Europeans*,” who have “introduc'd Drunkenness and Luxury amongst them, which have multiply'd their Wants, and put them upon desiring a thousand things, they never dreamt of before” (63-64). This carries a stirring resonance with Johnson's description of mid-century London, though Johnson celebrates rather than laments the possibilities of consumer desire.

Trade was in some ways more important for a functional colony than proselytization; unlike other European countries colonizing North America, namely France and Spain, the British placed a unique emphasis on trade over religion (Mancall 24). In their self-imagining, they colonized not by willfully destroying Indigenous culture, but by integrating other cultures into networks of mutual exchange. Or, as Horace Walpole writes in a letter from 1755, upon reflecting that the cost of the purchase of Maryland from its “savage proprietors . . . was a quantity of vermilion and a parcel of Jews-harps,” “we do not massacre, we are such good Christians as only to cheat” (455). Thus the only named Briton in *Tsonnonthouan* is Indian trader Bunce, while the only Frenchman is Father

Pego, whose name represents in Spanish both trickery and violence.⁶⁹ The liquor trade was therefore seen with decided ambivalence, since it integrated Native people into the economy of trade, generating a huge market for European goods, but it caused a great deal of harm to Indigenous communities and, more significantly, it built resentment among them and, on a discursive level, spread fear throughout white colonial settlements of drunken, destructive Indians.

The Indians in *Tsonnonthouan* do not angrily resist the influence of alcohol in their lives and communities, but rather, they celebrate it through drunken orgies and the glorification of traders who distribute it among them. The sole kind of alcohol they consume is brandy, which was in reality an increasingly important commodity for British trade in northern locations. The Hudson's Bay Company, for example, sold a mere 70 gallons of brandy in 1700 at their post in Fort Albany-Eastmain; by 1753, the combined amount sold at their three major northern posts had grown to 2300 gallons, and remained around 2000 gallons per year until 1763, the year of the publication of *Tsonnonthouan* (Mancall 54). In Pierre-François-Xavier de Charlevoix's *Journal of a Voyage to North America*, published in English in 1761 and cited repeatedly by the author of *Tsonnonthouan*, the French Jesuit notes that "an Indian will give all he is worth for one glass of brandy," and this has been exploited by the "avarice of our dealers" and hindered the success of missionaries (219-220). The power of

⁶⁹ "pego" *The Concise Oxford Spanish Dictionary*. Ed. Nicholas Rollin. Oxford University Press, 1998. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. McMaster University. 2 December 2010
<<http://www.oxfordreference.com.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t67a.e23318>>

brandy was celebrated by wits; Johnson once remarked that “a hero . . . must drink brandy,” though there are few men who are able to drink it, and it “will do soonest for a man what drinking *can* do for him” (*Life*,286). An Odawa man and a “great drunkard” named John le Blanc told Count de Frontenac, according to Charlevoix, that he suspects brandy is made of “tongues and hearts,” since “after I have drank of it I fear nothing, and I talk like an angel” (83).⁷⁰ Charlevoix offers this as proof that Indians are “not only quick but also very ingenious, and smart in their repartees.” In *Tsonnonthouan*, the author claims that “an Indian is so sensible of the power of brandy over himself, that he very readily allows for, and excuses all its effects in others” (I, 71). As a result, if one is drunk on brandy, one can physically assault others with impunity; the unscrupulous Bunce does just this, feigning drunkenness so he can attack Tsonnonthouan, giving him a furious beating after the Indian insults the trader's hero, David Garrick, and is subsequently forgiven. Ironically this assault occurs after Bunce is defending the dignity of human nature, while Tsonnonthouan insists there is little difference between men and beasts. Bunce's frame of reference for the beauty of human accomplishment is through the performances of “Little Davy,” whom the Indian dismisses as a “mischievous monkey” (I, 67). After Tsonnonthouan forgives the Briton when he claims drunkenness as an excuse, Bunce proclaims, “I now think [men] are worse than beasts” (I, 77). His false excuse and his worship of Garrick

⁷⁰ Known also as Outoutagon, Jean le Blanc was an important Odawa chief known, among other things, for his sharp tongue. Peter Moogk suggests, however, that this brandy story is likely a fabrication.

reveal the British propensity for mistaking surface for depth, while his exploitation of the drunken Indians uncovers the damaged relationship between trade and its effects.

The reality of the destructive effects of alcohol was apparent not only to First Nations people and British settlers and colonial officials, but also to any Briton who was well-versed in accounts of North America.⁷¹ And yet nowhere does there appear in the novel a clear sense of this reality; at one point Tsonnonthouan and his fellow Roundheads raid the entire supply of tobacco and liquor from English trader Bunce, and do not stop until they “had arrived at the most perfect state of happiness, which Indians are capable of, namely, that of complete intoxication” (I, 72). The tone is ironic in its celebration of consumption, but is unique in its lack of explicit concern over the deleterious effects of alcohol among Native peoples. Instead the narrator notes that in describing the scene following the drunkenness, “those who have seen what has passed at our gin-shops . . . will form a better conception of it than I can supply them by words” (I, 74). The text here enacts a denial of difference, providing instead a reflection on the exporting of British debauchery abroad. Despite the initial cost of furnishing the Indians his supply for their “elegant entertainment,” Bunce is compensated when they buy his remaining stock, at the urging of Tsonnonthouan, at a very high price, thus rewarding him “in a mercantile way” (I, 79). In addition, his name becomes proverbial; a man who is “excessively

⁷¹ See Stevens 170-173.

intoxicated” is said to be “drinking with Diggory Bunce, or he has been at Bunce's brandy-warehouse,” and all forms of strong liquor that are consumed at no cost are known as “Bunce's brandy” (80).

Transported criminals were frequently blamed for the debauching of the morals of Native people; Thomson, writing in 1759, cites one colonial administrator who regrets “the miserable Situation of our *Indian Trade* carried on . . . by the vilest of our own Inhabitants and Convicts imported from *Great-Britain* and *Ireland*, by which Means the *English Nation* is unhappily represented among our *Indian Allies* in the most disagreeable Manner” (76). Yet this explanation itself implicates the imperial project and capitalism, since Britain is, in effect, exporting its own moral degeneracy to North America. But while transported criminals reflect the flaws in both the poorer classes and the justice system that circulates their “vileness,” the back story of Bunce suggests that the kind of debauchery he peddles was in fact learned among the wealthiest class of people in London. His life is akin to Tom Rakewell in Hogarth's *A Rake's Progress*, though Bunce has humbler origins. Like Rakewell, he earns the favour of a wealthy older woman, and squanders her fortune in a gaming house. But while Rakewell goes to prison, where he loses his mind, Bunce's career is salvaged by transportation to the colonies. He buys his redemption by debauching the Indians in North America, a place which, as Sussman rightly points out, functions as “a convenient offstage site for capital accumulation, or as a respectable outlet for entrepreneurial energy” in eighteenth-century novels (*Consuming*, 85). *Tsonnonthouan* makes this

economy visible and central.

Despite his flaws, then, when compared to the Europeans in the novel, Tsonnonthouan is an exemplar of virtue. Bunce is the lone Englishman in the novel besides the narrator, and he debauches and cheats Tsonnonthouan before he, at a later date, becomes a Quaker and converts him. The other significant European is Father Pego, a French priest who lusts after the wives of the medicine men in the tribe he is attempting to convert; he succeeds in converting Tsonnonthouan to Roman Catholicism, and he then helps the missionary to bed the women he desires. The Jesuit later convinces Tsonnonthouan that it was the English who crucified Jesus Christ, and he sets out on a crusade against them. He is eventually captured and, as the novel ends, converted to Presbyterianism by Tribulation T'otherworld, "parson of Tottipottimoy and professor of divinity in the university of Cataracoui." The two men prior to this preacher, one English and one French, represent the corruption of North America by the colonial powers who turned it into a warzone over the previous decade and sought to establish their own moral superiority among Indigenous people.

In this way, *Tsonnonthouan* adopts an anticolonial position similar to that of Samuel Johnson. In a much more explicitly morally outraged piece, Johnson imagines the words of "one of the petty Chiefs of the inland regions" in an essay which Fulford describes as among the "most powerful anti-colonialist statements ever written"; Johnson writes in *The Idler* from November of 1759 that the Indians hope to see "the cruelties of invasion . . . revenged," with his unnamed

fictional chief declaring, “The sons of rapacity have now drawn their swords upon each other, and referred their claims to the decision of war; let us look unconcerned upon the slaughter, and remember that the death of every European delivers the country from a tyrant and a robber” (qtd in Fulford 20). The one military campaign in the book, besides Tsonnonthouan's singular conquest against the English, comes to similar conclusions as Johnson's essay, but in a decidedly different manner.

If the brandy bottle represents the avarice of British traders and the dangers of commodity fetishism, Tsonnonthouan's third manitou highlights the book's depiction of North America as not so much a warzone, which it in reality still was, but as a space of debauchery and degeneration between cultures at sites of contact. Following his marriage to Sasteratsi,⁷² the Indian maiden he rescues from the bear, Tsonnonthouan is unable to consummate their union because of “how devoutly he had addressed his manitou, not only the bottle itself, but also its contents the brandy” (I, 114-15). Since Indians in the novel, like Moses in the old Testament, demand physical proof of a bride's virginity, and the “tokens of virginity” are not in Tsonnonthouan and Sasteratsi's marriage bed, the zealous shaman or, as Indians calls all priests and ministers, juggler, Doctor Chickamichabou demands the bride be “scalped and tomahawked” unless she submits to an examination. The narrator notes that if the English were to adopt such a custom, only one bride in a thousand would be proven a virgin and spared

⁷² This name is from Charlevoix, and is a Huron hereditary chief (258).

her life, owing, he believes, to the “extreme humidity of our atmosphere, and a consequent relaxation of fibre” (I, 111). The modest Sasteratsi refuses to allow the doctors to examine her, and Tsonnonthouan asks that her delicacy be spared until he is able to acquire a new manitou, which will restore his vigour. He tells the village divines that, after he drunkenly smashed his brandy bottle manitou, he dreamed that Sasteratsi “was whipping him with a bull's pizzle over the back and hips till the blood ran down to his heels” (I, 115). Though Doctor Chickamichabou remains unconvinced, the rest of the canton applauds Tsonnonthouan and allow him to go on a quest to find his new manitou.

Tsonnonthouan sets off with some Catawba warriors who were moved by his speech in defense of Sasteratsi, and they eventually arrive in the Quaker back settlements of Pennsylvania. Here they proceed to kill a great many oxen, who are of course lacking the “necessary appendage” (I, 119), until they eventually find and kill a virile bull. This provides Tsonnonthouan with his new manitou, with which he happily returns home. However, this bull, and most of the slain oxen, belonged to a powerful Quaker named Ezekiel Soady, who “forgot one of the original tenets of his sect, namely, when his cloak was taken away, to give his coat also” (I, 120). He honours his religion's insistence “never to fight himself,” the narrator notes, and uses his influence to “incite the Pensylvanians to commence hostilities against the Indians.” He succeeds, and the colonists declare war on the innocent Indians who happen to be nearest to them, the “Chickesaws” (I, 120). In the resulting warfare, many English women and children are “scalped

and tomahawked,” including the Quaker's wife, and the nation of the “Chickesaws” is almost wiped out; Soady himself is able to “secure his own person” (I, 121). The narrator vows not to go into greater detail of this “bloody war” because Tsonnonthouan, though the cause, was not directly involved in it, but he reflects on “what minute and unconnected circumstances roll the most important events of this world”; if Tsonnonthouan had been able to consummate his marriage, or had he dreamed of a different object, the Quakers would still have their wives and children, and the Chickasaws would still be a “flourishing nation.” Similarly, the narrator continues, if a “certain great man” in Germany had been able to consummate his marriage, “or to take those divertissements with the fair sex, so innocent in a person of his station,” he would not take such pleasure in “the toils of ambition, and the horrors of war and bloodshed” (I, 121-22). War, then, is the sublimation of erotic desire, and Frederick II's reputed celibacy or homosexuality is contrasted with Tsonnonthouan's brandy-fueled impotency as a catalyst for armed conflict. But while Frederick II's sublimated sexuality is more directly transformed into violent ambition, Tsonnonthouan's thwarted desire becomes a quest for another materialization of divinity, manifested in the form of a phallic tool of corporal punishment. This is what marks the colonial war; the materialization of phallic drives and ideological motives, in the form of land, trade goods, resources, and other forms of wealth. It is, in other words, a commodified version of the wars of Europe, in which the Native people are necessarily drawn in by the European economies of consumer goods and religion.

Consuming Religion

If colonialism must be about more than “private Interest,” as Colden insists, then it must be driven by a central principle. To that end, missionaries and colonial officials such as Sir William Johnson maintained that conversion efforts would lead to more equitable relations between Indians and Europeans. One of the major targets of the author of *Tsonnonthouan* is therefore organized religion. The *Critical Review*, while celebrating the novel as “one of the best executed modern romances,” boosted by the same “keen satirical strictures which distinguish the works of Swift,” worried that this “dangerous tendency of the work” could be a “poison which may have a bad effect upon weak minds” (XV, 388, 383), while the *Monthly Review* complained that the author was “frequently as gross and indelicate in his satire, as he is mistaken in the objects of it,” to the point that he is “bordering sometimes [. . .] on blasphemy” (XXVIII, 492). The novel questions the very foundation of revealed religion, mocks the miraculous feats described in the New Testament, and implies that religion in general is an “infection” that spreads through all peoples. The inconstant Tsonnonthouan leaps from faith to faith, adopting each religion or belief system “[w]ith all the fury, heat and enthusiasm of a bigot”; we are told “[h]e was first a papist, then a presbyterian, next a cacatorian, then a merrydancer, next a jew, then a mutilator, after that a methodist, and lastly, a quaker” (I, 12). Towards the end of his life, after many other conversions, he “would do as every wise man ought to do, conform to the religion of his country, and worship paws, horns or rags, as his

friends and relations did" (I, 13). However, before that time, because of religion, he is castrated and, later, while in England, pilloried and sent to beat hemp in Bridewell (I, 14).

Indian manitou worship is repeatedly compared to Christianity in the novel, with the suggestion that both require blind faith and a dependency on a false attribution of positive qualities to arbitrary objects or ideologies. The narrator observes that, in fact, manitou worship is better than Christianity since "this species of madness is not near so contagious amongst them as it is in other nations," because each worships his or her own deity and "they do not worship one common universal manitou, as is the custom in most other countries" (I, 170). In one episode, Tsonnonthouan believes he has been saved from a herd of rampaging buffalo by his devout prayers to the hide of one of the animals. He was actually rescued by his fellow Indians, but they do not try to convince him otherwise by "using reason and argument" because, "knowing that in any thing where religion, or a manitou, are concerned, they would only render matters worse, rivetting the person . . . more firmly in his madness, and making him more obstinate in pursuing its suggestions" (I, 182). To argue against his faith runs the risk "of having the madness communicated to others, and, perhaps, the infection spread amongst nations." There is throughout the novel similar comparisons between the comical, arbitrary faith of Tsonnonthouan and the foundational tenets of all forms of Christianity.

The use of a North American Indian to critique religion is an apt choice,

since some of the most prevalent writing about Native people was, since the mid-seventeenth century, written by missionaries and their supporters.⁷³ The missionary fantasy that Indians should, and in fact could easily, be converted to the Christian religion was found in many texts published by groups such as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG), as well as in literary texts; Friday in *Robinson Crusoe* is perhaps the most well-known example. The British interest in converting Native people to Protestantism was particularly high during the period in which *Tsonnonthouan* was published, with both the SPG and the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge (SPCK) publishing accounts of their missionary efforts and continuing need for more funds. Three years after the novel's appearance in 1763, Mohegan preacher Samson Occom toured all of Britain in a highly successful fundraising effort for Moor's Indian Charity School, raising over £10,000 and showing that British people were prepared to invest in the education and conversion of the "poor Indians" of North America. The self-image of compassionate and righteous colonialism was an integral part of the ideological structure of the British empire, and it was widely believed that while the Spanish practiced violent slaughter and subjugation in their earlier conquest of the Americas, and the French exploited Native fears and superstition through a perverted religion, the British sought to introduce a rational faith through education and a genuine concern and pity for what Stevens calls the "the figure of the virtuous but uninformed Indian" (11-12,

⁷³ See Stevens, Laura. *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2004.

