Table of Contents

- About this Volume
- "Introduction: A History of Transatlantic Romanticism"
- Lance Newman, California State University, San Marcos
- Essay
- "'Points of Contact': Blake and Whitman"
- Sarah Ferguson-Wagstaffe, Harvard University
- Essay
- "'An Anti-Democratic Habit of Feeling': Nationalism and the Rhetoric of Toryism in O'Sullivan's *Democratic Review*"
- Sohui Lee, Stanford University
- Essay
- "National Demons: Robert Burns, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and the Folk in the Forest"
- Scott Harshbarger, Hofstra University
- Essay
- "Acting 'Natural': *Vanity Fair* and the Unmasking of Anglo-American Sentiment"
- Cree LeFavour, New York University
- Essay
- "Money, Matrimony and Memory: Secondary Heroines in Radcliffe, Austen and Cooper"
- Jen Camden, University of Indianapolis
- Essay
- "Love and Merit in the Maritime Historical Novel: Cooper and Scott"
- James Crane, Loyola University Chicago
- Essay
- "London-Kingston-Caracas: The Transatlantic Self-Fashioning of Simón Bolívar"
- Joselyn M. Almeida, Long Island University
- Essay
- "Children Playing by the Sea: the Dynamics of Appropriation in the Brazilian Romantic Novel"
- André Cardoso, New York University
- Essay
- "The Allure of the Same: Robert Southey's Welsh Indians and the Rhetoric of Good Colonialism"
- Rebecca Cole Heinowitz, Bard College
- Essay

Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism

About This Volume

This volume of *Romantic Circles Praxis Series* includes an editor's introduction by Lance Newman, essays by Joselyn Almeida, Jen Camden, Andre Cardoso, James Crane, Sarah Ferguson-Wagstaffe, Scott Harshbarger, Rebecca Cole Heinowitz, Sohui Lee, and Cree LeFavour. The volume is co-edited by Joel Pace and Chris Koenig-Woodyard.

The essays in *Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic* have moved beyond the simple notation of literary influence or ideological parallelism to perform a functional taxonomy of transatlantic Romanticism. Taken together, they help explain why the movement developed at different times and rates in different places around the Atlantic. Romanticism was a complex and multivalent response to, and articulation of, the combined and uneven rise of capitalist social relations. The first two sets of essays focus on literary nationalism and gender and nationalism. The third explores the rich cultural history of literary exchange between England and Latin America, pointing out new directions for the field.

The text is encoded in HTML, but features no frames and a limited use of tables. It will work best with Netscape 4.0 or Internet Explorer 4.0 or higher or a comparable browser; earlier browsers may not display everything properly. Because you may enter and exit these files along multiple paths, you may need to use the back-arrow button on your browser to return to your starting point. The full text of the volume, like all hypertexts in the *Romantic Circles Praxis Series*, is fully searchable.

The essays and other files were marked up in HTML by Lisa Marie Rhody and Joseph Byrne at the University of Maryland. The volume cover and contents page were also designed by Lisa Marie Rhody.

The photographs of Walt Whitman's grave were taken by Sarah Ferguson-Wagstaffe and were used with her permission. Blake's plate "Death's Door" comes from the Collection of Robert N. Essick Copyright (c) 2005, the William Blake Archive. Used with permission. The cover image, which combines details from both, was designed by Lisa Marie Rhody.

About the Romantic Circles Praxis Series

The **Romantic Circles Praxis Series** is devoted to using computer technologies for the contemporary critical investigation of the languages, cultures, histories, and theories of Romanticism. Tracking the circulation of Romanticism within these interrelated domains of knowledge, **RCPS** recognizes as its conceptual terrain a world where Romanticism has, on the one hand, dissolved as a period and an idea into a plurality of discourses and, on the other, retained a vigorous, recognizable hold on the intellectual and theoretical discussions of today. **RCPS** is committed to mapping out this terrain with the best and mo st exciting critical writing of contemporary Romanticist scholarship.

About the Contributors

Lance Newman, Associate Professor of Literature and Writing Studies at California State University at San Marcos, is the author of *Our Common Dwelling: Henry Thoreau, Transcendentalism, and the Class Politics of Nature* (Palgrave, 2005) and editor of *Transatlantic Romanticism: An Anthology of American, British, and Canadian Literature, 1767-1867* (Longman, 2006).

