



Narrating Colonial Violence and Representing New-World Difference: The Possibilities of Form in Thomas Harriot's A Briefe and True Report

Sandra Young

To cite this article: Sandra Young (2010) Narrating Colonial Violence and Representing New-World Difference: The Possibilities of Form in Thomas Harriot's A Briefe and True Report , Safundi, 11:4, 343-360, DOI: [10.1080/17533171.2010.511777](https://doi.org/10.1080/17533171.2010.511777)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17533171.2010.511777>



Published online: 23 Sep 2010.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 189



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

Narrating Colonial Violence and Representing New-World Difference: The Possibilities of Form in Thomas Harriot's *A Briefe and True Report*

Sandra Young

In tracing the stories—or “histories,” as sixteenth-century exploration narratives were called—with which expansionist Europe came to know its colonial Other, we see outlines of the habits of thought and the systems of identification with which imperialist Europe constructed its world.¹ Thomas Harriot's *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia* has been read as a key text in the development not only of knowledge specifically of America, but of sixteenth-century natural history and early scientific methodology more generally. The *Report* itself does not claim to be compendious and is driven by Harriot's openly acknowledged agenda of promoting support for the English colonization of America. But the interesting feature about the Harriot text, the thing that is given scant critical attention, is that it is really two distinct texts, published only two years apart but each strikingly different in its treatment of the alarming effects of the colonial encounter.

When it first appears as a pamphlet in 1588, the *Report* is one of the very first accounts of the New World as a potential English settlement.² It is presented from the start as a promotional text, written with the express aim of encouraging further

Correspondence to: Sandra Young, Department of English Language and Literature, University of Cape Town, Private Bag X, Rondebosch 7701, South Africa. Email: sandra.young@uct.ac.za

¹I use the term “Europe” loosely to refer to the geographical region from which emerged the principal and increasingly competitive investors in the colonial project in the sixteenth century. Specifically, Spain, Portugal and England began to identify themselves as national entities during the period of imperial expansion (as is evident in the title of Richard Hakluyt's 1589 compilation, *The Principall Navigations, Voiages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English nation*). I recognize that “Europe” itself did not exist as a coherent entity and that in this period it remains an anomalous term.

²I have accessed both editions of the *Report* through the online resource, Early English Books Online. Instead of page numbers, therefore, my references in parentheses offer the date and the number of the “image” (that is, the photographed page).

investment in the English colonial project and, specifically, Walter Raleigh's return voyage to the Roanoke colony in "Virginia" (assumed to correspond with present-day North Carolina).³ Descriptions of the "nature and manners of the people" of Roanoke are produced self-evidently from the vantage point of a would-be English settler (1588, Image 18). In establishing the authority of its claims, the narrative has to describe actual encounters between colonialists and indigenous Americans and navigate its way through the uncomfortable history of the early contact period. By its own acknowledgement, the stakes are high, and the imagined readers—prospective investors in the colonial project—stand to lose, or gain, materially. They need evidence that can be attested to by identifiable historical characters that can vouch for the claims here presented. But the process of offering experience-based evidence and local witnesses calls for a narrative account of sometimes disturbing events and the adjudication of contradictory perspectives. As a result, the contestations of this period find their way into a text that aims only to offer a convincing account of new-world opportunities.

Harriot's account of the Roanoke colony circulates in a very different way from its first incarnation as a modest pamphlet when it is republished as the first volume of Theodor de Bry's ambitious 13-volume series on the voyages of discovery, titled simply *America*. The title itself bespeaks a different orientation to the newly "discovered" continent from what would be reflected in a text that claims only to be a "report," and its publishing history suggests that it was conceived of as a significantly more prominent text from the start. It was first published in four different languages simultaneously (English, Latin, French and German) and a number of new editions appeared in the years and decades following.⁴ Unlike the earlier pamphlet edition, it had a presence in the book industry well beyond England—evident, for example, in the fact that the Latin and German editions appear in the catalogues of the Frankfurt spring fair in 1590 and in its survival in the libraries of "wealthy owners" across Europe (Kuhlemann 2007, 83).

More significant in determining the heightened cultural impact of the text is the document itself. The particular framing of the 1590 compilation works to contain and fix "America" as an object of study, thereby creating for the European reader a less troubling mode of entry into the text than might have been possible in a bald account of European brutality in the New World. The natural historical language and the frame set up by the compilation's additional textual features announce a conspicuously scholarly endeavor and allow the reader the privilege of approaching the text as a seeker of knowledge. The New World and its inhabitants are presented as objects of learning. The text offers a more static comparison between an "us" and a "them," through visual and written representations of "the Inhabitants of the great Bretannie . . . in times past," (1590, Image 67), a comparison that addresses itself to the relationship between the indigenous Americans and the colonialists in ways not

³David B. Quinn offers a careful explanation of the historical location of the Roanoke Island colony (1970, 268).

⁴See Kuhlemann (2007) for a detailed account of the publishing history of the De Bry edition, especially pp. 82–4.

imagined by the earlier text. The insertion of this comparison is one of a number of changes made to the first edition when it is restructured and presented anew in the seemingly disinterested register of knowledge-building. When De Bry turns Harriot's pamphlet into one element within a more distinguished compilation that draws on other seemingly scholarly textual tools (indices, tables, figures, lexicons), the story loses some of its contestability. Doubts about the effects of the colonial encounter, hinted at in Harriot's narrative, are subsumed into matters of learning. When the form of the text changes, partisan interests seem to lose their visibility.

A comparison of the two editions demonstrates how a text creates the possibilities for meaning through formal features that appear unquestionable, even as they set up the identifications and hierarchies upon which early imperialism depended. The multiple elements of the second, enlarged edition work together to soften the disturbing history narrated in Harriot's account. What can be known or imagined is partly conjured out of a text's form and the habits of thought it establishes through its representational techniques.⁵ An inquiry into how a text authorizes a particular history, therefore, will necessarily include the analysis of its framing devices and the scholarly tools that manage the readers' points of entry into the text. These devices include the indices and tables, the illustrations, lexicons, the dedications that anticipate the text's significance and the seemingly authoritative catalogues that confer scholarly status on particular objects of investigation. These textual features help to establish the terms and the orientation with which European readers approached the New World. Their effects are felt well beyond the domains of learning. In fact, in her study of the De Bry engravings, Ute Kuhlemann describes the De Bry publication, specifically, as "generally credited with having forged the European concept of American Indians until the eighteenth century" (2007, 79). This may be too large a burden for a single publication to carry but, even so, it is well to consider how a text might set in place the enduring yet troubling identifications upon which colonization depended.