125). Of course, as in the case of Eleazar Wheelock's Indian Charity School, British sentiment was exploited to further the colonial apparatus: the funds raised through immense personal sacrifice by former student Occom during his two lonely years in Britain, away from his Mohegan family, did not go toward the expansion of the Charity School, as Occom and his donors believed it would, but rather mostly went to the establishment of Dartmouth College, an institution that primarily educated white colonists and graduated only 19 Native people in its first 200 years.⁷⁴

Nonetheless, the ideological foundation of Protestant colonialism, or the “reforming empire,” as Christopher Hodgkins has called it, was in part based on a genuine, though self-serving and condescending, pity for Indians. The extent to which *Tsonnonthouan* challenges this sentiment is made clear by the negative evaluation in the *Monthly Review*; the Whiggish critic writes

[i]t would, doubtless, be extremely absurd and ridiculous in an European, to adopt the Indian manitou, and make a deity of a bear's paw, a bull's pizzle, a buffaloe's hide, a brandy bottle, or a red rag; but this circumstance in an untutored Indian, ought rather to excite sensations of pity and compassion, than those of ridicule and laughter. (492)

Thus, the writer believes that like Pope's “poor Indian” in *Essay on Man*, “whose untutor'd mind / Sees God in clouds, or hears him in the wind,” *Tsonnonthouan* should be seen as a miserable figure, desperate for Protestant intervention. Of

⁷⁴ Dartmouth College. *About the Native American Program*. <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~nap/about/> (accessed May 01, 2009). For letters written by Occom during his unhappy time in Britain, in which he frets over the poverty of his family and his rebellious son back home, see Brooks, Joanna, ed. *The Collected Writings of Samson Occom, Mohegan*. New York: Oxford UP, 2006. 76-85.

course, he does become a Protestant, numerous times in fact, and ultimately rejects the faith for his own. Further, the *Monthly* reviewer fails to see the extent to which Tsonnonthouan's worship of objects implicates and imitates patterns of British consumption at home. Instead he sees the reality that, emptied of religion, the only successful British practice that colonialism effectively introduces is debauchery and commodity fetishism, in this case in the most literal sense. The satire of colonialism in *Tsonnonthouan* is similar to the Tory critiques by Swift and Smollett, in that it is not necessarily connected to broader emancipatory goals or movements; a way of looking at its critique is through Laura Brown's dialectical approach which aims for an understanding of the intimacy between what she calls structures of oppression and liberation. While Brown is interested in the ways in which *Gulliver's Travels* critiques imperialism through frequently misogynist representations of corporeality, it can be similarly argued that *Tsonnonthouan* uses racist stereotypes about First Nations people to criticize not only colonialism proper, but the cultural and governmental institutions that give it meaning.

In addition to its obvious importance as a text which provides a unique access to eighteenth-century modes of interaction between First Nations people and British self-imaginings, there is a significant chance that *Tsonnonthouan* influenced others who in turn produced more canonical and influential texts. It is very likely that Tobias Smollett read *Tsonnonthouan*, and that he is the author of the favourable review in the *Critical*. Foster notes that the review makes sense

chronologically in Smollett's career, and the style is similar to other reviews known to be by him. Further, the political and artistic opinions of the reviewer are in keeping with what one might expect from him. As I have already mentioned, Smollett's *British Magazine* extracted a chapter of *Tsonnonthouan*, and both *The History and Adventures of an Atom* and, more significantly, *Humphry Clinker*, bear its influence. Just as Tsonnonthouan falls sick from eating too much bear, so too does Lismahago's Miami bride Squinkinacoosta, though she dies of the affliction; Lismahago claims the Miamis avoid the "articles of luxury" popular in Britain because "they were too virtuous and sensible to encourage the introduction of any fashion which might help to render them corrupt and effeminate" (195), while the narrator of *Tsonnonthouan* maintains that "Luxury and effeminacy have not, as yet, come to such a height amongst the Indians" (135). Smollett also saw the hopelessness in converting the Indians to British ways, complaining that the British "have a strange itch to colonize America, when the uncultivated parts of our own island might be settled to greater advantage" (256). Furthermore, "the Indians were too tenacious of their own customs to adopt the modes of any nation whatsoever" (195). Both authors are interested in the fruits of colonialism; while Smollett is disgusted by the tide of corruption and dependency brought into Britain from the colonies by "every upstart of fortune . . . enriched they know not how," the author of *Tsonnonthouan* concerns himself with the ideological and representational practices of colonialism and the exports of greed, hypocrisy, and cynicism.

Tsonnonthouan is a peculiar book for its singularity and obscurity, but is important as a transatlantic text, giving unique insight into the ways in which North American Indians functioned in the British imaginary in a pivotal year in the colonies. Indians loomed large in policy and strategic importance, but few other texts satirize the very means through which information on them was disseminated. Smollett would take up some of the text's concerns over consumption in *Humphry Clinker*, but his Indians are too "tenacious" and virtuous to be dazzled by the wares of Europe, and demonstrate instead, as Sussman has shown, that the "colonial encounter violates Europe" (88). In *Tsonnonthouan*, the logic of colonial discourse and consumerism is extended to its extreme, and the novel mocks the pretensions of missionaries and traders who, in the end, are equally guilty of making "[Tsonnonthouan's] original notions . . . warped, his knowledge improved, and . . . his principles debauched" (II, 28). The novel does not, however, offer a way out of these cycles, since it highlights its own participation in crass consumerism as a commodity.

Tsonnonthouan's final manitou before converting to Christianity for the first time is a red rag, which is from the uniform of a British soldier who was captured by "French Indians" and "put to death by those Barbarians" after his wounds would not allow him to travel further (II, 1-2). The captive body, as I have argued elsewhere, becomes an important site in captivity narratives of the time as a reminder of the costs in the colonial project and the thrills and perils of cross-cultural contact, but in this the case the captive is absent. His body was

“long ago consumed by the birds and beasts,” and the red cloth that remains appears “by its cut and shape, as well as other marks, to have been the seat of his breeches.” The ideological apparatus of colonialism is the primary target of the novel, but here the underlying violence is evoked metonymically; all that remains of the British military, despite the recent historical victory of the French and Indian War, is the bawdy without the body. Even the damaged, abject soldier disappears in this case. The end product of colonialism is the vulgar and profane object, which replaces all value systems and people, or turns them into objects themselves.

Chapter 4

Sentimental Appropriations: The Lure of Hybridity

Eighteenth-century representations of First Nations people frequently resort to what can be described as either noble or ignoble savages, but there is also frequently a resistance to absolute otherness. In the historical context, it is only following the most violent confrontations between Britons and Indians that the desirability of a hybrid British-Indian identity becomes articulated. In most cases, it is also only following the loss or the perceived loss of the American colonies that Britons began to romanticize North American Indians in a way that splits from earlier strategies of representation. The Indian is, as I will argue below, often similar to the “impartial spectator” of Adam Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759), but in Smith he (“savages” are male) is not yet fully subsumed into British and Anglo-American identity and remains an ambivalent subject. Indeed, for Smith, Indians are overly impartial, unable to sympathetically identify with others because of the harshness of savage life. This lack of sympathy among savage nations prevents them from being ideal selves to occupy, despite their resemblance to the “man within the breast” who provides appropriate ethical and emotional responses. At the time which Dror Wahrman and others such as Charles Taylor locate the origins of the modern self in the final quarter of the century, the Indian becomes paradoxically appropriated in some discourses; it is not during the more fluid “*ancien régime*” when the hybrid British-Indian subject becomes distinct and desirable, but during the ascendancy of the confident and

stable self.

The figure of the Indian shifted when texts began to appear which celebrated British-Indian identities, and the Indian became at times absorbed into the British self. Beginning with *The Female American* (1767), and seen also in texts such as Henry Mackenzie's *The Man of the World* (1773), William Richardson's "The Indians, A Tale" (1774, adapted into a play in 1791), John O'Keeffe's play *The Basket-Maker* (1789-90), and Robert Bage's *Hermsprong, Or Man as He is Not* (1796), Indians became more aestheticized and, as in the American context, were appropriated into a nationalist narrative of identity formation. While it could rightly be argued that this transformation offers an image that is more qualitatively positive and less ambivalent, it also obscured or erased actual colonial struggle and the cultural strength of various First Nations. Further, it is always Britons, not Indians, who emerge from encounters with an improved sense of self. This shift is, of course, not uniform, and there continued to appear texts which villainized Indians, in some cases with even less ambivalence than captivity narratives. These polarized visions do not necessarily contradict one another, but offer competing interpretations of the same cultural fantasies. Both the inhuman savage and the sentimental chief desire British bodies, and fail to see either social or cultural distinctions among themselves or their enemies. Adoption and torture, as Sussman has argued, represent a fear of incorporation, and both threaten to dissolve the individual signification of the Briton as subject or corporeal being.

The British context is distinct from the American history of what has been described by Renée L. Bergland as “the national uncanny,” in which the vanishing or even spectral Indian becomes a symbol of both a triumphant American state and a reminder of national guilt. Bergland argues that, beginning with texts by Puritan colonists in the sixteenth century, North American “land is haunted because it is stolen” (9). She notes that “Native Americans, as a race, are absorbed into the white American mind as an aspect of American consciousness” (48), which separates them from both the future and the past of the state. Philip Deloria similarly describes the act of “playing Indian” as an act of national self-definition in American history, while, in the context of Canada and Australia, Terry Goldie classifies white appropriations of Indigenous subjects in literature as “indigenization” (13). In Britain, this spectralization is not tied to the triumphant yet guilt-ridden occupation of a haunted landscape, but rather, at least in part, to a melancholic sense of loss of North American colonial space. Further, Indians could function in literature as a relatively safe site to critique or celebrate the larger colonization occurring in India towards the end of the century. This phenomenon is also a development of discourses from the preceding decades, which saw a large dependency on and fascination with the Indigenous people loyal to Britain. The experiments in subjectivity by peripheral figures such as Peter Williamson point to an embedded desire in even the most pernicious texts about Indians, while subsequent appropriations often linked the Indian to radical politics emerging in Britain between the American Revolutionary War and the

French Revolution.

The fetishization of Indians at the end of the eighteenth century highlights their unique position in the British imaginary. No other non-European culture was so consistently seen as providing correctives and alternatives to British culture, while also being so demonized and despised in other contexts. While this position already existed prior to the Revolutionary War, the growing disenchantment with empire that occurred following the loss of the American colonies and the Hastings trial in the 1780s solidified Indians as ideal anti-colonial subjects in literary texts. As Fulford notes, “Indians, in British accounts, were often shaped by the complexities of imperial politics outside, as well as inside, America” (31). He argues, using the same adjective as Bergland but in a different context, that Indians were “uncanny figures because they suggested that at the heart of the British self was a kinship with the foreign, a kinship that Britons wanted to explore but were frightened to acknowledge” (32). This kinship points to the singularity of the Indian, who at times operated as a kind of other self, an external projection of both melancholic loss and desire. The parallel depiction of inhuman savagery and Indian violence is a denial of difference, but at the same time also functions as a projection of the moral failings of Britain at home and in the colonies.

The expansion of texts about Indians by British authors, Romantic and otherwise, began to wane in the nineteenth century, while representations of Indigenous people became a significant aspect of emergent American and colonial

literatures. Prior to this time, because of their open yet stable notions of identity, in which non-Native people could be fully adopted into Native societies, North American Indigenous people provided a model of culture and selfhood which was both alluring and dangerous to the expanding British Empire. An Indianized Briton represented a fantasy of a self who could enter a foreign culture, gain from it, and still retain the best qualities of British identity.⁷⁵ Richard Slotkin argues that the shared trait in European representations of relations between British colonists and Indians, whether positive or negative, is “the association of the Indian with the forces of the unconscious, the suppressed drives and desires that undergulf the intellect” (205).⁷⁶ This is similarly the case in depictions of encounters between Britons who were not colonists, but soldiers, traders, or otherwise involved in the colonial enterprise, and the Indians who adopt them or whom they choose to join.

Hybridity in this chapter is not meant to evoke Homi Bhabha's well-known discussion of colonial mimicry, which describes the destabilizing ways in which colonized peoples appropriate dominant colonialist cultures in reaction to the “civilizing mission.” This process, which is “profound and disturbing” to the

⁷⁵ For a compelling discussion of Britons dressed as Indians, and vice versa, in paintings, see Tobin, Beth Fowkes. *Picturing Imperial Power: Colonial Subjects in Eighteenth-Century British Painting*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999. 81-109

⁷⁶ Celia Brickman argues that modern psychoanalysis is similarly predicated on colonial ideas of otherness and regression: “[T]he abjected past from which the psychoanalytic subject is believed to have emerged includes the maternal (infantile) past, the evolutionary (racial) past of humankind, the social (racial/ethnic group structure) past, and the cultural (religio-symbolic) past. Domination and subordination were the political relations of primitivity; enthrallment was the psychology of primitivity; religion was the ideology of primitivity; disgust and repugnance were the emotional affects provoked by primitivity; and non-white was the skin color of primitivity” (171). See *Aboriginal Populations in the Mind: Race and Primitivity in Psychoanalysis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003

authority of colonial discourse (86), can arguably be seen in captivity narratives, but becomes normalized in the texts I will be discussing. This is not to suggest that in all cases, because it is in a colonial context, this hybridity is meant to produce an ideal model of imperial governance, though this can also be seen. Rather, the hybrid provides a uniquely “modern” way of imagining subjectivity by appropriating the figure often used to critique earlier forms of self and culture, and who generally stands for unconscious or libidinal desires. The Indian as critic earlier in the century becomes subsumed into British identity as a means of correcting or transforming the innate shortcomings of European culture.

This chapter will explore the hybrid subjects produced beginning in the 1770s, but will start with a discussion of the changing representations of Indians as they began to inform the development of late-eighteenth-century political and aesthetic movements; as Tim Fulford argues, “[i]t is not too much to say that Romanticism would not have taken the form it did without the complex and ambiguous image of Indians that so intrigued both the writers and their readers” (12). Robert Rogers' play *Ponteach: or the Savages of America, A Tragedy* (1766) is a striking example of this shift, given that it romanticizes the Ottawa leader who led a massive anti-colonial uprising against the British only three years earlier. Gordon M. Sayre notes that this kind of phenomenon can in part be explained using Renato Rosaldo's notion of “imperialist nostalgia,” in which “agents of colonialism . . . often display nostalgia for the colonized culture as it was 'traditionally,’” and anthropologists, colonial agents, and missionaries also

participate in this “mourning for what one has destroyed” (qtd in *Indian Chief*, 5). This is not dissimilar from the “national uncanny” as discussed above, but, in Rogers' case, the ideological agenda is less clear; Ponteach as represented in the play is, as Fulford notes, “the first fully-fleshed Native American hero in English literature,” possessing “authority, dignity, honesty, wisdom, and a strong sense of political justice” (21). Further, the English colonists and soldiers in the play are almost uniformly despicable, forming a chain of corruption and greed that clearly implicates the British themselves in the colonial resistance, more so than the pride, ambition, and righteous anger of Ponteach. The four scenes in the first act focus, respectively, on corrupt traders who cheat Indians, hunters who plan to indiscriminately slaughter them, military officers who are complacent and dismissive towards Indian complaints of poor treatment, and the colonial governors who, like the traders, wish to cheat the Indians and hoard the gifts from the king for treaty promises themselves. In three short years, the leader of a costly war against British interests had become a tragic hero in a play written by one of the colonial officials who fought against him. Despite prevailing sentiments in the press or other literature, the discourse of savagery is constantly regenerative, able to sustain itself no matter the historical circumstance.