Joel Pace Joel Pace is Associate Professor of British and American Romanticism at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. He has worked with Lance Newman and Chris Koenig-Woodyard on several scholarly projects, including *Transatlantic Romanticism: An Anthology of British, American, and Canadian Literature, 1767-1867* (Longman 2006) as well as a special issue of *Romanticism on the Net* devoted to Transatlantic Romanticism. His first book, *Wordsworth in American Literary Culture* (Palgrave 2005), was co-edited with Matthew Scott. His other scholarship on Transatlantic literary relations in the Romantic period has appeared in *Romantic Circles Praxis Series*, *Symbiosis*, *The Cambridge Companion to Wordsworth*, and *The Wordsworth Circle*.

Chris Koenig-Woodyard read the Master of Studies and the Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford. A former Doctoral Fellow (Oxford) and Post-Doctoral Fellow (University of Toronto) of the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada, he teaches at the University of Toronto and has taught and lectured at Oxford, the University of Western Ontario, the University of Guelph, Trent University, Morgan State University, and Wilfrid Laurier University. He is editor of *Ann Radcliffe, The Italian (1797): A Critical Edition*, and co-editor of *Transatlantic Romanticism: An Anthology of American, British, and Canadian Literature, 1767-1867*.

Joselyn Almeida is Assistant Professor of British Nineteenth-Century Literature at Long Island University, Brooklyn, NY. She has published articles on Robert Southey, James Montgomery, José Blanco White, and Latin American writers such as Francisco de Miranda and Domingo Faustino Sarmiento. She is completing a manuscript that analyzes the hybrid cultural representations that emerge from the contact between British, African, and non-Anglophone American cultures.

Jen Camden is an assistant professor of English at University of Indianapolis. Her areas of specialization include 18th and 19th century British and American literature. She is currently at work on a book on the historical romance.

Andre Cardoso is a PhD candidate at the Department of Comparative Literature at New York University.

James Crane teaches literature and writing at Loyola University Chicago. He is currently at work on a book based upon his dissertation, *The Logic of Intimacy in Maritime Writing: Sailors, Gender, and Citizenship, 1776-1851*.

Sarah Ferguson-Wagstaffe is a Preceptor in the Expository Writing Program at Harvard University. She works on textual revision in nineteenth-century long poems. This is her first publication.

Scott Harshbarger is Associate Professor of English and Hofstra Universtiy, where he teaches courses in English and American literature. He has published on Wordsworth, Hawthorne, and the history of rhetoric.

Rebecca Cole Heinowitz is Assistant Professor of Literature at Bard College. Her article "'Thy World, Columbus, Shall be Free': British Romantic Deviance and Spanish American Revolution" has recently appeared in European Romantic Review 17:2 (April 2006). Another article, "'An Empire in Men's Hearts': Helen Maria Williams's Sentimental Conquest of Peru," is forthcoming in the essay collection Connecting Continents: Britain and Latin America, 1780-1900. She is currently completing a book-length study of the figure of Spanish America in British Romantic writing.

Sohui Lee is a Lecturer at Stanford University. She has published articles on ante-bellum American literature and transatlantic culture in journals *Symbiosis: A Journal of Anglo-American Literary Relations* and *Romanticism on the Net*. She is the author of the essay, "Manifest Empire: How U.S. rivalry with Great Britain shaped manifest destiny" in *Romantic Border Crossings* (Ashgate 2007).

Cree LeFavour writes about food and the history of books from her home in Garrison, NY. She teaches writing at NYU which is also where she earned her PhD in American Studies.

Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism

Introduction: A History of Transatlantic Romanticism

Lance Newman, California State University, San Marcos

1. Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote in 1840 that "the fame of Wordsworth is a leading fact in modern literature," calling the poet a "divine savage" and acknowledging that "Wordsworth now act[s] out of England on us...." Just as true was that Americans acted reciprocally on Wordsworth. As the poet noted in a letter to his U.S. editor, Henry Reed, the "acknowledgements which I receive from the vast continent of America are among the most grateful that reach me." He went on to exclaim: "What a vast field is there open to the English mind, acting through our noble language!" Wordsworth does strike a pose of condescension here, acting the part of the generous master. Nevertheless, it is clear that his sense of his own importance, of his significance as a public figure, is framed in relation to an international readership. He speaks to a community of readers defined not by a common nationality, but by a common culture.