My inquiry, therefore, is not so much about *what* Europe came to know of the world beyond home but about the way its texts structured *how* Europe could think, or come to imagine itself, in relation to what was unfamiliar.

CRITICAL RECOGNITION OF THE *REPORT* AND ITS EPISTEMOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

A comparison between Harriot's original *Report* and De Bry's republication of it as *America* is telling for what it suggests about the development of early modern "scientific" discourse and its textual representation, but it requires careful

⁵The influence of Michel Foucault and his "genealogical approach" for identifying the "politics of scientific statements" is evident in my analysis of the political effects of the formal features of the two editions of the *Report* (Foucault 1980, 112). For Foucault, "it's not so much a matter of knowing what external power imposes itself on science, as of what effects of power circulate among scientific statements" (112). Foucault describes genealogy as a methodology in deceptively straightforward terms—"describing," and "making visible" (113). It is a "form of history which can account for the constitution of knowledges, discourses, domains of objects, etc, without having to make reference to a subject which is . . . transcendental in relation to the field of events" (117).

scholarship to identify how this discourse of learning takes effect. The 1588 and 1590 editions of the *Report* are typically treated as a single text in the critical literature, yet are quite distinct in the meanings they make possible. Critics seldom specify which text they are referring to when they hail Harriot's *Report* as achieving a new level of scientific rigor, though this was not something Harriot himself claimed for his *Report* and is in large measure an effect of the particular construction of the larger, more ambitious 1590 edition.⁶

The *Report* has been recognized as a text with epistemological significance in the period. Mary Baines Campbell argues that the *Report* "has been rightly viewed as one of the first recognizably scientific accounts of the New World" (1999, 53) and for Karen Ordahl Kupperman it is "of greatest significance for natural history" (2000, 80). Paul Hulton, a scholar with a particular interest in the use of images in early modern natural histories, whose 1972 facsimile edition has become the standard reference for critics,⁷ talks about "topographical accuracy," "precision," and Harriot's "analytical" "method." He writes, "Harriot's notes achieve a new level of ethnological recording" (Hulton 1972, 12). But it is worth interrogating further what makes Harriot's text "recognizably scientific" and what announces "accuracy" as opposed to argument directed at promoting investment in the colonization project (ibid., 53). More specifically, to what extent is the scientificity of the *Report* a product of its generic form, once it has been repackaged as a compilation with epistemological aspirations rather than as a promotional pamphlet?

Certainly, Thomas Harriot could be said to have rightly earned the reputation for having had a "distinguished career as a scientist" in the period, as Karen Ordahl Kupperman puts it (2000, 80), but at the time of his voyage to Roanoke he was in his mid-twenties and a long way off from the experiments in ballistics and the refraction of light of his later years. The 1588 edition is his account of Roanoke and is published soon after his return to England, in time to influence support for Raleigh's next voyage to Virginia. It circulated as a plain 48-page book bearing the modest title, *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia* (modest, that is, while being at the same time bold in its truth claims). Its promotional intent is announced upfront (though there is also evidence to suggest that it does aspire to be contributing to knowledge, as I suggest below). The introduction casts the colonial enterprise as laudable for this reason. The "action of discovering" is deemed to augment "the honour and benefit of our nation" (1588, Image 3). The pamphlet begins by

⁶In the influential "Invisible Bullets" article that introduced Harriot's *Report* to a much wider academic readership, Stephen Greenblatt describes Harriot as "the most profound Elizabethan mathematician, an expert in cartography, optics, and navigational science, an adherent of atomism, the first Englishman to make a telescope and turn it on the heavens, the author of the first original book about the first English colony in America"; but as I discuss further, below, his analysis of Harriot's text refers only to the De Bry edition (1985, 18). Karen Ordahl Kupperman is more careful in her bibliographic sourcing, offering the dates of both editions, as appropriate (2000). Paul Hulton, whose facsimile of the De Bry edition is often used as the basis of critical discussions of the *Report*, is also careful to specify the 1590 edition when he judges in his "Introduction" that "the De Bry edition of the *Report* is the first of its kind which can justifiably be described as scientific" (1972, xiii).

⁷See, for example, Susan Scott Parrish (2006, 31).

defending the colonial project against “some slanderous and shamefull speeches” of disgruntled colonists, recently returned (1588, Image 3). The form of a report serves this purpose in a particular way, in the force and efficiency of its truth claims, in what it can imagine of this new land and in its accessibility as a cheaply produced pamphlet.

As distinct from its slim precursor, the 1590 compilation works in particular ways to make known the “habits” of people unknown to the Europeans and lay claim to them for the purposes of formal knowledge—transforming what they “do” into what they “are.” Through the activities of observing, recording, and packaging these observations as dependable knowledge, as opposed to fable or historical narrative, the compilation contributes to the production of what will become known of America. But it is worth interrogating what makes a text dependable and reflecting on what happens to history’s contestations when the period’s changing knowledge practices call for new forms of evidence and new ways of organizing the representations of what will be received as “knowledge.”

The impulse to produce more dependable evidence is itself a feature of the period’s changing epistemological sensibilities.⁸ Ralph Bauer reads “the new ‘inductive’ method” into Samuel Purchas’s foregrounding of “a New way of Eye-evidence” informing Purchas’s historiography in his 1625 compilation, *Hakluytus posthumus* (Purchas, qtd in Bauer 2003, 82). “Eye-evidence,” however, is itself not “New” in the period, despite Purchas’s posturing. Bauer recognizes this: “Of course, this ‘New way of Eye-evidence’ was not really new any longer in 1625, after Hakluyt had also been using empirical eyewitness accounts in modern geographical histories since the 1580s” (ibid., 82). The eyewitness had evidentiary standing well before Hakluyt too. John Mandeville’s (1983) one-eyed monsters, too, were reported on with the apparent authority of the eyewitness.⁹ But by the end of the sixteenth century Mandeville’s truth claims can no longer be taken seriously: Hakluyt excludes Mandeville’s *Travels* when he publishes his second, much-enlarged edition of the *Principal Navigations* in 1598. To produce dependable “history” by the end of the sixteenth century requires more than the avowal of the eyewitness, per se. Even before Baconian elevation of experience, being believed was a matter of being able to demonstrate integrity, or “character,” and of offering detailed, textured, demonstrable experience.