Savage Contradictions

There is a striking contradiction between the sentimental Indians who appeared in imaginative literature beginning in the 1750s and the depictions of Indians in the British press between the 1750s and 1770s. Troy Bickham provides

a useful description of the prevailing representations during this time, in which Indians emerged as possessing “a largely two-dimensional, war-focused, masculine character” (57). The focus in most newspapers was on the practices of warfare and torture, which were feared but also struck awe among Britons for their effectiveness and brutality (57). While some readers began to doubt the accounts of Indian cruelty due to their hyperbolic excess, editors and writers insisted on their veracity (61). The focus on violence is particularly evident in excerpts from travel and ethnographic accounts; as Bickham notes, while James Adair's *The History of the American Indians* (1775), for example, offered a largely balanced description of Indians, the extracted samples of it which appear in the press focus on torture and the harsh treatment of captives (62). There was a “rejection of the Indian as a noble, sentimentalised or romantic savage in the discourse of the British press,” and Rousseau's well-known treatment of Indians was similarly rejected outright (62, 63). During the Revolutionary War, public opinion was almost universally opposed to the use of Indians as allies against British colonists, though this was not the case when the French were the enemy during the Seven Years' War. Edmund Burke's “Speech on the Use of Indians” from February 6, 1776, which lasted for more than three hours and “was universally thought the very best Mr. Burke had ever delivered,” reflects this sentiment. Burke argues that “the fault of employing them did not consist in their being of one colour or another, in their using one kind of weapon or another; but in their way of making war; which was so horrible, that it shocked not only the

manners of all civilized people, but far-exceeded the ferocity of all barbarians mentioned in history” (521). The Indians, Burke claims, have no titles or distinctions for distinguishing themselves in battle, but instead “their rewards were generally received in human scalps, in human flesh, and the gratifications arising from torturing, mangling, scalping, and sometimes eating their captives in war” (521). The parliamentary record notes that Burke “repeated several instances of this diabolical mode of war, scarcely credible, and, if true, improper to be repeated.” No doubt drawing on accounts he read in the press, Burke steadfastly believes that “to employ them was merely to be cruel ourselves in their persons.” He excuses the British use of Indian allies in the colonial struggle with France as a necessary consequence of the close ties held by both European powers with various tribes, who were, at the beginning of European settlement, “comparatively, great and powerful states.” Now, however, because they are so reduced in number, their only strength is their cruelty. In Burke’s argument and in broader press coverage, the Indian is a decided other who threatens Britons not only literally, through their savage warfare, but also in a more fundamental way; by associating with them, Britons lose their claim to moral superiority and, as Burke argues, their “reputation as a civilized people” (521).

During this same period, despite the discourse of savagery in the public sphere, some authors were presenting radically different visions of Indians. Bickham argues that following the war, “[l]ess acute consideration of Indians’ impact on issues of imperial security allowed greater liberties in imagining

Indians, ultimately affording the necessary latitude for them to be widely considered as lamentable victims and heroic resisters of imperialism” (70). However, in literature and in periodicals, there was also a representation parallel to the cruel Indian which occurred before and during the conflict as well. Positive representations certainly dwindled at the height of the tensions in 1776, but there nonetheless continued to appear less overtly negative depictions in the surrounding years. Adair's *History of the American Indians* was printed in 1775 and offered a nuanced, often favourable description of Indians. He writes that the Indians could be valuable allies because “there is no such thing among [them] as desertion in war,” and the English need not pay mercenaries like the Swiss or Germans for protection if they acted nobly toward their Native allies. Indians are “[g]overned by the plain and honest law of nature, [and] their whole constitution breathes nothing but liberty” (379), which was considered a very British value. He observes that “[w]e have frequent instances in America, that merely by the power of affability, and good-natured language, the savage Indian, drunk and foaming with rage and madness, can be overcome and brought to weep” (379). The brutal savage and the sentimental Indian are, according to Adair, never far apart. Mohawk leader and British ally Joseph Brant, or Thayendanegea, went to London in 1776, and was warmly received. His interview with James Boswell, as discussed in the first chapter, appeared in the July 1776 issue of *The London Magazine*, only six months after Burke's impassioned plea before Parliament. Boswell notes that “[t]he present unhappy civil war in America occasioned his

coming over to England,” and Brant supposedly wished to meet “THE GREAT KING” in order to make up his mind on which side he should take in the conflict. While Boswell is unsure “[b]y what mode of reasoning this chief was convinced of the justice of the demands of Great Britain upon her colonies, and the propriety of enforcing them,” he happily writes that Brant has promised his assistance by bringing 3000 men into the field. Even newspapers occasionally printed more positive stories, such as in the *Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser* for June 10 of that year, which told the story of a Mohawk chief, perhaps meant to be Brant, complaining over all the favourable attention South Sea Islander and Captain Cook passenger Omai received during his visit despite the fact that, unlike the Mohawks, neither he nor his people ever assisted the British.

The ubiquitous depictions of cruel Indians which generated so much fear and disgust were at times understood as ideological constructions. In the anonymously written *Modern Midnight Conversation, or Matrimonial Dialogues* (1775), meant to be a humorous revelation of the secret thoughts of the most influential or common types of people in British society, the terrifying savage is discussed in the dialogue, “*Between a POOR Manufacturer on the Point of emigrating to America and his Wife.*” The husband tries to argue that all their labour only furnishes the enjoyment of the frivolous class, who do not pay their debts and have the law on their side, and he suggests, “Let’s to America repair, / To breathe a less infected air” (190). While he is able to convince his wife of the injustice and difficulty in commerce which he faces in Britain, she tells him,

“Wild beasts, and Indians too, I dread, / The notion almost strikes me dead, / Such shocking things I've often read; / Their cruelties my fancy chase, / And make me shudder while I'm safe” (196). The manufacturer urges her to “[b]elieve not all you read, or hear,” and suggests that “[t]he greatest brutes you'll always find, / Are polish'd brutes of human kind” (196). He assures her,

Be not depriv'd of ease, my life,
By tomohawk, or scalping knife;
From such ideas, pray, refrain,
Indeed they're groundless, weak and vain.
Altho' it ne'er disturbs your head,
We've savages at home to dread;
Reason can at St. James see,
Many a drest up Cherokee,
With gold lac'd coat and high toupee;
And many a furr'd gown Catabaw,
Here scalp us by the forms of law;
Let's quit such savages this week,
Less dreadful canibals to seek;
And to America repair,
Indeed you'll find less danger there. (197)

Though the dialogue is meant to be humorous, the author suggests that at the heart of British commerce and culture is an inequality far more harmful than the projected image of Indian violence in the press. The fear generated by the propaganda of newspapers masks the real threat to the working and middle classes, who would be well-advised to seek out the less harmful savages of America rather than the extravagant ones in London. Anti-Indian discourse, while prevalent, was clearly not unchallenged, and was at times seen as a projection of Britain's own political and moral failings both at home and in the colonies.

Alexander Kellet wrote two satirical captivity narratives in his *A Pocket of*

Prose and Verse (1778) which, while far from romanticizing Indians, display an understanding of the conventions of representing their violence. He worked as a colonial official in Georgia for a time, which no doubt gave him a keen awareness of the gap between representation and reality. The fictional narrative “A true Relation of the unheard-of-Sufferings of David Menzies, Surgeon, among the Cherokees, and of his surprizing Deliverance,” tells the story of a Briton taken captive and given to an old woman. She rejects him, “instead of courteously inviting her captive to replace by adoption her slain child,” and decides that they shall lard him instead (or boil his fat while he is alive). They perform it on one half of his body and lard some bacon with the results, but become too drunk on rum to complete the process (201). He seizes this opportunity and flees, setting fire to the Cherokee town on his way out. Since he is without any means of gaining food, he “sustained famished nature by the bacon that was saturated with the juices of [his] own body,” and was thus “preserved by the very cruelty of the Indians” (203). He remarks that he has received a “momentous benefit” from his treatment among the Indians: “I have got rid entirely of a paralytic complaint, with which I had been for years afflicted, in that left side of mine which was roasted” (204). The other fictional narrative in the collection, “The Innocent Suicide,” is a short text in which a Highlander is given by the Spanish to a group of Indians in Florida. Before they torture him, he flatters them in a speech, insisting that he has “no personal enmity to the natives of America, whom in truth I venerate, on account of the incorrupt simplicity of their manners, and the

similarity of their customs to many of my own country” (218). Whether Kellet is mocking the representation of Highland Scots as savages or simply endorsing it is difficult to say,⁷⁷ but the man goes on to convince the Indians that he cannot be harmed by any weapons of war. As proof, he insists that one of them take his broadsword and deliver a blow to his neck. The Indians oblige, and decapitate the man in the process, after which they realize “that the subtle suicide had deceived them, in order to evade the impending tortures” (223). Both narratives provide a central role to Indian torture, which signals its ubiquity, but also demystify it by making it a site of satire. By re-writing torture as beneficial and avoidable, respectively, Kellet's texts challenge the prevalent terror and loathing of the press.

There are more substantial representations during this period which provide sentimental scenes of Indians and Britons interacting; in his *Fugitive Poetical Pieces* (1778), Edward Jerningham describes a captivity episode in the short piece “The Indian Chief.” The description notes that the story is about an English officer taken prisoner by the French Indians during the Seven Years' War, who “became the slave of an old Indian chief, who treated him with humanity” (25). The chief assures the man, in verse, that he is sorry that the man is absent from his father, since the chief, too, once had a son. After telling the brief tale how he lost him, “[t]he Indian chief now paus'd with sorrow fraught, / Wrapt in the awful silence of despair; / At length in words he cloath'd his mournful

⁷⁷ While it is more in the nineteenth-century context, Colin G. Calloway explores the similar experiences and representations of Indians and Highlanders in the British empire. See *White People, Indians, and Highlanders: Tribal People and Colonial Encounters in Scotland and America*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.

thought” (26). He reflects that the world must still look bright for the Englishman, and proclaims to him, “Go virtuous stranger, to thy father go, / Wipe from [your father's] furrow'd cheek Misfortune's tear: / Go, bid the sun to him his splendor shew, /And bid the flow'r in all her bloom appear” (27). The sentimental masculinity of wizened Indian elders appears in other texts of the period as well, as in the anonymously written novel *The trial: or, the history of Charles Horton, Esq.* (1772). The title character is in the army and is deployed to America, leaving his family behind. He is there for three years, at which point his garrison is sent to battle against hostile Indians. After all his companions are killed, Horton is taken captive. He is held for a number of days, uncertain of his fate, until he is taken by a mob of Indians and tied to a stake with a pile of wood at his feet.⁷⁸ Though he mourns the loss of his life on behalf of his wife and son, Horton resolves to “shew the savages, that even their tortures could not daunt a British spirit” (51). He suffers in this position for some time, until the people divide and an old Indian enters, “who approached the place where I was with a slow pace, but with much dignity” (51). He is accompanied by twenty other old men and, after closely examining Horton's face, he calls his companions over. They all examine him as well, and after the chief confers with them, he beckons some warriors to untie the Englishman. Horton throws himself at the man's feet, but the man raises him and embraces him. The two men gaze at each other for

⁷⁸ This image became synonymous with Indian captivity beginning at least with W.R. Chetwood's *The voyages, dangerous adventures and imminent escapes of Captain Richard Falconer*. London: T. Jauncy, 1720. The frontispiece of the text depicts the protagonist in this exact position (figure 8).

some time, though the Briton is unsure as to why the chief is so delighted. At length one of the elders, who was raised among the English, explains to Horton that the chief had lost a son, and “he found so great a resemblance in my face and person of his lamented child, that he was quite astonished” (53). The departed son, Tuskarora, was beloved by the people, who rejoice when the chief mentions him in relation to the officer. Horton agrees to stay with the old man for a time, and after a month the chief agrees to let him return to his garrison. He sends two Indians with him as guides, and after they are treated well by the soldiers, they become allies of the British. Both these tales contradict the more dominant representations of the time, and show the Indians displaying humanity and compassion. They also revolve around familial drama and absent sons, with Britons able to fill the place of the departed men. The family unit, which embodies the emergence of bourgeois values, is in these texts rendered flexible while at the same time universal, and Indians are desperate to maintain them even in new forms.⁷⁹ As Kellet writes in his partly satirical “Letter concerning the American Savages” (1778), “their love for offspring is so excessive as to replace their lost children by the adoption of captive enemies, the Whites not excepted” (20).

Thus, while the romantic Indian dwindled for a time during the Revolutionary War, he (and, less often, she) did not disappear completely. The

⁷⁹ For an exploration of the rise of the family unit and domestic space, see McKeon, Michael. *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2005.

contradictory impulses of fear and pity were themselves, at least in part, manifestations of the anxiety many Britons felt towards the civil conflict occurring in the colonies. The mourning of the absent son performed by the Indian chiefs is a displaced grief over the familial battle of the war itself, much as the heartless savages represent the brutality of conflict between fellow Britons. As Wahrman notes, both pro- and anti-American Britons began to “deflect the anxieties attendant upon an unnatural civil war, by associating and even conflating the enemy with the unnatural savagery of the Indians” (233). At the same time, the desire for unification with the sentimental Indian completes the need for healing the fragmented subject, split across the Atlantic and at war with itself.

Briton-Indians

Within this context of incomprehensible otherness and the want of sameness emerges the hybrid British subject. While hybrids existed before in British literature, as seen in the previous chapter, they were forced to renounce their Indianness as an expedient for survival or a coerced performance, or they were treated with contempt and derision by the writers who created or represented them. Authors began to experiment with internalizing the critiques that Indians had offered in literature from earlier in the century, even at the height of anti-Indian propaganda during the 1770s. The precise cause for this change in the understanding of transculturation is difficult to pinpoint, but some likely factors include the increased awareness in Britain of actual examples of men and women

who willingly chose to live among Indians, anxiety surrounding the loss of the colonies, and a growing group of political radicals who were dissatisfied with the corruption of the gentry and the lack of social mobility and liberty in British society. As the texts below will show, there is not a singular political or philosophical agenda in the fantasy of the Indian-Briton, but they all contribute in some way to subsequent cultural myths about First Nations people. For Britons, more fundamentally, this cultural fantasy contributed to the growing sense of the modern subject, and of modernity itself.

The Female American, by “Unca Eliza Winkfield,”⁸⁰ has become a popular text in contemporary criticism due in part to its unique depiction of a mixed-race woman as the primary narrator. Half-Native and half-English, Unca Eliza's identity is constructed out of actual historical figures from earlier English colonial history: Uncas, the prominent Mohegan sachem of the seventeenth century, and Jamestown settler Edward Maria Wingfield, whom Unca Eliza claims as her paternal grandfather. Kristianne Kalata Vaccaro notes that this merging of historical and fictional narrative fashions a lineage for the protagonist that becomes a performance and manipulation of both forms (134). Unca Eliza's identity, as the child of an Indian princess and a fictional plantation owner descended from an actual person, is also representative of subsequent North American fantasies connecting the lineage of settlers to Indigenous North

⁸⁰ Little is known about who the anonymous author was, or even if she was in fact a woman. In all likelihood, however, the author was female, possibly from the colonies. See Michelle Burnham's introduction to the text, 22-24.

American “royalty,”⁸¹ yet here it appears in a British novel prior to the American Revolutionary War. As such, the colonial history which is represented in emerging settler literature is re-cast and becomes a strangely abstract and at times anti-colonial expression of cultural contact. There is also an echo here of the Pocahontas story, which would become more popular in subsequent centuries in North America, but was in circulation throughout the eighteenth century.⁸² The Indians in this novel, however, are anachronistic, a melding of Egyptian and various cultural groups from both North and South America, and not in keeping with the huge amount of information available on Native people by the end of the decade which witnessed most of the French and Indian War and Pontiac's Rebellion. This is in some ways typical of sentimental representations of Indians, who in this text have much more in common with Dryden's Indians one hundred years earlier. At the same time, the protagonist's identity represents the contemporary reality of the mixed identity possessed by many people living in the colonies. These intercultural subjects were generally excluded from British texts, and therefore this novel is an important document in understanding the racial discourse of the period.

