

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Powhatan Lords of Life and Death: Command and Consent in Seventeenth-Century Virginia.  
By Margaret Holmes Williamson.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5rr1j5hw>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 27(4)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Kawashima, Yasuhide

**Publication Date**

2003-09-01

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Apache expansion on the ethnogenesis of new peoples in Texas. Strangely, Wade neither uses nor cites these two important works, as well as many others.

This does not mean that she has produced bad history. In fact, it is very good. Wade uses an incredibly wide variety of microfilmed primary sources in the many libraries and archives at the University of Texas at Austin. She also provides new translations of some crucial documents that scholars have long relied upon. However, a broader look at many of the excellent ethnohistories written on her topic during the last few years would make this an even stronger work. A little reorganization would also help. Some chapters are annotated re-translations of primary source documents, others are expanded timelines, while a few chapters are narrative history. Wade admits that this work came out of her doctoral dissertation, and, unfortunately, it often reads that way.

Nevertheless, she has proven herself to be one of the new breed of ethnohistorians producing quality work on Texas Indians. Like Anderson and others, Wade goes beyond the so often told story of Spanish triumphalism and Indian victimology. Instead she shows how the Indians of the Edwards Plateau adapted to the coming of the Spanish, manipulating them when they had to, and working their own agendas and strategies when they could. It makes a fascinating story.

*David La Vere*

University of North Carolina at Wilmington

**Powhatan Lords of Life and Death: Command and Consent in Seventeenth-Century Virginia.** By Margaret Holmes Williamson. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 323 pages. \$55 cloth.

This book uses an ethnographic approach in an attempt to reconstruct the Powhatan culture around the time that the Jamestown Colony was founded in 1607. Although it covers various aspects of the Powhatan in Tidewater Virginia, the work's scope is rather limited. Helen C. Rountree's books, *The Powhatan Indians of Virginia* (1989) and *Pocahontas's People* (1990), treat the Powhatan thoroughly and comprehensively. In contrast, Williamson concentrates on a narrower area: the basis of leadership, the relationship between political leaders and religious specialists, the role of ritual, and Powhatan cosmological beliefs.

*Powhatan Lords of Life and Death* relies heavily on one type of original source: eyewitness accounts by early colonists. However, instead of taking them at face value, the author attempts to interpret these accounts based on the English background, ideas, and beliefs of the Jamestown observers. A lengthy introduction sets forth her thesis that a structuralist analysis of these colonial documents should reveal more about Powhatan culture and the argument that a knowledge of contemporary European culture is essential to understand the cultural descriptions in the documents. Williamson also insists that these accounts be translated into the anthropological terms that would best reveal aboriginal Powhatan culture—hence, the need to analyze the entire culture just to understand Powhatan chiefs. She is also concerned about the colonists'

description of the Powhatan hierarchical society in which the paramount chief, Powhatan, and his lesser chiefs enjoyed “absolute power over their subjects.” She asserts that “power” does not mean “willful, coercive power,” as understood by scholars until recently, but “efficacy,” and no more (pp. 8–9).

Williamson begins her study with an examination of the Powhatan Confederacy, relying heavily on the colonists’ accounts and taking them at face value, because such a statement requires “no particular knowledge of Renaissance culture for its understanding” (p. 47). Citing John Smith, Robert Beverley, Richard Hakluyt, and William Strachey extensively, the author concludes that Powhatan’s realm in 1607 consisted of about thirty tribes under his command, which depended on both military strength and the categorical conceptions that the people had of their leaders (*werowances*), shamans (*quiyoughcosoughs*), and the *mamanatowick* himself. Significantly, the practice of matrilineal descent caught the attention of both Strachey and Smith who stated emphatically that the status of *mamanatowick* passed “not to his sonnes nor children, but first to his brethren . . . and after their decease to his sister. First to the eldest sister then to the rest and after them to the heires male and female of the eldest sister, but never to the heires of the males” (p. 108; quoted from Smith, *A Map of Virginia* [1986, 174]).

In a provocative chapter, “‘Civilizing’ the Powhatan,” Williamson analyzes the working of Powhatan’s polity. Her close examination of the colonial documents reveals that they reflected not only the colonists’ interests in increasing the domain of King James I and enriching his kingdom, but also their concerns about the nature of kingship and the relationship between king and subject. The author vividly illustrates the colonists’ description of the Powhatan polity in an attempt to “civilize” them by making them seem “civil” and more English and less “savage” to men and women in England. The author argues that the colonists’ accounts should be taken on their own terms and that their description of the Powhatan as a different culture should be treated as such in order to obtain the information needed to understand this culture.

The colonists identified several ranks among the Powhatan, including the secular leaders (*werowance* and *cockarous*). The author argues that their accounts of these leaders and their relationships reflected the colonists’ own background. Coming from a hierarchical society, the colonists were keenly sensitive to evidence of ranking and wished the Powhatan to be ranked, in order to deem them “civil.” Thus, they sometimes saw evidence where there was none, and, more important, they were prepared to recognize such evidence even in an unfamiliar social setting.

According to Smith, Strachey, and Beverley, the Powhatan *werowance* assured the judicial, economic, social, and spiritual well-being of his people. He was also an aesthetic object, covered with pearls, copper, red paint, and sometimes spangles. The *werowance* was, indeed, the embodiment of his polity, “the totality of [his] society and its institutions” and also of its dignity (p. 151); see Marcel Mauss, *The Gift* [1990], p. 78). His subordinate was the *cockarouse*, with whom he formed a complementary relationship: the *werowance* judged wrongdoers and the *cockarouse* carried out his sentence. When the former planned raids, he expected the latter to lead them.