Harriot’s attempt to underwrite his account of the New World with reference, first, to his governor’s word and, second, to his own lived experience does not provide the

⁸See Steven Shapin’s *A Social History of Truth*, especially Chapter Five on “Epistemological Decorum: The Practical Management of Factual Testimony” (1994, 193–242) for a rich discussion of the relationship between testimony and plausibility. Shapin demonstrates how claiming “expertise and knowledgeability” was a “communicative exercise” (218–9)—a matter of being able to deploy recognizable representational forms in accordance with agreed norms.

⁹See Frank Lestringant’s “Foreword” for a discussion of Mandeville’s confident but unreliable deployment of the eyewitness convention (1994, xi). See also Anthony Pagden (1993) for an account of the ancient trope of the eyewitness.

apparent stability of the later version. Whereas the 1590 edition is secured by the epistemological clout of the form of the compilation and the seemingly disinterested stance it is able to produce, the 1588 edition cannot mask its tensions, as I will argue in a more detailed discussion of the texts, below. It is precisely this visibility of history's contestability that becomes hidden behind the later edition's scholarly affectations, in its adoption of formal features that lay claim to scholarly seriousness.

Ralph Bauer describes the ideological effect of facticity in "the emergence of what we might call a 'modern' historical epistemology" when analyzing Samuel Purchas's *Hakluytus posthumus* (2003, 81). Bauer suggests that the tendency of "modern historians" to dismiss Purchas's unsophisticated historiography is because "Purchas' texts still too imperfectly mask the modern ideology that 'facts' can be isolated from texts, thus reminding us that this modern ideology itself has a history" (86–7). Both editions of Harriot's *Report* precede Purchas's texts by a significant 35 years or so and therefore predate Francis Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* (1610) and the new epistemological methods he established. These earlier texts, too, demonstrate a preoccupation with evidentiary reliability and credibility, manifest in distinct ways. Their textual strategies for securing reliability mark a subtle but significant shift in the period's sensibilities in light of colonialism's disturbances to received knowledge.

In what way is history effaced or somehow undone through the particular strategies and language with which Harriot and then De Bry bring into being "America," for sixteenth-century Europe? There is evidence of a particular kind of staging of America, an anxiety about its disruption of received knowledge and European worldview. Leslie Fiedler (1972) characterizes the newly "discovered" America in this period as a disturbing and disruptive third term in the traditional dyad that involved Europe and its other, Africa. But unlike Africa, source of displaced labor and (projected) hostility, Harriot's New World must figure as a land of bountiful, effortless harvest and passive, agreeable inhabitants. Harriot's text is at pains to negotiate a way through the image of America as a land of savage people who are in need of Europe's civilizing influence, on the one hand, and the more agreeable image of America as free, innocent and fertile, on the other. The difficulty of trying to resolve the multiple versions of this history is evident in the first edition of the *Report*, but the framing of the second edition works to contain what is troubling about the encounter with "America" and to set it up as an object of study. Whereas the second version reads as a kind of ethnological treatise presenting the New World and its people as objects of seemingly impartial study along with the natural world, the more modest and purpose-driven promotional pamphlet of 1588 has few of de Bry's accessories to reading that announce this epistemological ambition. In the second edition, it is the epistemological status of this scholarly compilation itself that confers authority. Harriot's narrative must be read in the context of the whole compilation in the hope of being able to recognize the ways in which the distinctive textual elements validate each other, using their particular methodologies and references to establish a lens with which to view the New World.

When critics discuss the Harriot text, they tend to be talking about the second, more contained version that achieves its effects in quite specific ways.¹⁰ Andrew Hadfield talks about “John White and Thomas Harriot’s Picts” (2002, 176) in a chapter titled “Bruited Abroad: John White and Thomas Harriot’s Colonial Representations of Ancient Britain.” But in fact the Pict engravings—and, with them, the suggestive comparison being made between the peoples of the New World and the forebears of England—is the work of De Bry. Stephen Greenblatt, whose well-known article, “Invisible Bullets: Renaissance Authority and its Subversion in *Henry IV* and *Henry V*,” gives great prominence to Harriot’s *Report* in his discussion of subversion in Shakespeare’s plays, treats it as just one text, though his references suggest he accessed Harriot’s text through D.B. Quinn’s two-volume collection of narratives, *The Roanoke Voyages, 1584–1590*, published by the Hakluyt Society in 1955. As a result Greenblatt incorrectly attributes to *Harriot*, rather than De Bry, the “glossary” that appears at the end of the compilation—that is, De Bry’s “Table of the Principall things that are contained in this Historie, after the order of the Alphabet” (1590, Image 78). Greenblatt also describes the *Report* as having been published “with perfect appropriateness” by “the great Elizabethan exponent of missionary colonialism, the Reverend Richard Hakluyt” (25) whereas, in fact, the *Report* was published more humbly, in its first incarnation as a pamphlet, without the fanfare of a stately frontispiece and without the representational features of a work that takes itself seriously as a contribution to formal knowledge. It was De Bry who approached Hakluyt to publish his 1590 compilation.