The Indians in *The Female American*, both Unca Eliza's family and those she later encounters, lack the fortitude in their own beliefs which shaped other depictions of romanticized Indians, and as such are not as strongly contrasted with

⁸¹ See Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. *This Violent Empire: The Birth of an American National Identity*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2010. 207-249

⁸² For a history of the Pocahontas story in the American context, see Tilton, Robert S. *Pocahontas: The Evolution of an American Narrative*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Britons. They are instead similar to the sympathetic figure of the “poor Indian” propagated by missionary texts, and the conversion efforts of the protagonist suggest this construction of malleable and sympathetic colonial subjects is necessary for these practises. The Indians do, however, articulate anti-colonial critiques at times; early in the novel, Unca Eliza describes how her father came among the Indians. Following the massacre of Jamestown settlers by Indians in 1618, in which her grandfather is killed, her father, William, is taken captive along with five others. Though the action of the Indians is violent, Unca Eliza's father recalls the words of his brother in England, who told him that the English “have no right to invade the country of another, and I fear invaders will always meet a curse” (8). Colonial discourse is further unsettled when the six captive settlers discover that the Indians are not, in fact, “men-eaters.” They are stripped and surrounded by a large circle of Indians, and a “venerable old man seemed to address them in a pathetic manner, for tears accompanied his words” (10). He is their king, and he asks his captives if they were sent by their god, the sun, to punish them. He continues, “[W]e know you not, and have never offended you; why then have you taken possession of our lands, ate our fruits, and made our countrymen prisoners? Had you no lands of your own? Why did you not ask? [W]e would have given you some” (12). When the Britons do not respond because they do not understand the language, the king takes it as an admission of guilt, and proclaims that they must be killed for the sake of justice. Each is beheaded in turn, but one of the king's daughters intervenes to save Unca Eliza's

father just as the executioner is about to deliver the same fate to him. Thus the violence in texts from the Puritan period, which demonized Indians in captivity narratives and religious works, is re-written as a justifiable resistance to invasion. The settlers themselves, and not just the traders and others who profited from the colonial project, are implicated in the crime of displacement and land theft.

The author transforms the righteous anger and hatred expressed by New England Puritans and early colonists into sympathetic identification in its contemporary British context. And yet, though there is a critique of colonial settlement, this sympathetic identification is based upon a Christian ideology whose ultimate goal is religious conversion. The desire to convert rather than kill— to, as Stevens suggests, transform fear and disgust into pity (2) — is an important aspect of British colonialism. Despite the widespread failure of British missionary attempts, the rhetoric and fund-raising efforts by groups such as the SPG taught many Britons that their benevolence could bring good to the people who had been colonized by other Europeans. Unca Eliza's father, who is implicated as an invader by his own brother, falls in love with the king's daughter and converts her, which the novel depicts as an organic process once he is taken into the Indigenous society. The princess asks him to marry her, but he tells her that “my God will be angry if I marry you, unless you will worship him as I do” (20). In this endeavour, “he was more successful than he expected, and in a little time the princess became convinced of her errors, and her good understanding helped to forward her conversion.” While he comes to “look upon the country he

was in as his own . . . and was . . . willing to make [Unca] and her country his forever” (42), her easy conversion nonetheless points to the desirability and superiority of European culture. All the initial fear felt by Winkfield becomes transformed into a successful conversion. Unca's adoption of the Christian faith at the same time brings her into European culture, and when she is subsequently killed in a revenge plot orchestrated by her sister, who loves William and wants him for herself, the novel evokes the tragic fate of Indian women in earlier stories such as Pocahontas and Inkle and Yarico. However, unlike the Inkle and Yarico tale, it is the Indians themselves who cause the death of the Indian princess, and the desirable Englishman is not implicated in the crime. The stain of colonial betrayal which marked the earlier story is washed out by the missionary impulse.

It is important to note that what makes this text unique is that the hybrid subject is in fact a product of miscegenation, and not a white person who appropriates aspects of a Native identity following time in North America. While the novel is in many ways singular, Roxann Wheeler suggests that during the period in which it was printed there was an increasing interest in British fiction directed toward intermarriage between Britons and non-Europeans. She writes that “[t]he mid-eighteenth-century literary focus on conjugal relations, rather than on a master/slave dynamic, occurred when the British empire was shifting emphasis from territorial acquisition to issues of governance. Through the representation of intermarriage, these novels responded to Britons' concerns about governing an empire” (“Desire,” 316). While most of these works were about

Muslims from the Ottoman Empire (316), North America provided a convenient site for imagining the dynamics of intermarriage as a form of colonial rule even as its fate as a British colony was beginning to be in question by the time of the publication of *The Female American* in the late 1760s. Wheeler notes that in all of these novels, it is Christianity which proves to be the most significant difference between the intercultural couples, not skin colour. Unca Eliza's father's objection to marrying her mother was not that she was an Indian, but rather that she was a "Pagan." We are told that "[t]hough a complexion so different, as that of the princess from an European, cannot but at first disgust, yet by degrees my father grew insensible to the difference" (41). Her religion, however, could not be overlooked. In each intermarriage novel of the period, the high-ranking non-European woman becomes a Christian before her marriage to the European. Thus, "[t]he consent of non-Europeans to this formative trope of British national identity enacts an unproblematic change of their religious and cultural affiliation: each time, their assimilation is successful" (316). In the case of Unca Eliza, a product of intermarriage, she is raised Christian and so she does not suffer for her complexion, which is only significant in other novels prior to the main characters' Christian conversions. It is, in fact, her in-betweenness that makes her appealing when she visits Britain: "My tawny complexion, and the oddity of my dress, attracted every one's attention, for my mother used to dress me in a kind of mixed habit, neither perfectly in the Indian, nor yet in the European taste, either of fine linen, or a rich silk. I never wore a cap; but my lank black hair was adorned with

diamonds and flowers” (49). Her hybrid appearance is celebrated in Britain, and her fashion is a visible sign of her colonial origins, perfectly combined in the metropolis to visualize the fantasy of transcultural desirability.

While hybridity could in many instances be menacing to colonial rule, Unca Eliza's liminal status is not only aesthetically appealing in London, but is also shown to be beneficial in converting the Indians. Anne McClintock argues that “the staging of symbolic disorder by the privileged can merely preempt challenges by those who do not possess the power to stage ambiguity with comparable license or authority” (69). She suggests that “mimicry and cross-dressing” can be “a technique not of colonial subversion, but of surveillance” (69). The colonial agent knows that “passing ‘down’ the cultural hierarchy is permissible; passing ‘up’ is not,” and there is therefore an “other side of mimicry: the colonial who passes as Other the better to govern” (70). This kind of “passing” is one of the “privilege[s] of whiteness” in colonial discourse, and the threat of hybridity becomes a tool in deflating colonial resistance. While Unca Eliza is not white, complexion is, as I discuss above, less important than Christianity in *The Female American* and broader racial discourse during this period of the eighteenth century. She is an acceptable British subject thanks to her upbringing and cultural identity.

Unca Eliza's use of hybridity as a means of aiding her efforts to convert Indians becomes a central idea in the narrative. While on a ship back to England, she is left on a deserted island after she refuses to marry the son of the captain.

As Michelle Burnham suggests, the text “critiques the helplessness of women within a coercive marriage market, and it goes on to offer a fantastic alternative to typical female roles within dominant culture” (16). A “female Crusoe,” Unca Eliza explores the island, cataloguing its life like a naturalist, and discovers how to survive thanks to an old guide written by a hermit. She effectively assumes white male strategies of survival and exploration, and is largely dependant upon the words and experience of the man who came before her. The guide warns her that Indians come to the island annually to worship at their ancient ruins; she discovers a hollow idol which she can get inside, and she resolves “to ascend into the hollow idol, speak to the Indians from thence, and endeavour to convert them from their idolatry” (83). By speaking to them in their own language, she believes she will “prejudice their minds greatly in favour of what I should say to them,” and, should she reveal herself to them, “my tawny complexion would be some recommendation” (84). Thus, while much of her information comes from the old hermit, she proves herself to be more bold and ambitious in spreading Christian doctrine. It is true that the novel presents what Burnham describes as a kind of feminist utopia on the island, but at the same time, as she suggests, this is tempered by the ideology of Christian imperialism.

The hybrid heroine is ultimately successful in converting the Indians by using their own religious artefacts and beliefs, and, before she appears to them, she tells them that “[a] person shall come to you, like yourselves, and that you may be the less fearful or suspicious, that person shall be a woman, who shall live

among you as you do” (111). Her method of using ventriloquism through a male idol to address the Indians, and her strategy of exploiting her gender and racial identities to aid in this conversion, are remarkable for the ways in which they subvert and challenge other kinds of missionary or imperialist writing of the period. And yet, in the end the novel resolves in a typical marriage plot, with Unca Eliza marrying her English cousin and deferring to him, though she notes that they “never intended to have any more to do with Europe” (154) and they stay among the Indians. Thus the hybridity of the characters and plot of the text becomes what McClintock calls a “symbollic disorder,” creating the ideal conditions of colonial governance. Indeed, the desire for cross-cultural missionaries was reflected in mainstream missionary discourse; a major premise of Eleazar Wheelock's Indian Charity School was the similar goal of sending out Indians to live among and preach to other Indians, and Mohegan preacher Samson Occom toured across England the same year that *The Female American* was printed to raise money for this endeavour.

The Female American represents one strand of British sentimentalism, rooted in missionary efforts and built around pity for Indians rather than admiration. Protestant missionary writing, which by the end of the eighteenth century had been produced for over one hundred and fifty years, was key to shaping representations of Indians. Laura Stevens argues that the large body of missionary texts about North American Indians were, in addition to forming perceptions of Native people, more important for their discussions of shared

feeling than missionary work (6-7). In this way they prefigured and shaped the culture of sensibility which began to appropriate the fortitude and authenticity of Indian voices by the end of the century. At the same time, the “poor Indian” depicted by missionaries is, as Stevens notes, distinct from the “noble savage,” since “[p]oor Indians are defined through their need for the very things that noble savages do not need, Christianity and European civilization” (19). Thus the Indian-Briton (or perhaps Briton-Indian) of *The Female American* does not function in a way meant to appropriate the virtues of the Indians, but rather to introduce European virtue among them.

Indian-Britons

The depiction of Indians in the following novels and texts show that it is Britons who need the virtues of Indians, not the other way around. This is not to suggest that *The Female American* is simply an oddity, a singular text which does not reflect prevalent ideologies or sentiments. However, it belongs more to the genre of intercultural novels which Roxann Wheeler discusses in her article on the subject, and, while it is illuminating for its important strategies of self-representation in eighteenth-century women's writing, it presents a model of hybridity which is less about the specificity of Indians and more about a broader cultural fantasy of conversion and governance.

Representations of Indians in sentimental fiction present an epistemological contradiction; on the one hand, as Stevens has shown, the “poor Indian” was an important aspect in the foundation of the culture of sensibility. In

its secular form, outside of missionary discourse and in imaginative writing, Indians became the opposing pole to sensibility and fellow-feeling. Intercultural contact thus produced both the sympathy which marked the British, and their desire for the virtues possessed by the objects of pity. It was the failure of the missionary effort overall which led to the perception of cultural strength of Indians, but the rhetoric of this effort contributed to the melancholic romanticization of the plight of Indians. How can it be that missionary works on Indians, which aimed at pity over sympathetic identification, led to the texts which sought to hybridize British people by bringing in the perceived virtues of Indians? That is, how did this process become reversed?

Henry Mackenzie's *The Man of the World* is in some ways a companion piece to his earlier *The Man of Feeling* (1771). As Sir Walter Scott noted in describing the novels, "in [*The Man of Feeling*] he imagined a hero constantly obedient to every emotion of his moral sense; in *The Man of the World*, he exhibited, on the contrary, a person rushing headlong into guilt and ruin, and spreading misery all around him, by pursuing a selfish and sensual happiness which he expected to obtain in defiance of the moral sense" (110). The novel tracks the villainous Sir Thomas Sindall, who we are told is a "Man of the World," and his relentless pursuit of vice. While at Oxford he corrupts the virtuous Billy Annesly, whose sister Harriet becomes the object of Sir Thomas's lust. In an elaborate scheme to win the favour of the Annesly family, Sir Thomas manipulates Billy into a life of poverty and vice, to the point that the young man

is forced to commit a robbery to relieve a gambling debt. Billy is, as Lise Sorensen suggests, a “failed man of feeling” (75), and he is transported from Britain to the West Indies. His master dies soon after he arrives, after which he is disgracefully enlisted in a regiment as a felon. He notes that he could have used his station and education to his advantage, but he resolves to “[suffer] every part of my punishment” (168). He casts away the marks of cultural distinction, while his suffering improves his physical constitution, and he is singled out by some officers and goes on several “Indian expeditions.” As he gains distinction for his actions, others begin to resent him because he is a “jail-bird” (170). He fights one of the men who offends him, and is sentenced to 500 lashes. He resolves to attempt suicide after the first 100 are administered, but, after freeing himself from his binds, decides to flee the further injustice of the army to “join the Indians” (173). Mackenzie takes his sentimental hero and places him among stoic Indians who still possess the emotional control which Britons can no longer access. As Sorensen argues, “[i]f *The Man of Feeling* represents the decline of the ambiguous discourse of sensibility, *The Man of the World* seems to pick up this dead-end, remodelling a passionate man of feeling by giving him the heroic qualities associated with stoical Indians” (84). Billy comes across a party of Cherokees, and tries to communicate his intention of deserting his own people. The oldest Indian “asked me, in broken French, mixed with his own language, of which too I understood something, what was my intention, and whence I came?” Billy shows the Indians the lashes he had received from the British fort to convey to them “my

friendship to [their] countrymen and hatred to my own” (174). In response, the Indians load him with the burdens of two of their prisoners which, due to his fresh lashes, is very painful, but he is aware that “fortitude was an indispensable virtue with the Indians” and so he “bore it without wincing” (175). After he carries this load for a couple of days without showing any signs of discomfort, they gradually remove it from his back and apply herbs to his wounds and heal them (176). When they reach their village, many of the captives are taken in by families who have lost members and are “adopted . . . in place of the relations they had lost” (177). The remaining prisoners are brutally tortured in a “festival of their revenge,” yet they do not show any signs of pain. Instead, “they sung, in their rude, yet forcible manner, the glory of their former victories, and the pleasure they had received from the death of their foes” (177). The victims provoke their tormentors when they slow down in their tortures, so that “intenseness of pain might not be wanting in the trial of their fortitude.” The elder of the tribe gestures to Billy during particularly brutal moments, to show him the proper way to endure suffering. The next day, he experiences a similar fate when he is tied and stabbed repeatedly, after which his wounds are rubbed with gunpowder. Following this, they “laid quantities of dry gun-powder on different parts of my body, and set fire to them, by which I was burnt in some places to the bone” (179-180). Like Lismahago's punishment at the hands of the Miamis in *Humphry Clinker*, the torture of the European involves the use of distinctly European commodities. Billy's “mangled body” is invaded by the implements of exchange, and he is able

to endure this brutal treatment thanks to “a life of hardship” and a “contempt of existence” brought about by his own people.

The Indians approve of his strength and, after healing his wounds, he is adopted by the elder as his son, who “gave me a name, and fastened round my neck a belt of wampum” (181). He is welcomed as a Cherokee, “to whom shame is more intolerable than the stab of the knife, or the burning of the fire.” He lives among them happily, admitting that “scarce any inducement could have tempted me to leave the nation to which [the old man who adopted him] belonged” (182). Billy celebrates the virtues of life among savages, such as the notion that “rule is only acknowledged for the purpose of immediate utility to those who obey,” that “greatness cannot use oppression, nor wealth excite envy,” and that “desires are native to the heart, and the languor of satiety is unknown.” Following this he observes, “Certain it is, that I am far from being a single instance, of one who had even attained maturity in Europe, and yet found his mind so accommodated, by the habit of a few years, to Indian manners, as to leave that country with regret” (183). While he mentions these people eventually leave their host tribes, he acknowledges the numerous Britons and other Europeans who found themselves among Indians and willingly chose to live among them, which was a fact generally disavowed in fiction of the time. The Indians may be a less “polished people,” but they “[feel] no regret, for the want of those delicate pleasures.” It is precisely that polish and delicacy which leads Billy to be corrupted, and he learns more among the Cherokee than during his time at Oxford. The corrupt gentry and

the vices of commercial society are presented as the other to the rustic Indians. The Cherokee provide Billy with a new self, naming him and providing him with the confidence to make proper ethical and emotional decisions through their profound self-control.