“Priests” and “conjurers” are the spiritual counterparts of kings and councilors. Although the colonists were keenly interested in the Powhatan religion, they viewed it as a perversion of their own, and thus paid insufficient attention to its positive aspects. As the author points out, the colonists leave ambiguous whether “priest” and “conjurers” refer to the same person or to different types of religious personage and, if the latter, what distinguished one from the other. Generally speaking, the “priest” was the master and the “conjurer” his agent.

According to the Jamestown documents, the *quiyoughcosough* primarily served a being whom the colonists call Oke, one of four principal Powhatan divinities. Besides seeking counsel from Oke, the Powhatan religious leader cured the sick. The term *quiyoughcosough* meant more than “shaman,” or even “priest” or “conjurer.” To Smith, it meant “Pettie Gods, and their affinities,” or, more specifically, “a superior power they worship,” while Oke referred to a greater divinity and *quiyoughcosough* to those of lesser status. Williamson points out that the Jamestown colonists used a Powhatan word, *quiyoughcosough*, for the shaman, but referred to these men with two English terms: “priest” and “conjurer.” Sometimes they presented them as two distinct statuses; in other accounts the terms were interchangeable. Still some other Jamestown accounts either make no distinction between the priest and the conjurer or show a significant difference between them. The author finds this confusion analogous to that over the titles *werowance* and *cockarouse*. She insists that the English were not prepared to be as tolerant of paganism as they were of supposed tyranny, and that their comments about Powhatan religion and religious persons are almost entirely interpretations, rather than objective reports.

Perhaps the most important contribution is chapter five, “Dual Sovereignty in Tidewater Virginia,” in which Williamson analyzes the balanced dualism pervasive throughout Powhatan society. The use of the term, *dual sovereignty*, however, might not be appropriate because sovereignty seems to have been mistaken for political power and authority or jurisdiction. The Powhatan dyarchy, politically speaking, was the dual rule by a religious authority (*quiyoughcosough*) and a secular power (*werowance*), who was directed by the *quiyoughcosough*. Although the chief was more like a shaman, he was the shaman’s agent, not his equal. Powhatan, the paramount chief, was the only exception, being regarded as a more sacred person, “halfe a God,” than his subordinate *werowances*. The Powhatan dyarchy, however, was not just a politico-religious structure, but exemplified the totality of symbolic classification in Powhatan culture. The author reveals a consistent association between authority and masculinity (the west, the elevated, the right hand, desiccation, sterility, stasis, black, the spiritual, and death) and between power and femininity (the east, the nether, the left hand, moisture, fertility, change, white, the mundane, and life).

In Beverley’s description of the *huskanaw*, the ritual of initiation that produced the *quiyoughcosough*, the author discovers some symbolic oppositions: wilderness and the settled area, high and low, spiritual and mundane, male and female, right and left, senior and junior, black and white, death and life. Furthermore, she finds that only boys participated in the *huskanaw*, a ritual conducted only by men, excluding women and girls from engaging in spiritual contact.

Williamson points out that the colonists paid little attention to Powhatan women, whom they considered similar to their counterparts in England in their subordination to fathers and husbands. The relationship between Powhatan men and women was not a parasitic one, as Smith implies, but a division of labor, a collaboration. The consistent pattern among the Powhatan that men initiate and women carry on is, to the author, a syntagmatic relationship analogous to that between shaman and chief and between chief and subject. However, the Powhatan women were, in fact, not only the power in their household, but acted as political and diplomatic agents for their male relatives, and participated in Powhatan's councils. At the same time, women could also be punished for breaking laws. The author insists that the Powhatan marital relationship, as with all other hierarchical relationships in the culture, expressed the general principle of dualism, and that understanding the full dimensions of this balanced dualism requires a study of the entire Powhatan culture. The author's conclusion, which has little to do with the nature and content of the Powhatan society, is thus devoted almost exclusively to "dual sovereignty," which she expands in its global and historical contexts.

On the whole, this book, although more a study of colonists' accounts as reliable sources than a detailed analysis of the Powhatan tribe, is insightful, stimulating, and useful to scholars and general readers alike.

*Yasuhide Kawashima*

The University of Texas at El Paso

**Riding Buffaloes and Broncos.** By Allison Fuss Mellis. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003. 266 pages. \$34.95 cloth.

One of comedian George Carlin's quips is about the incongruity of an Indian wearing a cowboy hat. This remark might strike a city dweller as funny, but Westerners wouldn't get the joke because they are used to seeing Indian cowboys, both on ranches and in the rodeo arena. In fact, two of the best early twentieth-century bronc riders were Jackson Sundown, a Nez Perce from the Idaho-Oregon area, and Tom Three Persons, a Blood Indian from Canada, who won the bronc riding at the first Calgary Stampede in 1912.

Over the years American Indians have continued to excel in the rodeo arena. In my rodeoing days growing up in Kansas, I particularly recall an excellent calf roper and bull dogger from Wichita, but I didn't realize the extent of Indian participation in rodeo until one Fourth of July weekend in the early 1960s. Three of us were traveling together, hitting rodeos in western Kansas, eastern Colorado, and southwest Nebraska. While at the Nebraska rodeo someone told us about a rodeo in Wall, South Dakota. It didn't look that far on the road map, so we decided to go. It turned out to be an all-night drive, and none of us placed at the rodeo, but I still value the cultural experience because the majority of the contestants were Indian. When I commented to one of the Anglo cowboys from the area that Sioux seemed to predominate in the bronc and bull riding, while the timed events were well