This conflation of the two versions of Harriot’s *Report* blurs the nature of the relationship between colonization and the production of knowledge. The link to Hakluyt is true only for the second edition, not for the version first penned by Harriot. Greenblatt’s allusion to Hakluyt’s active interest in English colonialism does not necessarily demonstrate the text’s complicity in imperial relations of power or increase our understanding of the nuances of those relations. Greenblatt’s analysis of the tension in Harriot’s text between orthodoxy and its subversion (and then its reinscription in the interests of the colonial establishment) would have benefited from the recognition that Harriot’s text took two different forms. Greenblatt refers to “the production of Harriot’s text” in staging his argument about the text’s role as a “continuation of the colonial enterprise” that simultaneously challenges the

¹⁰An exception is Timothy Sweet (2002). Sweet explicitly deals with the 1588 pamphlet, indicating in his bibliography that he accesses it from Myra Jehlen and Michael Warner’s anthology (1997) which in fact uses as its source Richard Hakluyt’s 1598 compilation, *The principal navigations: voyages, traffiques and discoveries of the English nation, made by sea or ouer-land*. But the version included in the anthology (1997) does not include any of the prefatory material from the 1588 pamphlet (the epistle by Governor Ralph Lane, for example) and does include some of the engravings from the 1590 De Bry compilation, so it is an abridged and altered textual artifact, as is to be expected in a lengthy anthology that encompasses *The English Literatures of America, 1500–1800* (Jehlen and Warner 1997). Jehlen’s rich critical discussion of the *Report* in *The Cambridge History of American Literature* does not specifically draw a comparison between the two versions, as I discuss further below, though it carefully lays out the publication histories of each: the first was “published in haste to support Walter Raleigh’s petition to the queen not to abandon the Virginia colony” and the second was “brought out by . . . Theodor de Bry two years later as part of a projected series entitled *America*” (1994, 59).

“coercive power of religion” (26). And yet the argument does not in fact examine the “production” of Harriot’s text. The management of subversion in the interests of power is carried out with greater intricacy and on multiple levels in the second edition of the *Report*. There is a great deal more to be said about, as Greenblatt puts it, “the process whereby Indian culture is constituted as a culture and thus brought into the light for study, discipline, correction, transformation” (27)—that is, how the text establishes Indian culture as an object for European study. De Bry’s contribution as compiler and editor transforms the text’s structure and, as a result, its possibilities for meaning. The 1590 edition affirms, in ways that are subtler and less vulnerable to scrutiny, the legitimacy of English imperial ambitions.

It is worth examining more closely the form each of these editions takes in order to be able to suggest how their “packaging” as distinct genres has a bearing on the way the colonial encounter can be understood within their pages.

THE 1588 EDITION

The earlier publication is modest in its self-presentation. There is no elaborate frontispiece as such, and the title page offers a fairly simple layout of Harriot’s lengthy title. Over the page appears Ralph Lane’s brief preface, an epistle addressed “to the gentle reader,” and his family crest (“Amore et Virtute”), celebrating love and virtue (1588, Image 2). This preface does not appear in the De Bry edition. In fact, Ralph Lane’s presence has been expunged altogether, most significantly from the title itself, under De Bry’s editorial hand. This is presumably as a result of the changing fortunes of the Roanoke Colony, of whom Ralph Lane was the first and most disastrous governor, from 1585 to 1586.¹¹

Lane’s preface functions primarily to underwrite the dependability of Harriot’s word, with reference, first, to character (his own and Harriot’s) and to the well-established trope of the eyewitness (again, his own and Harriot’s). Lane declares that Harriot was “an Actor in the Colony & a man no lesse for his honesty than learning commendable” (1588, Image 2). The truth of this is “assured by mine owne experience” (1588, Image 2). Lane urges his readers to approach the text “not with a preiudicate [prejudiced] minde to the reading thereof” (1588, Image 2). His avowals implicitly acknowledge, however, the inherent unreliability, potentially, of Harriot’s word, and his own, and of a representational system that depends for its authority upon character. Lane and his readers understand that the “true enformation” and “knowledge” that he promises are not reliable, at root, albeit sealed with his family crest. By the time De Bry brings out his edition he is able to draw on different representational tools to establish his version of America and there is no need for a family crest.

¹¹By the time De Bry published his 1590 edition, it had been discovered that the colonists who had been left on the Island had mysteriously disappeared—a mystery that was never solved, though it was feared they were the victims of violence. Lane was implicated in the brutal treatment of the local inhabitants, on whom the colony was utterly dependent for food.

In 1588 Lane's preface is as much framing as we get. There are no further textual devices directing the readers and training them in the strategies of acquiring apparently impartial knowledge. This is a frankly polemical text. Harriot's objective is unashamedly promotional:

... that you seeing and knowing the continuance of the action, by the view hereof you may generall know and learne what the countrey is, and thereupon consider how your dealing therein, if it proceed, may returne you profit and gaine, be it either by inhabiting and planting, or otherwise in furthering thereof. (1588, Image 4)

This is about commerce. It is self-evidently an account offered with a view to encouraging "dealing" and "profit" and "gaine" (1588, Image 4). But it is also about *appropriate* commerce. The structure of Harriot's text allows him to present a case for commercial enterprise that is laudable, and to distance the colonial mission from the disgraceful behavior of some of the first colonists, behavior that he attributes to "ignorance," poor character, envy and maliciousness (1588, Image 3). "Knowledge" and "wisdom" are on the side of rightful commerce. Significantly, it is Harriot's foregrounding of the advertizing objective that allows his reader to see how partisan the business of colonization is—that there is a case to be made, for and against—and to choose to be persuaded, or not. Myra Jehlen recognizes in Harriot's initial staging of his narrative the acknowledgment that "colonization is a highly competitive business and that scholarship like Harriot's entered deeply into the competition" (1994, 60).

Like "knowledge" and "wisdom," agriculture too is an ally of colonial commerce—given added respectability through the discourse of natural history. The tantalizing suggestion is made that in America the "fertility of the soile" is such that the soil yields food with little work and, in some cases, no work at all (1588, Image 10).¹² Virginia is presented as an Eden: a place where, if the passive verbs are to be believed, the soil naturally yields agricultural produce that compares favorably with English produce—the "corne is there to be preferred before ours," and so on (1588, Image 11)—a land of plenty where "commodities for sustenance of life" are "found growing naturally or wilde" (1588, Image 12). The subsections of the second part introduce a rightful order to this abundance without diminishing the impression of plenty: "Of roots," "Of fruits," "Of a kinde of fruit or berry in forme of Acornes," "Of Beasts," "Of Fowle" and "Of Fish" (1588, Images 12–15). The categories of knowledge here presented all relate to their use, by the English, specifically, and establish the possibility of English inhabiting of the land. The indigenous people appear only as "proofe" of the possibility of successful habitation and as sources of useful knowledge about local natural history. The linguistic structure of the natural historical mode places the inhabitants in a strikingly passive position.