Mackenzie's account of Billy's initiation into the Cherokee world is remarkably similar to Smith's description of savage life in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Indeed, *The Man of the World* was reportedly the only novel in English that Smith owned,⁸³ and the two men were friends, so it is hardly surprising there should be such similarities. Smith claims that the “magnanimity and self-command” of savages “are almost beyond the conception of Europeans” (399). “The savages in North America,” Smith writes, “assume upon all occasions the greatest indifference, and would think themselves degraded if they should ever appear in any respect to be overcome, either by love or grief, or resentment” (399). He describes how the Indian, upon receiving a death sentence after being captured, does not show “any other passion but contempt of his enemies” (401). While he is in the midst of the most brutal bodily tortures, the savage “derides his tormentors, and tells them with how much more ingenuity, he himself had tormented such of their countrymen as had fallen into his hands” (401). Mirroring Mackenzie's account, Smith also describes the “song of death,” which is “a song . . . he is to sing when he has fallen into the hands of his

⁸³ John Rae notes that Smith cared little for the popular form of the novel, and did not own any Fielding, Richardson, or Smollett. See *Life of Adam Smith*. London: Macmillan and Co, 1895. 348

enemies, and is expiring under the tortures which they inflict upon him” (402).

Tim Fulford discusses the rise in popularity of Indian songs in Britain beginning in the 1760s, and notes that the death song in particular was seen as “both noble in itself and a form of terrible enquiry-- a means that Indians use to test each other's resolution, to probe the determination with which they maintain their identity” (145). Furthermore, “the death song seemed to be an overflow of being into language— an articulation of essential self without the intervention of self-consciousness or pre-meditation” (145). This represented, on the surface, the opposite to the educated, lettered English gentleman, yet, as Fulford rightly points out, “[t]he Indian of the death song . . . was not simply the other but the secret twin of the British male reader— the embodiment of his taboo desire” (145). The desire for an authentic expression of selfhood, Fulford argues, was a large part of the British fascination with the death song. In Smith's description, he writes that the Indian “sings this song upon all extraordinary occasions, . . . whenever he has a mind to show that he has familiarised his imagination, to the most dreadful misfortunes, and that no human event can daunt his resolution, or alter his purpose” (402). He describes all savage nations as “nations of heroes” because of their “magnanimity,” and mourns their treatment at the hands of cruel Europeans (402). Robert Goadby, the printer behind *The Life and Adventures of Bampfylde Moore Carew*, claims in *The Universe Displayed* (1763) that the death song “has something mournful and haughty at the same Time,” and describes the gist of most of the songs: “*I am brave and intrepid; I do not fear Death, nor any*

Kind of Tortures: Those who fear them, are Cowards; they are less than Women: Life is nothing to those that have Courage: May my Enemies be confounded with Despair and Rage: Oh! that I could devour them, and drink their Blood to the last Drop" (42). This description is comparable to other accounts in British texts, and suggests an alternative model of masculinity embodied by the Indian who sings the death song. Faced with his own destruction, the Indian provokes his enemies into torturing him more, giving the appearance that, as Goadby writes, "they take pleasure in being tormented." At the end of his life, the Indian warrior asserts his identity and strength of character over that of those about to take it.

Besides providing what Fulford describes as both a homoerotic and macabre fascination for the British male, Indian death songs also helped establish the problematic link between Indians and death. This became an important aspect of American colonial ideology in the nineteenth-century expansion of territory at the expense of Indigenous people.⁸⁴ Their acceptance, even welcoming, of death could, on an ideological level, be viewed as a dehumanizing aspect of violent colonialism. The British male can absorb the fortitude and strength of character exemplified by the death song, while the Indian is given only an honourable but inescapable death. This is indicative of the Romantic use of Indians in both the British and American context, and they become abstracted and sentimentalized to the point that the Indian death opens a symbolic space for the white reader to occupy. The Indian effectively sacrifices himself for the affective response of the

⁸⁴ See Bergland 1-24, Stevens 160-194.

European in this cultural fantasy.

The model of fortitude offered by Smith is, despite its ambivalence, not meant to be taken as an ideal model of behaviour. Smith was sceptical of the view of savage life presented by Rousseau in his *Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality Among Men* (1754) and wrote in a 1755 letter to the *Edinburgh Review* that “Mr. Rousseau, intending to paint the savage life as the happiest of any, presents only the indolent side of it to view, which he exhibits indeed with the most beautiful and agreeable colours, in a style, which, tho' laboured and studiously elegant, is every where sufficiently nervous, and sometimes even sublime and pathetic.” Smith admits that “[t]he life of a savage, when we take a distant view of it, seems to be a life either of profound indolence, or of great and astonishing adventures; and both these qualities serve to render the description of it agreeable to the imagination.” However, this view presupposes the idea that “there is in man no powerful instinct which necessarily determines him to seek society for its own sake.” While commercial society may have negatively impacted the virtues of Europeans and their ability to suppress their emotions, it is also the only state of being which can produce sympathy. Indeed, Smith observes in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* that savage nations cultivate virtues of self-denial rather than those founded upon humanity (397-8). He argues that “all savages are too much occupied with their own wants and necessities, to give much attention to those of another person” (398-9).

Though Smith did not endorse the life of the savage, his description

partially laid the groundwork for the subsequent abstraction of Indigenous people into sentimental objects. The appropriation which occurs in Mackenzie and later Romantic thinkers comes in part from the description of the “impartial spectator,” abstracted onto the Indigenous people of North America. Maureen Harkin notes that “[t]he vision of discipline and self-denial offered by the figure of the impartial spectator clearly offers something of a parallel to the self-control of the savage” (442). Sorensen suggests that in both Smith and Mackenzie, the stoical Indian presents “an attractive, if highly ambivalent, alternative to the modern passionate self” (74). Mackenzie puts forth a literalization of Smith's spectator in the form of the Cherokee, who, when coupled with a British man of feeling, can shape a subject who properly measures the appropriate emotional response and controls their vices.

Mackenzie's Billy only leaves the Indians following the death of his adopted father, which “naturally awakened in me the remembrance of a father in England, whose age might now be helpless, and call for the aid of a long-lost son to solace and support it” (187). His Cherokee father's final words are spent critiquing the contradictions and follies of Europeans, noting that he can see in Billy's tears that he still “retained so much of the European.” He tells him, “In those tears . . . there is no wisdom, for there is no use” (184). This is in stark contrast to Harley in *The Man of Feeling*, whose numerous outbursts caused Victorian readers to add an “Index of Tears” to the text. While Harley proclaims that “there is virtue in these tears; let the fruit of them be virtue” (100), the stoic

Indian faces death with such “composure” that he “would have done honour to the firmest philosopher of antiquity” (184). The Indian's function as the impartial spectator is clearly evident in this scene, and he attempts to reign in his adopted son's potentially unruly emotions.

There is a gap between the “poor Indian” of missionary writing and the “noble savage” as described by Smith; one exists solely as an object of pity, while the other is incapable of experiencing sympathy for others. As Stevens notes, “the poor Indian borrowed much from the noble savage, whose moral simplicity was used to set off European's contrasting hypocrisy,” but these figures are ultimately oppositional because “[p]oor Indians are defined through their need for the very things that noble savages do not need, Christianity and European civilization” (19). In a sense, the noble savage pities the European in the same way as the European pities the poor Indian.

Sentimental accounts of transculturation are often attempts to re-write and re-imagine the kinds of cultural contact which were represented in earlier “non-fictional” descriptions of the brutality of life for the suffering British captive. The captivity narratives produced in the 1750s and 1760s, which led to the broader British interest in the possibilities of life among the Indians, as we have seen, present a radically different vision of cultural contact. While they are frequently ambivalent in their portrayals of both the suffering captives and the cruel Indians, the texts have a problem with making sense of Indian violence. On the one hand, the torture and execution of European bodies represents a critique of British

colonial practices, or at least a response to them, but, on the other hand, the extreme violence is often carried out and described with such excess that it goes beyond any symbolic critique. It becomes, in a sense, meaningless, providing only a pornographic spectacle rather than a metaphor of deeper value. To a certain extent, it is this meaningless violence that fuelled the popularity of these texts, as was no doubt the case in Peter Williamson's narrative. Like sentimental writing, this vision of dismembered, suffering British bodies often produced affective responses rather than rational or political ones, and aestheticized colonial violence to the point that these representations threatened to efface its causes. This is not to diminish the value of these captivity narratives, which have long been dismissed as commodified and propagandist versions of Puritan captivity narratives, but to suggest that their struggle with the significance of Indian violence is in part what led authors of fiction to take up this violence to produce meaning. In fiction, this violence is rarely so empty, particularly in texts containing captivity episodes beginning in the late 1760s.

William Richardson, a Scottish professor and literary scholar, first published his short story "The Indians, A Tale" in 1774 in his collection *Poems, Chiefly Rural*, which was re-printed in that same year, again in 1776 and 1781, and as *The Cacique of Ontario, A Tale*, in 1786. He would later adapt it for the stage as *The Indians, A Tragedy*, and it was performed on at least one occasion at the Theatre-Royal in 1789 or 1790. The performance was not particularly celebrated, but both the *Critical* and the *Monthly Review* saw some merit in it.

The *Critical* found that, despite some tedious language, “more striking marks of originality are to be found in the present publication . . . than in any which for several years past have come under our inspection” (203), while the *Monthly* less generously maintained that “though not in the first rank of tragedies, [the play] is interesting and pathetic” (430). Richardson was ultimately more acclaimed as a scholar than a writer, but his story appears to have been circulated to the point that it was re-printed in America in several magazines. Like fellow Scotsman Mackenzie, Richardson depicts the encounter between British sentimentality and stoic Indians, but his Indians are not quite the same unfeeling, heroic savages we find in Adam Smith.

The story paints a different picture of Indian culture than the press of the same time, as discussed above. The 1774 edition remained fundamentally unchanged up to its adaptation for the stage, and it begins with the weeping Marano, who we initially are to assume is an Indian woman mourning her missing husband, Oneyo. However, the opening sentences also mention her “snowy arm” and that “[h]er blue eyes were full of tender anxiety” (115). As she speculates on the fate of her husband, his father, the respected elder Ononthio, comes to her side to comfort her. In their ensuing conversation it is revealed that Marano is a Briton who was captured as a child during a raid by the Outagami. While many years have passed, she confesses that “at the name of Briton, my bosom glows with peculiar transport” (117). This hurts the elder, who worries that though they took her in and named her according to their customs, “your affections are estranged,

and you languish for the land of your fathers” (117-118). He concludes his sentimental speech by looking at her while “a tear rose in his eye,” sadly repeating twice to his adopted daughter-in-law, “You would leave me” (118). She assures him, “No, I will never leave thee.” She admits, “I have heard of European refinements, of costly raiment and lofty palaces; yet to me the simplicity of these rocks and forests seems far more delightful” (118). This scene contradicts the inhuman, unfeeling depictions of savagery of the press and periodicals, and opens up a moment of sympathetic identification with the benevolent old man. At this point it appears that Marano exercises her superior British sensibility in her relationship with the Indians, since she argues against the torture and execution of captives, but this view is subsequently challenged in the text, as we shall see below.

The Indians eventually capture the people they believe to be responsible for the presumed death of their beloved Oneyo, and their leader is a bold Briton named Sidney. It is revealed that he is Marano's long-lost brother, and she begs that his life be spared as they prepare to torture him. Ononchio immediately offers to adopt him into their tribe, and allow him to “[s]upply the place of the dead” (127). Sidney is not able to comprehend such a rapid shift in relations from enemy to friendship but the elder tells him, “You reason . . . according to the maxims of Europeans, whose external guise is imposing, but whose souls are treacherous and implacable” (127). Ononchio then gives a lengthy speech on the failing of European justice and retribution, in that it fails to prevent future wrongs

and attempts to ruin the offender with infamy. He acknowledges that Indian practices may appear cruel, but argues that “the simple Indian is not inhuman. Our reason may be obscured, but our principles are innocent. Our passions may be excessive, but they are not corrupt” (129). While this is hardly exemplary of Smith's model of stoic self-command, Ononthio displays a level of interiority and self-reflexivity that is equally appealing. He explains to Sidney that the death he was on the brink of suffering was not meant to insult him, but to honour him, since they admired his bravery: “Death is not a misfortune but to the feeble, to those whose lives have dishonoured their memory, who disgrace their nature by unseemly feats, and affront the Almighty with their distrust” (129). There is no contradiction between the torture and execution of a captive and his or her adoption into the tribe, since both are meant to fulfil the absence of a loved one. From the British perspective, as Sussman has shown, both options involve the fear of incorporation; however, in texts such as Richardson's, the commercial fear which typifies Smollett's transcultural vision of “the collapsing distinctions between foreign sites of capital accumulation and domestic spaces of consumption” (598-599) becomes a sentimental desire for appropriation. Adoption is a conceit of romance, and challenges the culture of inheritance. Among Indians, the adopted Briton is born anew and allowed to rise within their ranks on their own merits.

Following the elder's speech, Sidney is “filled with astonishment and admiration,” and asks, “Can I . . . who am of a different origin, born of a people

whom you have reason to execrate, and the votary of a different religion, can I be adopted into your nation?" (130). Ononthio replies that "the simple, unaffected Indian . . . is a stranger to your distinctions." This lack of social distinction is precisely what fuelled the fear of Indian violence in the press, since they treated all enemy combatants equally, and also what made them so fascinating to critics of stratified British society; among Indians, class became irrelevant. The Indian explains in a speech which is remarkable for its progressive and modern values of tolerance that while human difference exists, it does not mean that people should "hate or contemn the stranger" (130).⁸⁵ He denies that Europeans and Indians are of a different religion, since they all reflect "the creating Spirit," and encourages the Briton to "[e]njoy your faith, your freedom, and the love of your country; but give us your friendship and intrepid valour" (131). As in other representations of cultural adoption from the period, Britons can in fact perfect their Britishness by assuming an Indian identity. Sidney's initial response reflects his faulty European values, and though he admires the "elevation of sentiment" and the lack of bigotry and prejudice, he "cannot allow that the uncivilized life of an Indian is preferable to the culture and refinement of Europe" (131). Ononthio argues that refinement does not "better the heart or improve the affections," but in fact dulls sympathy and the "exquisite sensations of youth" over time. He encourages Sidney to "[b]e guiltless— Be an Indian" (132). While Sidney already possesses the virtues that Indians admire, despite being brought up among Europeans, the Indian way of life

⁸⁵ For a study of the rise of human rights discourse in the eighteenth-century novel, see Hunt, Lynn. *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. New York: Norton, 2007. 35-69

is elevated as being an authentic way of experiencing morality and emotional life. Not surprisingly, Richardson was a defender of the authenticity of Ossian, and no doubt saw in his understanding of Indians the immediacy of experience embodied by an oral culture.

Following this exchange between the wise old man and the virtuous Briton, a party of Indians return with the news that Oneyo has been slain, and one of them points to Sidney as the man guilty of the killing. There is a call for vengeance from the tribe, but Marano and Ononchio intercede once again on the Briton's behalf. He reveals that he spared the honourable warrior his life, but is unsure what became of him after their encounter. Marano takes her brother and the other captives away from the incensed throng, and Ononchio urges Sidney to not judge his people because they “follow the immediate impulse of nature, and are often extravagant” (136). This, he assures him, will not last, because they are unaware of “latent or lasting enmity” (136). Soon after, Oneyo returns secretly and displays this same impetuosity; he observes Marano in the arms of her brother, who is a stranger to him, and he plans to kill the man. Upon recognizing Sidney as the soldier who had spared his life in battle, however, he decides to take his own life. All is quickly revealed before he can act on his rash plan, the lovers are reunited, and they are welcomed by Ononchio at the village, where “the day was crowned with rejoicing” (140). While there is no explicit mention of the ultimate fate of the Britons, they presumably stay among the Indians and live out their lives. The numerous editions of this story and the later play suggest that it

attained some level of popularity, perhaps influencing fellow Scottish poet Thomas Campbell's more well-known "Gertrude of Wyoming" (1809), and while William Richardson may not be remembered for his literary prowess, his vision of Indians embodying the virtues that Britons should aim for while self-reflexively understanding their own motivations and limitations offers a striking contradiction to the broader press coverage of the time. Ononthio's open invitation to "[b]e an Indian" powerfully represents the desire for an authentic expression of individuality at the heart of the emerging modern self. Though Richardson's defence of Ossian suggests his alignment with a primitivist critique of the modern, the Indian occupies both the pastoral past and, more importantly, a future possibility; in the epilogue of the subsequent play, Richardson writes, "Th' Indian loves liberty, and will be free: / And so have Britons been, and still will be" (57).