¹²"Of the growth you need not to doubt: for Barlely, Oats, and Peaze, we have seene proofe of, not being purposely sowed, but fallen casually in the worst sort of ground, and yet to be as faire as any we have ever seene heere in England" (1588, Image 11).

This is especially true in the third section of his text, where Harriot addresses more directly the “nature and maners of the people of the Countrey” (1588, Image 16). This is where the text goes slightly awry. It never quite recovers from the insoluble tension this section cannot but acknowledge. The text cannot sustain the fiction that this Eden is uninhabited, given its acknowledged dependence on the local inhabitants as a key source of knowledge. For example, Harriot claims to have “learned [about their religion] by having special familiarity with some of their priestes” (1588, Image 20). The language draws heavily upon the natural historical mode, rendering the indigenous “Americans” “indifferent and well disposed” and predictable (1588, Image 23). Moreover, the indigenous people *themselves* appear knowable, in the manner of fruits, roots, and beasts. The subheading introducing the indigenous people as a topic of study is structured in exactly the same way as the earlier subheadings, with the topic item placed in the passive accusative case, object of the preposition “of”: “Of the nature and maners of the people” (1588, Image 16). The subject matter (in this case, the people of the New World) occupies as static a position as the natural produce and “commodities” listed earlier. To talk of their “nature” is to fix them for all time and evade the waverings of history. But this reach towards knowledge has an acknowledged prior agenda. Right up front, he declares that his purposes in this third section is to reassure his readership that they need not fear the Americans, who are more likely to feel reverence towards the colonists: they “are not to be feared, but that they shall have cause both to feare and love us, that shall inhabite with them” (1588, Image 23).

But it does not stay there. When it relies on narration to lend authority to the claims, Harriot’s text gives away more about the devastating effects of this colonial contact. His text’s dependence on the eyewitness mode to authorize its claims about the amenability of the natural and political environment leads, also, to an unwitting acknowledgement of the deadly effects of colonial contact for the indigenous people, just when it is attempting to present a state of harmony into which the prospective colonialists can expect to be welcomed.

There are two disturbing issues the text cannot avoid: the alarming and incomprehensible phenomenon of the widespread mortality of the Indian communities and the Europeans’ brutality towards the Indians. In searching for explanations about the fatalities, Harriot relies on faith in the divine: “some said, that it was the special worke of God for our sakes, as we our selves have cause in some sort to thinke no lesse” (1588, Image 22). This is not unlike the explanations offered by the Indians themselves, as Harriot reports it, who reach for religious explanations when unable to make sense of the European instruments or their invulnerability to disease: “no man of ours [was] knowen to die,” so much so that “some people could not tell whether to thinke us gods or men” (1588, Image 22).

Harriot finds himself caught up in the complex and disturbing task of acknowledging the devastating and mystifying impact of colonial contact and of trying to interpret and explain Indian sickness and death without the help of medical science’s later understanding of pathogenesis. The narrative also finds itself stuck in the contradictory position of acknowledging the excessive brutality of the English,

while also at the same time explaining it away as “justly deserved” (1588, Image 23). Harriot manages to suggest that, first, the actions of the English were “too fierce” and unnecessary (that the provocation “might easily ynough have bene borne”) and, second, that at the same time the treatment of the Indians was “on their part justly deserved” (1588, Image 23). And then he goes on to claim that they “neede nothing at all to be feared” (the final and most important point, in light of his text’s promotional objective) if the colonists take due care in their self-management, that is, “by carefulnesse of our selves” (1588, Image 23).

Were it true that Harriot’s text remains stuck in a natural-historical discursive mode, there would not be much more to say. But it is striking that in this final and most lengthy section that deals with the disturbing effects of the colonial encounter, the text must take on an increasingly complex position as moral adjudicator of behavior that results in fatality when describing the tension of these encounters between the English and the Indians. In offering interpretations of these events, the text acknowledges the possibility of different perspectives of the same events (“on our part” versus “on their part”) and the possibility that these interpretations could change (“the alteration of their opinions generally”) or might have been different (“causes that on our part might easily ynough have bene borne”) both by the Indians and by “us” (1588, Image 23). As a result, the recognition of colonization as a contest finds its way into the text despite its promotional objective.

Myra Jehlen describes the tension in the *Report* in this way: The “*Report* makes particularly clear the way that acknowledgment of the Indian presence renders the conquest of America something other than the unilateral unfolding of a manifest destiny. It is a contest, a collision. . . . [T]here is no way finally to take away a people’s land without violence” (1994, 62–3). Jehlen is right to identify this “contest” of perspectives in the *Report* as unresolved. The *Report* is not able to adjudicate between the positions it represents, but instead holds both in tension. As Jehlen puts it, the *Report* is “not balanced but dualistic. In this lack of fusion—not a lack of coherence but only of resolution—the latter-day reader may glimpse something of the complexity of the period of America’s early exploration” (64). My contention is that this lack of resolution is most visible when the *Report* is self-evidently promotional—that is, when it announces itself as an argument that can conceive of counter-arguments rather than the presentation of a singular truth about Virginia and its peoples. To read Harriot *through* De Bry is to risk losing sight of this tension.¹³

When Harriot’s *Report* is taken up by De Bry, his editorial efforts produce a change dramatic enough for Harriot’s name to become associated with the serious discourse of learning in this period (call it “science”), though Harriot himself does not lay claim to this objective. Harriot’s use of the term “knowledge” is context-specific and

¹³For example, Ute Kuhlemann’s careful comparison between John White’s original paintings and De Bry’s reworking of these images in his engravings is very sensitive to the effects of the (altered) images on what can be seen of American cultural life. And yet her characterization of Harriot’s narrative underscores my contention that De Bry’s aestheticization and idealization of American existence renders the tension in Harriot’s narrative invisible: “Reflecting the basic tone of Harriot’s account, all plates by De Bry portray the Indian life encountered by the English as a peaceful existence in balance with nature” (2007, 86).

relates quite clearly to the business of what he calls “planting”—nowhere does he claim to be furthering knowledge for the edification of humankind, in the sense that his contemporary Richard Hakluyt claimed to be doing, with his enormous compilations of English exploration narratives. De Bry’s compilation, by comparison with the earlier pamphlet, reveals serious epistemological ambitions.

THE 1590 EDITION

De Bry’s republication of Harriot’s pamphlet in 1590 was the first part of a much larger endeavor by Theodor de Bry and his sons to publish a series of “voyages” of discovery known as the *Great Voyages*. This first volume took the form of an expensive and beautiful large-format book targeting prospective investors.¹⁴ It is estimated to have cost “between one and three guilders, which equals three to six weeks’ pay for a typesetter in the late sixteenth century” (Kuhlemann 2007, 83).

De Bry’s version of the *Report* is thus a new document entirely. It includes new prefatory material, tables, new text by John White, and engravings of John White’s paintings of the Algonquin people. Taken as a whole, the 1590 compilation forms a text quite distinct from Harriot’s more modest pamphlet. De Bry’s prefatory material and the final index provide an ostentatious frame. In the earlier edition, there is nothing like the splendid frontispiece; and even De Bry’s dedication to “the Right Worthie and Honovrable, Sir VValter Raleigh, Knight” bespeaks its elevated aspirations, in associating the “nowe nammed Virginia” with “the honneur of your most souueraine Layde and Queene Elizabetz” (1590, Image 2). Following Harriot’s lengthy report appears De Bry’s own text, introducing his engravings of John White’s watercolors.¹⁵ The De Bry text announces itself as a work of natural history through textual devices such as the table of contents; the engravings, which read as aesthetic products as well as uncomplicated referents of what exists; the accompanying descriptions; and the index, or glossary, at the end. Most significantly, De Bry’s compilation includes engravings of the ancient British Picts in poses that invite comparison between the peoples of the New World and English forebears.

On the title page of the second part of the compilation, announcing the engravings and the discourse by De Bry, we read that the “true pictures and fashions of the people in that part of America now called Virginia” have been “Diligentlye Collected and draowne by Ihon White” (1590, Image 33)—a description noteworthy not only for its assertion of “diligence” but also for the effacement of the interpretative distance between the object (“the fashions of the people in . . . Virginia . . . [here] collected”) and its representational form (“draowne”). But the engravings printed

¹⁴De Bry’s warning to those who might be tempted to produce a counterfeit suggests that the product itself is a valuable commodity, its copyright in need of policing. He ends his preface “To the gentle Reader” in this way: “Finallye I hartlye Request thee, that yf any seeke to Contrefaict thes my bookx, (for in this dayes many are so malicious that they seeke to gayne by other men labours) secret marks llye hidden in my pictures, which wil breede Confusion vnless they bee well obserued” (1590, Image 37).

¹⁵This section is titled “The Trve Pictures and Fashions of the People in that parte of America novv called Virginia, discowred by Englishmen sent thither in the years of our Lorde 1585” (1590, Image 34).

in this volume are not “by” John White; they are the work of De Bry and his apprentices, translations of White’s “eye-witness” watercolors into the beautiful regal figures of the engravings. Karen Ordahl Kupperman calls attention to the “puzzling contrast” between White’s paintings, “meticulously recreated” in respect of “tattoos, jewelry . . . and clothing,” and De Bry’s noble figures: in the latter engravings the “faces were sweetened, softened and Europeanized. With their new high foreheads, puckered mouths, and ringleted hair, they . . . were rendered more graceful to European eyes” (2000, 42). The artists simply added American accessories to “stock figures from their repertoire” (42). Kupperman interprets this as an unconscious attempt to “read” the bodies of the Americans in order to find congruence and connection, and argues that the effect of it was to render the Americans kin. She writes: “When English venturers looked at America’s natives they assumed they were looking at people who came from a common stock with themselves” (75).¹⁶

The attempt to find congruence is furthered by De Bry’s gratuitous inclusion of some engravings of the ancient British Picts into this now complex representational mix, in stances not dissimilar from those taken up by the Americans, their naked bodies extensively tattooed, their hair left wild and long and their arms clutching implements of war-making, including in one case a severed head, still dripping blood (1590, Image 69). In fact, De Bry’s written introduction to the pictures of the Picts explains this purpose: “to shoue how that the Inhabitants of the great Bretannie haue bin in times past as sauauge as those of Virginia” (1590, Image 67). De Bry sees fit to verify these pictures as “trve” with reference, rather vaguely, to White’s assurance that he “fownd” them in an “oollld English cronicle” (1590, Image 67).

I take Kupperman’s point regarding the recuperative effect of rendering the Americans similar to the Europeans, and the reassurance and optimism granted to a willing reader in being able to recognize sameness in the self-presentation of the Americans, rather than alienating difference. However, it seems to me that the comparison set up in the text’s juxtaposition of these figures suggests that it can only imagine a connection in time long passed—in the idealized prelapsarian garden, and in the regained mastery of a markedly primitive culture, such as can only be made comparable with the readers’ disturbingly savage forebears, long dead. The viewing stance that the text establishes for the reader is not one of a romantic kinship. What is shared is a mutual savagery, distanced from a reader’s self-identification by time, if not place. Jehlen understands “De Bry [as having] erased the difference between European and American Indian and projected a spuriously universal but actually European human model onto the latter . . . [so that] the non-Europeans are denied their identity, which White had granted them” (1994, 67). Jehlen’s reading here is acute, but it is at odds with her earlier description of the *Report* as being “dualistic” and contestatory, in her analysis of the narrative itself (as discussed above). True, the effect of “humanizing the Indians” in the engravings is significant: De Bry “improves on White by making his illustrations more classically aesthetic and more ethnically

¹⁶The engravings are careful to include markers of status and gender, markers that Kupperman believes readers would have been able to interpret accurately.

sympathetic to a well-educated, enlightened European audience” (1994, 67). However, this effect is absent from the 1588 pamphlet and is, as Jehlen acknowledges, “mostly the work of de Bry” (66). Though in a sense it is true to say that the “Harriot–White–de Bry trio encompasses the range of colonialist benevolence in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, an unsteady, fragile benevolence that briefly qualified the ferocity of the conquest” (67), placing Harriot in the same cabal as De Bry misses the opportunity to unpack the truth effects of the particular textual form of the 1590 compilation and the softening it achieves through its aesthetic and epistemological affectations.