The hybrid Indian-Briton appears again in Irish playwright John O'Keeffe's *The Basket-Maker* (printed in 1790, performed in 1789 at Hay-Market), and was, O'Keeffe would later claim, inspired by his own encounter with Indians in London in 1782. While he had also seen the Cherokees in 1762,⁸⁶ who "wore their own dress, and were objects of great curiosity," he writes that the later delegation "were not so wild in their appearance as the former," and "were accompanied by an Englishman, who had long resided among them, (and on this circumstance, some years after, I partly founded my two-act piece of 'The Basket-

⁸⁶ See Vaughan 165-175.

Maker')" (45-46). O'Keeffe showed the men the mechanism of the stage, demonstrating the stage traps and letting them rise up and down on them, and remarked upon the "dignity and composure" with which they conducted themselves. He adds, "I stood close to them, and paid particular attention to the Cherokee-Englishman, whose name was Bowles: he was in the full Cherokee dress, and not to be distinguished from a native. I was told he had been the chief means of introducing civilization and Christian benevolence among them. He is my King Simon in 'The Basket-Maker'" (46). As Helen Carr notes, the Cherokee as O'Keeffe saw them in their later visit had, in fact, largely achieved their present state of "civilization" through their own means, and the suggestion that Bowles had introduced Christianity among them was no doubt meant for the more conservative audience reading his memoirs (148). There is no mention in the play itself of conversion or civilizing the Indians, nor is it implied at any point.

O'Keeffe's memoirs were written in 1826, years after his encounter. While Carr speculates that the "Cherokee-Englishman" he met could have been Chief Duwa'li Bowles or his Scottish father (153 n.44), there does not appear to be any evidence of a Cherokee delegation in 1782, or of any visit to London by either man. In 1790-91, after *The Basket-Maker* was first written and performed, a six-person delegation of Creeks and Cherokees arrived in London. They were led by William Augustus Bowles, the "Ambassador from the United Nations of Creeks and Cherokees to the Court of London." It seems likely that it was this man that O'Keeffe encountered, and his insistence that this man inspired King

Simon is a conflation of encounter and inspiration. Bowles claimed to have been appointed by Creek and Cherokee leaders as a negotiator, but he was nonetheless turned away by King George III (Pratt, "Representatives," 113). However, Bowles had his portrait painted twice, one of which survives. Two members of his group were also painted. The portrait of the Englishman is a further indication that perhaps O'Keeffe had mistaken the dates of his encounter with his hybrid subject who so fascinated him. In the painting, Bowles appears in a costume which, as Stephanie Pratt observes, emphasizes his authority as a leader. His feathered turban, complete with a gemstone, and the wampum and gorget around his neck was, as compared to the Native men painted, flamboyant. Pratt suggests that "[t]he credibility of this British-born expatriate is thus mediated through these signs of Indian authority and their emphasis is a necessary strategy in the creation of his identity as a legitimate delegate and commander" (115).⁸⁷ Benjamin Baynton's *Authentic memoirs of William Augustus Bowles, Esquire* (1791), offers a curious portrait of the man which attempts to depict him as a self-made hero. Given the failure of Bowles' embassy, it seems the biography did not have the desired influence in official circles. The *Critical Review* noted that the author "gives such an improbable account of Mr. Bowles' natural ingenuity respecting different arts and sciences, as cannot impress us with any great opinion of the authenticity of the narrative" (238). Despite this and other inconsistencies, the reviewer believes that Bowles "is a gentleman of great merit, and [we] are happy

⁸⁷ Baynton claims that Bowles was in fact born in Maryland.

to think that Great Britain has so faithful and zealous a friend among the Creek Indians.” The *Monthly Review* was less kind, suggesting that “[m]emoirs written by nobody, are worthy or nobody’s attention; for what assurance can we have that there is a single word of truth in an anonymous publication, for which no one can be found to answer?” (356). Bowles, the writer reminds the audience, “at this time, appears in London in the character of an Indian Chief,” though he “is not an Indian by birth.” He summarizes the biography and Bowles’ character in the following words: “[B]eing of an unsettled, roving, and enterprizing disposition, [he] attached himself to one of the Indian nations, became enamoured of a savage life, and, which is perhaps more excusable, of a savage *girl*, whom he married.” Bowles “is now, by adoption, though not by birth an *Indian Warrior*.” The author complains that “[w]hat his errand, and that of his companions, is here, the pamphlet does not inform us.” Baynton himself admits that he “is altogether ignorant of the nature of Mr. Bowles’s embassy,” but assumes it “is doubtless a friendly one, and as such he wishes it success” (iv).

Though the *Memoirs* did not receive the critical reception and praise the author no doubt sought as a means of bringing attention to his subject, it offers a significant portrait of a man whose heroic qualities are traced to his merging of Anglo-American and Creek subjectivities. Born in Maryland to “respectable parents,” Bowles joined a Loyalist regiment at the outbreak of the Revolutionary War when he was just 13. Like Billy in *The Man of the World*, the young man finds himself wrongfully persecuted by his fellow soldiers. He is dismissed from

his commission, which he is not entirely unhappy about, and, after finding himself destitute, joins a party of Creeks. His time among them “had reduced him to the appearance of a savage,” and he leaves them after a few months. He ventures off on his own, fashioning a boat “like an Eskimaux,” and lives by hunting and fishing, “the sky his canopy, and the earth his bed” (16). He is forced “to seek for resources in himself alone; resources which at some future day were to shield him in the hour of danger, and which alone could complete him for the leader of a brave and gallant nation” (17). While Bowles was introduced to life among the Indians, he teaches himself how to be one. His ambition and individuality are what ultimately lead him to success with the Creeks, but not among Britons. Following a cold year in 1779, he joins a white settlement. His dislike of labour, however, inclines him to re-join the Creeks. This time he remains for two years, and he marries the daughter of one of the chiefs. “His children,” the author writes, “were living pledges of their father's fidelity,” and he becomes united to the Indians “both from inclination, and the ties of blood” (22-23). Family among the Indians empowers the Britons who take up their ties. Bowles finds a home with the Creeks, and “[h]abit now confirmed his predilection for a state of nature” (23). He joins them in battle, and distinguishes himself as a warrior; he becomes known, as the author writes earlier, as “the Beloved Warrior.” He is noteworthy for his love of the British nation, which “is only to be equalled by his affection for those by whom he was adopted” (26). The love for both does not diminish his ties to either, and his patriotism, like his identity, is transnational. He is invited to

re-join the British army, though his appearance is “in every respect like a savage warrior” (29), but he is once again jealously pursued by his fellow soldiers. They bring numerous charges against him, including “ungentleman-like behaviour” because he was seen collecting scalps. He does not deny these charges.

The conflict between British standards of behaviour and “barbarous custom” threatens Bowles’ re-entry into white society, but the author explains that “at the time now specified, Mr. Bowles was not only naked, like a savage, but was fighting side by side with his brother chiefs, who would have considered his withholding his hand from seizing this distinguished badge of a warrior’s bravery, as a mark of pusillanimity, and treated him accordingly” (39-40). Furthermore, he argues, scalping may be “savage,” but it is far from “inhuman” if we consider that “the victim is already dead, or senseless, before the scalp is thus torn away” (40). The transcultural subject becomes exempt from British standards of conduct and is given the benefit of moral relativism due to his split identity. Bowles is acquitted, and gets permission to visit his father and then the Creeks. He stays with them for a year, implementing cultural and political changes, reflecting that “he had experienced the worst that civilized men could do to him: from barbarians he had found shelter, in the days of calamity; to them he was perhaps indebted for his existence” (43). Though still only 19, he “had learned to know the animal man, stripped of artificial habits; and he knew him also with his seducing charms of polished manners. -The contrast was striking; and the judgment he formed appears to be decisive” (44). That is, he chooses to live with the Creeks, who

reward his singularity.

Bowles' heroic individualism, however, does not solely lay with his internalization of Creek cultural values; it is his ability to coalesce both British and Indian methods of self-expression. He accordingly, in a bourgeois fantasy of social liberty, forms an acting troop, teaches himself to paint, including manufacturing his own colours as a chemist, and learns the violin and flute. He is a "self-formed hero" (53), who has taken on the "gravity of manners corresponding with those of the nations whose habits he has assumed" (68). Unlike earlier examples in the century of fluid subjects who could cross cultural boundaries, Bowles is self-consciously driven by ambition. He is, among other things, an actor without having seen plays, a painter without knowing art, "a chemist, without even the rudiments of the science," and a "self-taught warrior, instructing savages in tactics" (71). He has the ability of "altering his whole nature, without making him effeminate" (72). While his cultural identity can shift according to his needs and desires, his masculinity is never in question. Unlike subjects during the *ancien régime* of identity, whose selves are malleable, Bowles is driven by a core subjectivity, an individual who can merge cultures to serve his needs, rather than be shaped externally by them.

The author of the text, Baynton, was like Bowles a staunch Loyalist born in the colonies whose sense of a British identity was not troubled by persecution following the Revolutionary War. His celebration of Bowles as a transcultural hero is likely in part due to his own experience as a fractured subject, and to the

understanding that ties between Indians and whites did not diminish the value of either one. The *Memoirs* are no doubt filled with hyperbole, but clearly Bowles' charismatic and hybrid presence, preserved in a portrait, affected many who actually encountered the young man on his mission to London. Certainly O'Keeffe carried the memory for many years.

To return, then, to *The Basket-Maker*, retroactively inspired by the striking young man in Indian dress that O'Keeffe encountered in London, we can see once again a heroic figure whose allegiances are untroubled by cross-cultural adoption. One of the main characters, Simon Rochefort, is a Frenchman who has become king of the Iroquois. The trajectory of the hybrid in Indian society in these British texts is always one of ascendancy. King Simon first appears onstage "in regal Indian dress," and reveals that he owned a tract of land in Canada, but was dispossessed of it by a new Governor. Left with only a marshy parcel of land, he entrusted his son to the care of a poor basket-maker and left to join the Iroquois. He distinguished himself in their war against the Hurons, and, in keeping with the broader representation of Indian societies as meritocracies, they subsequently made him their king. The plot primarily revolves around his determination to regain his land from the decadent governor Count Pepin and to reunite with his son, William, now a basket-maker himself. The ethnic identity of the elder basket-maker is never revealed, but his solitary existence suggests he was European. While it was a trade that was known in Britain, and was to a certain

extent synonymous with virtuous and humble hard labour and little reward,⁸⁸ baskets were also at this time known as important objects of Indian manufacture.⁸⁹ Whether it was O’Keeffe’s intention to draw on this ambiguity in the title of his play is difficult to say, but given his familiarity with and approval of Cook’s voyages (Carr 147),⁹⁰ it is possible to speculate that he had taken in some of the ethnographic displays of West Coast First Nations objects, including many baskets, brought back to Britain following Cook’s fateful third voyage. In either case, William, King Simon’s son who was raised by the basket-maker, functions on the periphery of both Indian and European colonial culture. His trade, as well as the culture of the Indians, is set in contrast to the easy life of Count Pepin, the decadent and arrogant gentleman.

King Simon puts a plan in action to have his Indians kidnap Pepin and force him to surrender the land he took from him. At the same time, the Count is planning on marrying Claudine, the niece of the French nobleman, the Marquis de Champlain. William and Claudine previously met in Montreal and are smitten with each other, but are unaware of their close proximity. Predictably, everything works out in the end; though the plan of kidnap is botched, and the Count is captured along with the Marquis, Claudine, William, and his foolish English

⁸⁸ See, for example, the basket-maker in Thomas Day’s *The History of Sandford and Merton* (London, 1795) and “The basket-maker, an original fragment,” in *The Village Orphan: A Tale for Youth* (London, 1797). Robinson Crusoe also manufactures baskets, recalling watching the craft as a child.

⁸⁹ In the nineteenth-century, baskets rather than tomahawks often became iconic of Indian identity, as in depictions of Huron-Wendats (Phillips 137).

⁹⁰ O’Keeffe wrote a pantomime called *Omai, or A Trip Around the World* (1785), about the Pacific islander brought to London by Cook.

servant Wattle, William is able to correct everything and convince the Indians to not kill Pepin, though he is unable to explain his use to the world beyond being a “gentleman.” In exchange, the Count must become William’s servant, which he at first refuses, arguing that people like William “are low vulgar bourgeois, a different species from us, they are born only to make and weave, and do and contribute to the ease of us noblemen” (359). He later appears on stage “in a Bear skin, his hair still in dress,” comically caught between stations and identities, and he laments, “I find a gentleman is a cursed bad trade; I’ve served my time to it, and now here’s my occupation” (368). The Indians force him to labour for the first time, fulfilling their role in the text as critics of aristocratic culture and defenders of the merchant class.

O’Keeffe burlesques the Indian practice of adopting white captives in an episode near the ending, in which Wattle is saved from being burnt alive by King Simon’s faithful ally Chichikou. The Iroquois man interrupts some of his brethren who are about to execute the hapless Englishman by declaring, “By custom of country, when relation killed in battle, we have a right to make prisoner relation in him room- I do claim his life, and take this man in place of my brother, that was kill in our last battle against Huron Nation” (370). Wattle is overjoyed, and Chichikou tells him, “You have now every right, privilege, name, goods, house, and all dat did belong to my dead brother, Kickapows, de warrior.” He replies, “Huzza! Mind good people, I am now Kick-a-mouse, the warrior” (370). Wattle quickly tries to exploit this situation when he discovers he is entitled to all

the dead warrior's possessions. He claims more than the man was owed, but is quickly put in place when the Indians try to begin to collect the man's debts as well, including an ear (371-372). Wattle is the only explicitly English character in the play, and his disingenuous adoption is put in contrast to the merited rise of King Simon among the same tribe. Earlier in the play, Wattle, who is a deserter from the army, longs for his homeland over the wild forests of French colonial country: "Oh, sweet London! I wish I was this moment sitting in the stocks, at Bethnel-green" (339). His inability to accommodate himself to his situation ensures his failure as a transculturated individual, and he carries forward the lessons of the metropolis rather than the periphery. That he would rather be in stocks in London than roaming free in the woods suggests that the English character is bound to the laws of the nation rather than a state of nature. Though it is a comedy, the play makes clear that Indians possess greater virtue and honesty, and can serve as instruments to improve the debauched or superficial values of Europeans. In the end, the Marquis declares to the now humbled Pepin, who vows to change, "And Count, when return'd to the gay world, tell the proud accomplish'd man of fashion, that the best master of manners, is a wild savage." To this King Simon adds, "And the truest schools for civilization, are the forests of America" (375).

The problematic nature of the hybrid subject is made clear in the ending of the play; as Helen Carr notes, "it is the good fortune of the Indianised European, not of the Indians, that ends the story" (151). King Simon regains his land and the

Count is reformed, but no mention is made of the Indians' struggle or reward. Carr points out that the text does contain strong anti-colonial critiques; the first song, omitted from some later anthologized versions of the play, has King Simon singing about British colonialism, despite the ostensibly French setting. He first evokes the Roman conquest of Britain, in which the Briton "now a godlike name, / Was savage then by Caesar call'd" (1). They fought for freedom, and "[p]oor Indians are but Britons now, / And we the Romans of the day." He asks, "Why from his wood the Indians drive, / And why usurp his native fields? / Unknown, unknowing let him live, / In all the sweets that freedom yields" (2). This song makes the sentiments of King Simon clear in relation to colonial conquest, and yet when the Iroquois Sokoki asks him, "But what right had King in Europe, to grant our land here in America?," the question goes conspicuously unanswered. The Indians cannot access the justice and freedom of the hybridized European, whose own struggles usurp their legitimate claims for redress.