The overall structure of the 1590 *Report* sets up for the reader, through a set of natural historical reading tools, a relationship of knowing that is decidedly hierarchical. The reader is invited to lay claim to the objects presented for consumption, curiosities to marvel at and to grasp. The figure of nature—a knowable, quantifiable natural world—mediates between worlds. Tools of study function as a means through which a new and strange people can be made intelligible and predictable to Europe. And this is as much an effect of the form itself as anything else, a form that announces its epistemological earnestness and in so doing reduces the historical vagaries evident in the 1588 narrative account of a fraught encounter to a presentation of the truth, as if for all time, of who the Americans are, objects to be seen and understood by a curious Europe.

The effect of the introduction of visual representation deserves consideration. Michel de Certeau contends that visual representation in a text such as De Bry’s foregrounds and privileges versions of a truth that would otherwise be open to challenge. In his discussion of eighteenth-century Jesuit Joseph-Francois Lafitau’s *Moeurs des Sauvages Ameriquains compareés aux moeurs des premier temps*, De Certeau makes passing reference to De Bry (specifically, not Harriot) as an early example in what became an “ethnological tradition” where visual representation of exotic peoples seemed to secure the truth and “presence” of the “Other.” The visual relies on the “principles of a readability or of a ‘seeing’ . . . principles that replace the dependence and belief formerly articulated upon a ‘historic’ existence of the Other” (De Certeau 1980, 56). The visual presents “a history which does not acknowledge itself,” a history which addresses itself to “the first times” but which refuses to acknowledge its interest in doing so (42). As representational gestures, visual “comparisons” function as the “writer’s assistants,” “transform[ing] the collection into a text” (49). That is to say, disparate elements are drawn together into a symbolic unity as though this stands alone by rights. This “manipulation” is “the inverse of historiography, not authorized by the objects it cites, only by itself” (48). The lack of authorization is not immediately apparent: “it shields its deficiencies of argumentation by a demonstration that only appears coherent” (59). But what it promises is an apparent transparency, giving the reader an unproblematic access to the “Other” of the text’s making as if this is all there is, as if this is not open to being contested.

For De Certeau, the *visual* thus removes the *historical* from view. In De Bry’s compilation, tension between two antagonistic groups is side-stepped, both by

situating the Americans in a pre-modern idyll and by demonstrating a visual congruence with the ancient English that can go unchallenged. Harriot's narrative becomes tangential to the more compelling and alluring tools of visual display and the techniques of cataloguing that have been read as "scientific" by critics, though these appear only in the De Bry, in the following ways.

The table of contents ("the table of all de pictvres contained in the Booke of Virginia") lists titles, all in the form of simple objects, all without finite verbs or markers of time (1590, Image 34). Even when they depict Americans performing acts, the title renders the subject static, frozen in time. So, the act of fishing becomes, "Their manner of fishynge in Virginia"; praying becomes "Their manner of prayinge with their Rattels abowt the fyer"; and dancing is referred to as a noun: "Their dances whych they vse at their hyghe feastes" (1590, Image 35).

The beautiful engravings themselves perform this natural historical function without clarifying their terms, representing the Americans seemingly transparently. Though they are for the most part translations of John White's paintings, the first engraving is an unrelated, purely decorative image of Adam and Eve beneath the Tree of Knowledge in the Garden of Eden, without a caption. This image is not referenced anywhere in the text itself and does not seem to be claiming a representational function. And yet it is not without a role in the knowledge-system upon which the text relies. It establishes right up front the association of the New World with that mythic first garden of innocence and unbounded fertility and with the presumed mastery over nature that is associated with the privilege of naming.

This sense of mastery is not evident in the early edition of the *Report*, at least not in the seemingly self-evident, uncontested way that the De Bry text demonstrates. Its assertion is inescapable in the De Bry edition through a series of textual features that remake Harriot's *Report* into a sort of early ethnography, rather than the commerce-driven description of natural commodities and the advertisement for colonization it admits to being.

It has been pointed out elsewhere that John White's portfolio of paintings included many natural historical items,¹⁷ but De Bry selects only those that pertain to the indigenous people themselves. In the first edition the orientation towards the local inhabitants is at times defensive, betraying a certain disquiet that belies the impression of harmony. De Bry's inclusion of the engravings places the inhabitants as objects of study in a fixed temporal universe—something that Harriot's text, on its own, is not able to achieve, because it cannot refrain from sliding into a narrative which gives away more than it means to, in its endeavor to produce "sufficient witness" (1588, Image 12). As I argued earlier, the first edition of the *Report* discloses something of the troubled relationship between the colonists and the Americans, and the devastating effects of that encounter, in describing it. The text's structure makes this unavoidable. Its evidence-based authority, set up right from the start with Lane's preface, must produce an eyewitness account by a man of character whose word can also be underwritten by another upstanding man, to vouch for American receptivity

¹⁷See Campbell (1999, 55).

to English colonization, rather implausibly, whereas De Bry's compilation sets up a textual structure within which Europe can confidently "know" America as sympathetic, from the loftier, less questionable vantage-point of science.

It is De Bry's text, rather than Harriot's which, as Mary Baines Campbell puts it, offers a "revealing illustration of how, in part, this science [of ethnography] came into recognizable being" (1999, 51) and, one might add, how it came into being as a discourse whose foundations could be obscured beneath systems of representation that appear natural and beyond question. Campbell's point is that it is precisely because ethnographic discourse is as yet undeveloped that De Bry relies on the engravings to give representation to the indigenous people as elements in a larger structural context that offers for view objects of knowledge.¹⁸ The index, situated at the very end of the entire compilation, underscores and facilitates this epistemological function. It also works to unify the compilation, because it refers back, across De Bry's contributions, to the items—or "commodities"—in the Harriot text, the fruits and dyes and trees, and so on. The subjects of the engravings simply do not appear in the index and the captions and explanations are also not referenced, though they offer themselves as a tool with which to translate the pictures. The explanations are secondary to the pictures themselves, to the point almost of irrelevance. In terms of the text's authorizing structure, the Americans are offered up to a mode of viewing that situates the reader as seeker of knowledge, rather than pleasure, despite the images' aesthetic and erotic tenor.

That curiosity about new-world difference formed a key axis for what became received knowledge is not in dispute. The ideological and imaginative shape that knowledge takes—what can be known, in what terms, and with what effect—seems to me to be a function not only of the historical moment, or of an author's particular preoccupations, but also of the shaping of specific texts and their effects. An inquiry into how objectifying knowledge systems are constituted is rewarded by attending closely to the features which come to seem self-evident, but which in fact establish the identifications with which Europeans came to know the New World, and themselves in relation to it.

REFERENCES

- Bauer, Ralph. *The cultural geography of colonial American literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Campbell, Mary Baines. *Wonder and science: Imagining worlds in early modern Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.
- De Bry, Theodor. *Les grands voyages*. Frankfurt: J. Wecheli, 1590–1602.
- De Certeau, Michel. "Writing vs. time: History and anthropology in the works of Lafitau." Translated by James Hovde." *Yale French Studies* 59 (1980): 37–64.
- Fiedler, Leslie. *The stranger in Shakespeare*. London: Croom Helm, 1972.

¹⁸Campbell (1999) rightly points out that the term ethnography "refers to a genre that did not exist in the sixteenth century" (48), though she identifies ample "material later to be codified as ethnographic" (25) to warrant frequent recourse to the term in her work on *Wonder and Science* in the period.

- Fitzmaurice, Andrew. *Humanism and America: An intellectual history of English colonisation, 1500–1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Foucault, Michel. "Truth and power." In *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*, edited by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980. 109–33.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. "Invisible bullets: Renaissance authority and its subversion in *Henry IV and Henry V*." In *Political Shakespeare: New essays in cultural materialism*, edited by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985. 18–47.
- Hadfield, Andrew. "Bruited abroad: John White and Thomas Harriot's colonial representations of ancient Britain." In *British identities and English Renaissance literature*, edited by David J Baker and Willy Maley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 158–77.
- Hakluyt, Richard. *The principall navigations, voiages, traffiques and discoveries of the English nation, made by sea or over land, to the most remote and farthest distant Quarters of the earth at any time within the compasse of these 1500 yeeres: deuided into three seuerall parts, according to the positions of the regions wherunto they were directed. . . . Whereunto is added the last most renowned English nauigation, round about the whole globe of the earth. By Richard Hakluyt Master of Artes, and Student sometime of Christchurch in Oxford*. London: George Bishop and Ralph Newberie, 1589.
- , ed. *The principal navigations: voiages, traffiques and discoueries of the English nation, made by sea or ouer-land, to the remote and farthest distant quarters of the earth at any time within the compasse of these 1500 yeeres: deuided into three seuerall volumes, according to the positions of the regions whereunto they were directed. This first volume containing the woorthy discoueries, &c. of the English toward the north and northeast by sea, as of Lapland, SCriksinia, Corelia, the Baie of S. Nicolas . . . together with many notable monuments and testimonies of the ancient forren trades, and of the warrelike and other shipping of this realme of England in former ages. Whereunto is annexed also a briefe commentarie of the true state of Island, and of the northren seas and lands situate that way. And lastly, the memorable defeate of the Spanish huge Armada, anno 1588. and the famouse victorie atchieued at the citie of Cadiz, 1596. are described/by Richard Hakluyt*. London: G. Bishop, Ralph Newberie and Robert Barker, 1598–1600.
- Harriot, Thomas. *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia of the commodities there found and to be rayseed, as well marchantable, as others for victuall, building and other necessarie vses for those that are and shalbe the planters there; and of the nature and manners of the naturall inhabitants: discovered by the English colony there seated by Sir Richard Greinuile Knight in the yeere 1585. which remained vnder the gouernment of Rafe Lane Esquier, one of her Maiesties Equieres, during the space of twelue monethes: at the speciall charge and direction of the Honourable Sir Walter Raleigh Knight, Lord Warden of the stanneries; who therein hath bene fauored and authorised by her Maiestie and her letters patents: directed to the aduenturers, fauourers, and welwillers of the action, for the inhabiting and planting there: by Thomas Hariot; seruaut to the abouenamed Sir Walter, a member of the Colony, and there employed in discouering*. London: R. Robinson, 1588.
- . *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia of the commodities and of the nature and manners of the naturall inhabitants. Discovered by the English colon there seated by Sir Richard Greinuile Knight in the eere 1585. Which remained vnder the gouernement of twelue monethes, at the speciall charge and direction of the Honourable Sir Walter Raleigh Knight lord Warden of the stanneries who therein hath bene fauored and authorised by her Maiestie: and her letters patents: This fore booke is made in English by Thomas Hariot seruaut to the abouenamed Sir Walter, a member of the Colon, and there imploied in discouering Cum gratia et priuilegio Caes. Matis Speciali*. Frankfurt on Maine: J. Wecheli, 1590.
- Hulton, Paul. "Introduction." In *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia, Thomas Harriot*, edited by Paul Hulton. New York: Dover Publications, 1972. vii–xv.
- Jehlen, Myra. "Three writers of early America." In *The Cambridge history of American literature, Vol. 1, 1590–1820*, edited by Sacvan Bercovitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 59–83.

- Jehlen, Myra, and Michael Warner, eds. *The English literatures of America, 1500–1800*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Kuhlemann, Ute. “Between reproduction, invention and propaganda: Theodor de Bry’s engravings after John White’s watercolours.” *A new world: England’s first view of America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007. 79–92.
- Kupperman, Karen Ordahl. *Indians and English: Facing off in early America*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Lestringant, Frank. *Mapping the Renaissance world: The geographical imagination in the age of discovery*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.
- Mandeville, John. *The travels of Sir John Mandeville*. London: Penguin, 1983.
- Pagden, Anthony. *European encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to romanticism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Parrish, Susan Scott. *American curiosity: Cultures of natural history in the colonial British Atlantic world*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Quinn, D.B. *The Roanoke voyages, 1584–1590; Documents to illustrate the English voyages to North America under the patent granted to Walter Raleigh in 1584*. London: Hakluyt Society, 1955.
- . “Thomas Hariot and the Virginia voyages of 1602”. *William and Mary Quarterly* 27, no. 2 (1970): 268–81.
- Shapin, Steven. *A social history of truth: Civility and science in seventeenth-century England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Sweet, Timothy. *American Georgics: Economy and environment in early American literature*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2002.