Robert Bage's *Hermesprong*, like *The Female American*, has received increased attention over the last several years.⁹¹ Bage's novel is informed by the radical political culture occurring in Britain in the wake of the French Revolution, and like earlier French radicals and O'Keeffe, his use of the Indian is meant to provide a critique of the gentry. As in *The Man of the World*, Bage's protagonist

⁹¹ Like *The Female American*, part of this increased attention is owing to a well-edited Broadview edition. While Bage's novels were respected in their time, interest waned until the later twentieth century with, as Gary Kelly notes, "the renewed attention to political and ideological aspects of literature." See "Bage, Robert (1728?-1801)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2006 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/view/article/1028, accessed 30 Nov 2010].

returns to Britain following his time among the Indians and carries forward the lessons learned by his cultural adoption. He appears suddenly in the book to rescue the virtuous Caroline Clampinet, the daughter of the arrogant and corrupt Lord Grondale, and her aunt as their carriage is being driven to the edge of a cliff (78). After reviving the young woman, she praises the stranger's profound philosophy, and wonders how it could be natural that one so young could be so wise. He assures her that it must be natural, "since it was of the sons of nature I learned it" (80). This is the first allusion to his origins, which are slowly revealed in the book during his clashes with the decadent gentry and polite society.

It is these origins on which I will focus; while they come much later in the text and comprise a relatively brief section, they are meant to account for the broader critique which Hermsprong offers throughout the novel in his clashes with polite English society and people with unmerited titles, such as the father of his love-interest Caroline, Lord Grondale. Further, the story of his time among the Indians has not received the critical attention which is necessary to unpack the novel's use of Indians and hybridized Britons. Bage's description of the young Hermsprong's upbringing among the "Nawdoessie" Indians⁹² near Michillimackinac, like the description of Indian life in *The Female American*, seemingly does not rely on ethnographic specificity. Indeed, the novel lacks the broader descriptions of Indian life and culture found in most novels with Indian episodes, however fictionalized they may be, and depicts the Nawdoessie as polite

⁹² Perhaps a reference to the Haudenosaunee.

and tolerant, yet tenacious in their beliefs. In the context of the broader novel, the episode among the Indians is quite brief, and is not described until the third volume.

Hernsprong's father was German and was the child of a man of rank, but he was forced to leave the country after his younger brother, a rival in love, framed him in the killing of a friend in a duel. He is cut off by Hernsprong's grandfather and forced to change his name. While in France, he meets and falls in love with a woman. Her father disapproves of the union and, after she refuses the offers of marriage by three gentlemen, he sends her to a convent. Following the intervention of a friend, Hernsprong's father and mother make their way to Philadelphia and marry there. His mother is disowned by her father, and a short while later the elder Hernsprong is informed via an anonymous letter written in Latin from Paris that he is unsafe in Philadelphia or anywhere else in America because "dark designs were forming against him" (247). He had planned on being an academic and lecturing in philosophy or heading an academy, but this threat and the "the quarrels then arising between America and her mother country" prevent these hopes. During this time a close friend of his had joined the fur trade, and Hernsprong's father is introduced to the son of a Nawdoessie chief. As he was "fond of seeing man in a less civilized state," he converses with the man. He realizes that through this man "he might find an asylum, gratify his ardent desire to know man, assist his friend's business, and employ himself to advantage" (248). He therefore sets out to join the Nawdoessie, while his wife,

who is pregnant, stays in Philadelphia until the spring. Thus like other Europeans before him, including Billy in *The Man of the World*, Hermsprong's father seeks to join the Indians to escape the persecutions or limitations of the European world. However, his commercial interests are rendered equally important, and the benefits extend beyond his desire to enrich his philosophical understanding of man.

He is well received when he arrives, and spends the winter learning the language so he can communicate with the chief, Lontac, or the Great Beaver. Following the winter, the chief gathers his people and tells them to welcome the man from the "American people" who has learned their language and "loves our customs," and will "reside with us a vast number of moons; perhaps till the great spirit calls him away" (249). He tells the gathering of head men from all the villages that they will build a large wigwam for the European man, so they can store "all the good things we want from the European people"; he adds, "When we return from hunting he will buy our skins. So we shall have powder and guns, cloth to warm us in winter, and rum to cheer us" (249). The relationship between Hermsprong's father and the Indians is fashioned around exchange, in which Hermsprong's family supplies material objects while the Nawdoessie provide a cultural refuge from the European world. The influx of European goods, however, betrays this appearance of cultural purity. Indeed, the Europeans themselves seek out alternatives to the cultural environment among the Indians, and Hermsprong notes that they brought with them "our books, our music, our

instruments of drawing, and every thing that could be supposed to alleviate the solitude my mother had pictured to herself.” These remnants of European culture prove to be unnecessary, however, as the people are “civil and attentive,” and there is “novelty in the scene” (249). Even Hermsprong’s father, the man of letters, finds it “difficult to procure leisure for the studies and amusements he most liked,” since he is so occupied by their adoptive hosts.

Ultimately the life among the Nawdoessie proves to be a masculine and patriarchal space, where the young Hermsprong thrives while his French mother, a “zealous catholic,” increasingly resents the polite but uncompromising Indians. She attempts to convert members of the tribe they live amongst to assuage her guilt over her perceived transgressions of faith in leaving the convent. She begins her missionary efforts with Lodiquashow, the wife of the leader, Lontac. She soon finds that the Indian woman defers too much to the opinion of her husband, and is unable to persuade her to adopt the Catholic faith. Hermsprong’s mother decides to wait a further two months, mastering the Nawdoessie language and building the courage to approach the “venerable chief” himself in an attempt to proselytize. While the chief finds it to be “an inversion of order, that [he] should lend his ear to a woman for instruction,” at the same time Hermsprong notes that “there is in these people a politeness derived from education . . . which qualifies them for patient hearers, to a degree I have never observed in more polished nations” (250). Elsewhere in the novel, Hermsprong endorses the ideas of Mary Wollstonecraft, and yet, as Carr rightly points out, “the unquestioning obedience

of Indian women is presented without comment” (144). The chief’s politeness induces him to sit in silence while the French woman lectures him, responding only “to thank her for the pains she took on his account.” Eventually she grows angry, and demands a response from Lontac. He proceeds to tell her one of the legends of his people involving a figure who “viewed on one side . . . seemed to be a bear; on the other, it seemed to be a man.” Hermsprong’s mother interrupts, exclaiming that the story is so “preposterous” that “it is impossible you should believe it.” The chief tells her that “it is tradition handed down to us from our fathers. We believe, because they said it.” He also points out the far-fetched nature of her own biblical stories, and insists that “[i]t is better to believe than contradict” the religious beliefs of others. Exasperated, Hermsprong’s mother retreats to her husband and complains that she despises the Indians and “shall never be easy amongst them.” He tells her that he himself despised them until he “found them equals in knowledge of many things of which I believed them ignorant; and my superiors in the virtues of friendship, hospitality, and integrity” (251-252). The Indians possess the familial, bourgeois values which many Europeans longed for in the wake of the rise of the middle-class, though here it is the gentry that are able to access these values. He adds that his wife will be comfortable among them as long as she “[doesn’t] think of converting them.” While the critique of the missionary impulse is somewhat tempered by its depiction as Catholic and feminine, the point that it is Europeans, and not Indians, who need reforming is encapsulated by this episode. Indians are comfortable with

who they are without the external forces of class or religion, and their elevation of kinship over other social distinctions represents the privileging of liberty and individual merit over all values.

Unlike his mother, Hermsprong thrives among the Indians, and his only barrier to becoming an equal to his brethren is likely due to “the sedentary portion of my life, spent with my father in learning languages, in mathematics, in I know not what” (252). As a result of his father’s attachment to Europe, Hermsprong claims he is “superficial,” which makes him “resemble the generality of young Englishmen” (253). The value of Indian life is that it is “calculated to render man robust, and inure him to labour and fatigue,” creating an ideal, rational masculinity in the young man. His internalization of this upbringing suggests that it produces a greater individuality, separating him from the “generality,” and the emphasis on physical development is a corrective to the European decline of manual labour and self-sufficiency. Despite the patriarchal culture under which he is raised, however, Hermsprong does not necessarily share the value of timidity in women; he tells the English women listening to the story of his youth that they should “acquire minds to reason, understandings to judge,” and this can govern their “propriety of action” (253). Thus, while he does not judge their subordination of women, he breaks from the Indians who raised him in this regard.

Hermsprong ultimately leaves the Indians following the death of his father and returns to France with his mother. His connection to the tribe is, significantly,

through patrilineal ties. While he does not become a king among the Indians, he is eventually able to marry a noblewoman and restore his family name in Britain. Fulford notes that “[t]he only good aristocrat, Bage suggests, is an Indianized one, a hybrid of true civilization and Native American savagery, a man that neither culture could have produced alone” (114). Once again, this hybridity serves the European but does little for the Indians who shaped him, and while Bage offers a radical critique of British society in some ways, it is in the end a vision of reform rather than revolution.

In tracking the representations of Indians towards the end of the century, it is striking that, particularly in the 1770s, never had the poles between fear and desire grown so far apart. While this polarity existed before and for long after, and indeed continues to, it is this same time that witnessed the emergence of the hybrid figure who appropriated aspects of Indian culture. The Indian was a source of anxiety that challenged dominant discourses of British cultural superiority, and while this was already the case prior to the final quarter of the eighteenth century, earlier modes of self-imagining did not seek to willingly take on this thrilling subjectivity. In the press, Indians were the wedge that threatened to split the trans-Atlantic British self with their inhuman barbarity, but in imaginative literature, they were a potential source of the re-unification of this subject, providing an important role in the foundation of the modern self, and indeed Western modernity proper. Unfortunately, this transformative role did not lead to benefits for actual First Nations people, who were effectively excluded

from the new discourses of liberty and human rights which encounters and conflicts with them helped shape. In both British and American discourse, they became powerful symbols, but the actual complexity of First Nations people was written out of this history.

Conclusion

It is tempting, based on the chapters in this dissertation, to trace the trajectory of British interest in Indians during the eighteenth century from a fascinating otherness and exoticism, to fear and revulsion, to a desirable sameness. Of course, the actual patterns of representation were far more complex and varied than the potential linear narrative offered by this chronological look at the evolving forms of textual contact. And yet there is an undeniable shift that is detectable in various texts, a movement which generally reflects the ambivalence and anxiety over the modernizing forces of capitalism, consumerism, and expansionism. Indians would become the stand-in for the individual Briton facing the future and negotiating the perils and benefits of a world which for many represented a drastic break from the past.

There is a much broader range of texts outside of fictional literature which describe Indians, from natural histories to philosophical treatises, but I focus on fiction, poetry, and drama because these texts are the site of cultural negotiation and, further, they are surprisingly overlooked. Marshall and Williams argue, reflecting a widespread opinion, that “[f]ictional representation of the American Indian in this period is nondescript, and his sporadic appearance in plays, novels and poetry is of limited significance” (203). They suggest that it is not until Mackenzie’s novels in the 1770s that the Indian began to “appear in fiction as a believable human being, an individual rather than a stock type” (203). Their argument operates under the assumption that the sole reason fictional authors used

Indians in their works had little to do with a “deep intrinsic interest” in the specificity of Indians and more to do with their “availability.” And yet this “availability” itself produced a specific trope that was harnessed by writers, beyond the bare necessity for a primitive voice to critique the excesses of Europe. The notion of a “believable human being” in eighteenth-century literature overlooks the importance of what Brown describes as the “cultural fable,” which “can be said to tell a story whose protagonist is an emanation of contemporary experience and whose action reflects an imaginative negotiation with that experience” (3). While the Indians in the eighteenth-century texts which are studied in this dissertation cannot be distilled to a singular myth, they all speak to a negotiation of not only the paired polarities of emerging modernity, but between the past and the future, between custom and law, between society and the individual. In short, the Indian lies on the cusp of both history and subjectivity, a mediation between the impulses of primitivism and progress which propelled so much Enlightenment thought.

The construction of Indians in scientific discourse would subsequently expand in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and become a more coherent body of knowledge which was useful for the colonial states to form Indian policy and displace First Nations people in the expansion of settler claims and territory. This can be described as a comparable discourse to Edward Said’s account of Orientalism. While there were plenty of ethnographic texts produced about Indians in the eighteenth century, they did not possess the level of authoritative

power which could uniformly shape public consciousness. They were not, as Foucault discusses, formed into a disciplinary knowledge, but instead comprised a heterogeneous and deeply ambivalent body of anecdote and observation.

Attempts to place the Indian into a scientific understanding of the world were offset by the vast and contradictory supply of newspaper stories, traveller's experiences, and imaginative literature. Emerging racial theory found it difficult to reconcile Indians into the categories of mankind, as Roxann Wheeler notes (169), and they were placed in the unique position between savage and European man. It is this power to elude definition which gave the figure of the Indian its rhetorical power.

Despite the overwhelming amount of contradictory knowledge about Indians, the real fate of First Nations populations is much more clear; in both the emerging American state and the British colonies which would later become Canada, Indigenous people were subject to harmful, sometimes genocidal, policies and practises whose effects continue to be felt today. As Marshall and Williams note, even the images of Indians which attempted to celebrate or fetishize them ultimately “proved powerless to protect [them],” since the attempt to erase North American Indigenous people from history “was a belief supported by interest, not merely by sentiment” (221-222). In Britain, the conflict between settlers and Native people was obviously experienced quite differently, and the romanticization of Indians toward the end of the century was largely self-generating, without the input of new accounts of frontier encounters. It is

noteworthy that British fictional texts informed the sentimental Indians who appeared in nineteenth-century American texts, despite the very real brutality of westward expansion and displacement. Once again, sentiment and interest were at odds with each other.

It is my hope that, in the context of eighteenth-century studies, the ongoing recovery of colonialist texts in both pedagogy and scholarship begins to address more available works representing First Nations people. These texts will make the field engage with the political in new and vibrant ways complementary to the important work of scholars such as Brown, Nancy Armstrong, Srinivas Aravamudan, and others. While many works were no doubt peripheral even in their own time, the vast body of texts featuring Indians deserves scholarly attention for their insight into not only the colonial past and present of North America, but for their negotiation of the modern world which was in many ways birthed during the eighteenth century.

Given the current circumstance of First Nations people in North America, where racism, poverty, and other social issues are distinct realities, it is important to question the political efficacy of scholarship of this kind. These images, after all, have had the power to effect historical process, and there is a valid concern that revisiting these often stereotypical representations can reinforce or reiterate the one-sided nature of colonialist texts. I hope that ultimately this work can speak for itself on this issue, but it is worth discussing the validity of such an approach. As I suggest in the introduction, this dissertation does not seek sites of

“authentic” voice and representation, but is rather meant to turn the gaze back on the people who constructed this discourse. In this way it becomes possible to see the entanglements and contingencies which inform the modern self, and to expose the fiction of not only the “Indian,” but also the fiction of a coherent and autonomous subject. Western modernity as we know it has not been empowering for Native populations, and it is important to understand how it is built upon the instrumentalization of Indians in the service of its self-imaging.

At the same time, we must acknowledge that the very reason for the pervasive trope of the Indian is that First Nations people formed an active and important part in the colonial struggle for North America. As both foes and allies, they shaped European imperial strategies and defended their land and ways of life. The enduring cultural fortitude which formed such a vital aspect of British admiration continues today, despite well-documented attempts to both destroy it and appropriate it. My aim is not to dispel the perceived positive attributes of Indigenous cultures as myth or fetish, but to understand the ideological and historical contexts which informed white perceptions and desires.

Bibliography

Primary Works

- Adair, James. *The History of the American Indians*. London: Edward and Charles Dilly, 1775.
- Addison, Joseph & Richard Steele. *The Spectator*. 8 vol. London: S. Buckley, 1712.
- Anonymous. *A Brief Narrative of the Indian Charity-School*. London: J. & W. Oliver, 1766.
- Anonymous. *A Collection of the Dresses of Different Nations, Antient and Modern*. 4 vol. London: Thomas Jefferys, 1757-72.
- Anonymous. *The four kings of Canada. Being a succinct account of the four Indian princes lately arriv'd from North America*. London: John Baker, 1710.
- Anonymous. *The Historical Pocket Library*. Vol.5. Bath: S. Hazard, 1790.
- Anonymous. *Memoirs of the Life and Adventures of Tsonnonthouan, a King of the Indian Nation Called Roundheads*. London: J. Knox, 1763.
- Anonymous. *Modern midnight conversation, or matrimonial dialogues*. London: T. Evans, 1775.
- Anonymous. *The Mohocks Revel*. London[?]: 1712.
- Anonymous. *The Speech of a Creek-Indian, Against the Immoderate Use of Spirituous Liquors*. London: R. Griffiths, 1754.
- Bage, Robert. *Hermesprong; or Man as He is Not*. 1796. ed. Pamela Perkins. Peterborough: Broadview P, 2002.
- Baynton, Benjamin. *Authentic memoirs of William Augustus Bowles, Esquire*. London: R. Faulder, 1791.
- Behn, Aphra. *Oroonoko, The Rover, and other Works*. 1688. New York: Penguin, 1992.
- Beverley, Robert. *The History and Present State of Virginia*. London: R. Parker, 1705.
- Blair, Hugh. *A Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian, the son of Fingal*. London: T. Becket and P.A. De Hondt, 1763.
- Boswell, James. *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LLD*. London: Henry Baldwin, 1791.
- Brown, Thomas. *A Plain Narrative*. 1760. v.8. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Burke, Edmund. "Commons on employing the Indians." *The Scots Magazine* 40 (October 1778): 521-577.
- . *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. 1757. *The Writings & Speeches of Edmund Burke*. Vol. 1. New York: Cosimo, 2008. 67-262
- Charlevoix, Pierre-François-Xavier de. *Journal of a Voyage to North America*. London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1761.
- . *A Voyage to North America*. Dublin: John Exshaw and James Potts, 1766.
- . *Letters to the Dutchess of Lesdiguières*. London: R. Goadby, 1763.

- Chetwood, William Rufus. *The voyages, dangerous adventures and imminent escapes of Captain Richard Falconer*. London: Chetwood, 1720.
- Cibber, Theophilus. *The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland*. London: R. Griffiths, 1753.
- Cleland, John. "Letter to David Garrick, 31 July 1754." *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*. Vol. 1. London: H. Colburn and R. Bentley, 1831. 56-59
- . *Tombo-Chiqui, or, the American Savage*. London: S. Hooper and A. Morley, 1758.
- Country Journal*. July 30, 1737
- Colden, Cadwallader. *The history of the five Indian nations depending on the province of New-York in America*. New York: William Bradford, 1727.
- D'Avenant, William. *The Temple of Love*. 1634. New York: Russell & Russell Inc, 1964.
- Defoe, Daniel. *The life and strange surprizing adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. London: W. Taylor, 1719.
- Dennis, John. *Liberty Asserted: A tragedy*. London: George Strahan, 1704.
- Dryden, John. *The Conquest of Granada by the Spaniards*. London: Henry Herringman, 1672.
- . *The Indian Emperor, or the Conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards*. London: Henry Herringman, 1667.
- . and Sir Robert Howard. *The Indian Queen*. London: Henry Herringman, 1665.
- Gay, John. *The Mohocks: A tragi-comical farce*. London: Bernard Lintott, 1712.
- General Magazine of Arts and Sciences* January 1759
- Goadby, Robert. *An apology for the life of Bampfylde-Moore Carew*. Sherborne: R. Goadby, 1749.
- . *The universe displayed; or, a survey of the wonderful works of creation, and of the various customs and inventions of men*. London: W. Owen & R. Goadby, 1763.
- Jerningham, Edward. "The Indian Chief." *Fugitive Poetical Pieces*. London: J. Robson, 1778. 25-27.
- Johnson, Samuel. *The Adventurer*, vol. 1, no. 67. London: J. Payne, 1753. 397-402.
- . *Idler* 41 (20 January 1759), (November 1759)
- Johnstone, Charles. *Chrysal; or, The Adventures of a Guinea*. Dublin: Dillon Chamberlaine, 1760.
- Kellet, Alexander. *A Pocket of Prose and Verse*. 1778. v.11. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Kimber, Edward. *The History of the Life and Adventures of Mr. Anderson*. 1754. ed. Matthew Mason and Nicholas Mason. Peterborough: Broadview P, 2009.
- Las Casas, Batolomé de. *A Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies*. 1542. Trans. Nigel Griffin. New York: Penguin, 1992.
- London Daily Post* 1740

- London Magazine* 45 (1776): 339.
- Mackenzie, Henry. *The Man of the World*. London: W. Strahan & T. Cadell, 1773.
- Monthly Review* XXVIII, 492. XXIII (December 1760): 425.
- Occom, Samson. *The Collected Writings of Samson Occom, Mohegan: Leadership and Literature in Eighteenth-Century Native America*. ed. Joanna Brooks. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006.
- Ockanikon. *A true account of the dying words of Ockanickon, an Indian King*. London: Benjamin Clark, 1682.
- O'Keeffe, John. *The Basket-Maker*. 1789. *The Dramatic Works of John O'Keeffe, Esq.* Vol. II. London: T. Woodfall, 1798.
- Oldmixon, John. *The British Empire in America*. London: printed for John Nicholson, Benjamin Tooke, and Richard Parker and Ralph Smith, 1708.
- Pope, Alexander. "The Rape of the Lock." 1712. *The Major Works*. ed. Pat Rogers. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. 77-99
- . "Windsor-Forest." 1713. *The Major Works*. ed. Pat Rogers. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. 49-62
- Post Man and the Historical Account* 11 October 1701
- Richardson, William. "The Indians, A Tale." *Poems, Chiefly Rural*. Glasgow: Robert & Andrew Foulis, 1774.
- Rogers, Robert. *Ponteach: or the savages of America. A tragedy*. London: J. Millan, 1766.
- Rutherford, John. *Narrative of a Captivity*. 1763. In *The Siege of Detroit in 1763*. Ed. Milton Quaiife. Chicago: R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 1958.
- Shebbeare, John. *Lydia or, Filial Piety*. London: J. Scott, 1755.
- Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. London: A. Millar, 1759.
- Smith, William. *An historical account of the expedition against the Ohio Indians*. London: T. Jefferies, 1766.
- Smollett, Tobias. *The Expedition of Humphry Clinker*. 1771. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984.
- Steele, Richard. *The Tatler*. no.171, 278
- Swift, Jonathan. *The Journal to Stella*. Teddington: Echo Library, 2007.
- Thomson, Charles. *An enquiry into the causes of the alienation of the Delaware and Shawanese Indians from the British interest*. London: J. Wilkie, 1759.
- Tickell, Thomas. "A poem, to His Excellency the Lord Privy-Seal, on the prospect of peace." London: J. Tonson, 1713.
- Universal Spectator* for January 30th and February 6, 1742
- Walpole, Horace. *The Letters of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford*. ed. Peter Cunningham. London: R. Bentley, 1857.
- Williamson, Peter. *French and Indian Cruelty; Exemplified in the Life and Various Vicissitudes of Fortune of Peter Williamson*. 5th edition. 1762. Intro. by Michael Fry. Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press, 1996.
- . *French and Indian Cruelty*. 1st & 3rd ed. 1757, 1758. v.9. New York: Garland, 1975.

—. *The trial of divorce, at the instance of Peter Williamson*. Edinburgh, 1789.
Winkfield, Unca Eliza. *The Female American*. 1767. ed. Michelle Burnham.
Peterborough: Broadview P, 2001.

Secondary Works

- Aravamudan, Srinivas. *Tropicopolitans: Colonialism and Agency, 1688-1804*.
Durham: Duke UP, 1999.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. trans. Caryl Emerson.
Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984.
- Bergland, Renée L. *The National Uncanny: Indian Ghosts and American
Subjects*. Hanover, NH: UP of New England, 2000.
- Berkhofer, Robert F. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian,
From Columbus to the Present*. New York: Knopf, 1978.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Bickham, Troy. *Savages Within the Empire: Representations of American Indians
in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.
- Bissell, Benjamin. *The American Indian in English Literature of the Eighteenth
Century*. 1925. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1968.
- Blewett, David. *The Illustration of Robinson Crusoe, 1719-1920*. Gerrards
Cross: C. Smythe, 1995.
- Bond, Richmond P. *Queen Anne's American Kings*. New York: Octagon Books,
1974.
- Bosch, René. *Labyrinth of Digressions: Tristram Shandy as Perceived and
Influenced by Sterne's Early Imitators*. trans. Piet Verhoeff. New York:
Rodopi, 2007.
- Brown, Laura. *Ends of Empire: Women and Ideology in Early Eighteenth-
Century English Literature*. Ithaca : Cornell UP, 1993.
- . *Fables of Modernity: Literature and Culture in the English Eighteenth
Century*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.
- Carr, Helen. "And the truest schools for civilization are the forests of America':
John O'Keefe's *The Basket-Maker* and Robert Bage's *Hermesprong*." *Native
Americans and Anglo-American Culture, 1750-1850: The Indian Atlantic*.
ed. Tim Fulford & Kevin Hutchings. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009.
136-154
- Castle, Terry. *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-
Century English Culture and Fiction*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1986.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and
Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1992.
- . *Captives*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2002.
- Cornu, Donald. "The Historical Authenticity of Dr. Johnson's 'Speaking Cat'."
Review of English Studies II.8 (1951): 358-370.
- Cro, Stelio. "Classical Antiquity, America, and the Myth of the Noble Savage."
The Classical Tradition and the Americas, volume 1. ed. Wolfgang Haase.

- Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1993. 379-418
- Deloria, Philip. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1999.
- Douglas, Aileen. "Britannia's Rule and the It-narrator." *The Secret Life of Things: Animals, Objects, and It-Narratives in Eighteenth-Century England*. ed. Mark Blackwell. Danvers, MA: Rosemont Pub., 2007. 147-161
- Felsenstein, Frank. *English Trader, Indian Maid: Representing Gender, Race, and Slavery in the New World: An Inkle and Yarico Reader*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1999.
- Flint, Christopher. "In Other Words: Eighteenth-Century Authorship and the Ornaments of Print." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 14.3 (2002): 627-672.
- Foster, James R. "A Forgotten Noble Savage, Tsonnonthouan." *Modern Language Quarterly* 14.4 (1953): 348-359.
- Foucault, Michel. "*Society Must Be Defended*": *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*. trans. David Macey. New York: Picador, 2003.
- Francis, Daniel. *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp P, 1992.
- Frohock, Richard. *Heroes of Empire: The British Imperial Protagonist in America, 1596-1764*. Danvers, MA: Rosemont Pub., 2004.
- Fulford, Tim. *Romantic Indians: Native Americans, British Literature, & Transatlantic Culture, 1756-1830*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006.
- Genest, John. *Some Account of the English Stage: From the Restoration in 1660 to 1830*, vol. II. Bath: H.E. Carrington, 1832.
- Goldie, Terry. *Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand Literatures*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1989.
- Harkin, Maureen. "Adam Smith's Missing History: Primitives, Progress, and Problems of Genre." *ELH* 72.2 (2005): 429-451.
- Hendricks, Margo. "Civility, Barbarism, and Aphra Behn's *The Widow Ranter*." *Women, "Race," and Writing in the Early Modern Period*. ed. Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker. New York: Routledge, 1994. 225-242
- Hinderaker, Eric. "The 'Four Indian Kings' and the Imaginative Construction of the First British Empire." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 53.3, Indians and Others in Early America. (Jul., 1996): 487-526.
- Hodgkins, Christopher. *Reforming Empire: Protestant Colonialism and Conscience in British Literature*. Columbia, MO: U of Missouri P, 2002.
- Hulme, Peter. *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492-1797*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Kalata Vaccaro, Kristianne. "'Recollection . . . sets my busy imagination to work': Transatlantic Self-Narration, Performance, and Reception in *The Female American*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 20.2 (Winter 2007-8): 127-150.
- Kersey, Mel. "Addison's Indian, Blackwell's Bard and the voice of Ossian." *History of European Ideas* 31.2 (2005): 265-275.
- Keymer, Thomas. *Sterne, the Moderns, and the Novel*. New York: Oxford UP, 2002.

- Mancall, Peter C. *Deadly Medicine: Indians and Alcohol in Early America*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.
- Marshall, P.J. & Glyndwr Williams. *The Great Map of Mankind: British Perceptions of the World in the Age of Enlightenment*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1982.
- McGregor, Gaile. *The Noble Savage in the New World Garden: Notes Toward a Syntactics of Place*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1988.
- McKendrick, Neil, John Brewer, & John Harold Plumb. *The Birth of a Consumer Society*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1982.
- McKlintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Moogk, Peter N. "Outoutagan." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*. 2000. Web 10 November 2010.
<http://www.biographi.ca/009004-119.01-e.php?&id_nbr=1016&&PHPSESSID=s3kiip5hli0frkmpokj5trkfr5#tphp>
- Nussbaum, Felicity. "One Part of Womankind: Prostitution and Sexual Geography in *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*." *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 7.2 (Summer 1995): 16-40.
- Phillips, Ruth B. *Trading Identities: The Souvenir in Native North American Art from the Northeast, 1700-1900*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1998.
- . and Dale Idiens. "'A Casket of Savage Curiosities': Eighteenth-Century Objects from North-Eastern North America in the Farquharson Collection." *Journal of the History of Collections* 6.1(1994): 21-33.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Pratt, Stephanie. *American Indians in British Art, 1700-1840*. U of Oklahoma P, 2005.
- . "From Cannassatego to Outalissi: Making Sense of the Native American in Eighteenth-Century Culture." *An Economy of Colour: Visual Culture and the Atlantic World, 1660-1830*. ed. Geoff Quilley & Kay Dian Kriz. New York: Manchester University Press, 2003. 60-84
- . "The Four Indian Kings." *Between Worlds: Voyagers to Britain 1700-1850*. London: National Portrait Gallery, 2007. 22-35
- . "Representatives and Representation: Southern Indians in Eighteenth-Century England." *Native Americans and Anglo-American Culture, 1750-1850: The Indian Atlantic*. ed. Tim Fulford & Kevin Hutchings. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 112-135
- Preston, Thomas R. "Smollett Among the Indians." *Philological Quarterly* 61.3 (Summer 1982): 231-241.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.
- Sayre, Gordon M. *Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1997.
- . *The Indian Chief as Tragic Hero: Native Resistance and the Literatures of*

- America, From Moctezuma to Tecumseh*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2005.
- Shannon, Timothy J. "King of the Indians: The Hard Fate and Curious Career of Peter Williamson." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 66.1 (Jan. 2009): 3-44.
- Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*. Norman, OK: U of Oklahoma P, 1973.
- Sorensen, Lise. "Savages and Men of Feeling: North American Indians in Adam Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* and Henry Mackenzie's *The Man of the World*." *Native Americans and Anglo-American Culture, 1750-1850: The Indian Atlantic*. ed. Tim Fulford & Kevin Hutchings. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. 74-93
- Stevens, Laura. *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2004.
- . "Transatlanticism Now." *American Literary History* 16(1): 93-102.
- Sussman, Charlotte. *Consuming Anxieties: Consumer Protest, Gender, and British Slavery, 1713-1833*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2000.
- . "Lismahago's Captivity: Transculturation in *Humphry Clinker*." *ELH* 61.3 (1994): 597-618.
- Taylor, Alan. *The Divided Ground: Indians, Settlers, and the Northern Borderland of the American Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, 2006.
- Vaughan, Alden T. *Transatlantic Encounters: American Indians in Britain, 1500-1776*. Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Wahrman, Dror. *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2004.
- Wallace, Tara Ghoshal. *Imperial Characters: Home and Periphery in Eighteenth-Century Literature*. Danvers, MA: Rosemont Pub, 2010.
- Wente, Margaret. "What Dick Pound Said Was Really Dumb-- and Also True." *The Globe & Mail*. [Toronto] 24 October 2008.
- Weston, Peter J. "The Noble Primitive as Bourgeois Subject." *Literature and History* 10.1 (1984): 59- 71.
- Wheeler, Roxanne. "The Complexion of Desire: Racial Ideology and Mid-Eighteenth-Century British Novels." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 32.3(1999): 309-332.
- . *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2000.
- White, Hayden. "The Noble Savage Theme as Fetish." *Tropics of Discourse*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1978. 183-196.
- Widdowson, Frances & Dick Howard. *Disrobing the Aboriginal Industry: The Deception Behind Indigenous Cultural Preservation*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 2008.