2. William Keach, in his contribution to a recent exchange on how to periodize Romanticism, argues that "all forms of merely habitual national one-sidedness (are) a serious barrier to critical advance" and that "the grounds on which we claim the continuing relevance and coherence of a ‘romantic century’ need to be transatlantic" (31). This news is both old and new. For like Wordsworth and Emerson, the British and American Romantics took their movement’s transatlanticism for granted. But despite the self-conscious internationalism of the Romantics themselves, most twentieth-century critics and cultural historians have attempted, in ways that are quite destructive of full understanding, to isolate discrete national literatures and cultures: English literature and American literature.

3. Critical nationalism has not been a matter of simple regression. After all, "English literature" was a Romantic innovation, part of the British Empire’s invention of a deep past to authorize its newly acquired power. In *Walden*, Henry Thoreau describes his reverent absorption of that tradition: during his senior year at Harvard, he ignored his official studies and labored to consume Alexander Chalmers’s twenty-one-volume collection of the British poets, claiming that he read it through "without skipping" (259). The power to command such attention, the cultural authority of British literature, was such that American literature, both as an object of study and as a scholarly discipline in the U.S., was invented both in opposition to it *and* by analogy with it.[1] When the U.S. did eventually replace Britain as the world’s dominant imperial power, American literature came to perform the same cultural work, providing a warrant for domination. Thus, during mid-century, the business of American cultural historians was to anatomize the triumphant "American Mind," with a special focus on its "renaissance" during the Romantic century. From time to time, influence studies appeared that recalled the responsiveness to British antecedents that afflicted even the most respectably original American Romantic authors. Not surprisingly, defenders of the national canon, like Perry Miller in his "Thoreau in the Context of International Romanticism" (1961), compensated for the resulting discomfort by asserting confidently that the canonical texts of the American Renaissance were the culminating achievements of Romanticism as a whole.[2]

4. The first sustained account of Romanticism in a transatlantic context came in Stephen Spender’s *Love-Hate Relations* (1974), a book that was based on a series of lectures delivered at Cambridge University in 1965 and that set out to examine an

> awareness felt particularly by writers (because it has a lot to do with living within the language of their birth) of the connection between their separate existence and their country, in its history, landscape and people. This awareness is of a life which is that of an ideal United States or England which the writer, if he is in a correct relation to it, releases in his work. Unless he does have such a relation, his work will be peripheral to that center or turned inward upon itself. (xxi)

Spender argues that American writers formed their sense of the significance of their "patria" by "comparing their idea of European civilization with their own county's force and vitality. They either reacted against Europe or they gravitated towards it, but the shadow image of England and Europe qualified their attitudes to their own country and state of culture" (xxvi). Spender looks to the Romantic period for the origin these "love-hate relations," arguing that while British readers were scarcely aware of American culture, the American literary community faced a "dilemma: the combination of political independence and cultural colonization" (8). As a result, that community was deeply divided between those who "regarded England and its traditions as undermining their freedom of development" (xx) and those who "saw America as deadened by its 'materialism,' and Europe as the center of spiritual values." These attitudes could coexist in the same person. For instance, Spender describes Emerson's ambivalence toward his hosts during a visit to Europe: "he felt, as an American, 'almost an invalid' when he compared himself with the English, although he managed, at much the same time, to feel that the English were aging parents of the strong independent American children who had left them behind, on their exhausted island" (4). Spender, with his focus on national identity as the definitive analytical category, and his almost mystical way of describing authors as uniquely constitutive and representative of that identity, articulates what had been common sense through decades of old historicism. [3]

5. Almost simultaneous with the appearance of *Love-Hate Relations*, Harold Bloom published *The Anxiety of Influence* (1973). Bloom's study does not specifically consider transatlantic literary relations, since he conceives of literary traditions and history as a matter of supranational interactions between individual authors. Nevertheless, his notion of "poetic misprision" elevated to the level of theory Spender's donnish comments on British oblivion and American anxiety. According to Bloom, strong poets construct fruitful misreadings of their forebears from whose influence they need to escape in order to discover their own individuality. Thus, the American Romantics were engaged in "a hidden civil war" with their British predecessors (12). This psychologistic narrative of maturation allowed for a schematic, even mechanical representation of transatlantic cultural relations. The process of American differentiation from the British tradition was isolated as the centrally important drama of the period, and came to be read as a family romance with a foregone conclusion. The study of transatlantic Romanticism was dominated for more than a decade by versions of this simple plot: influence, imitation, anxiety, rejection, and independence. The position received its most resolute, even absolute, statement in *Atlantic Double-Cross: American Literature and British Influence in the Age of Emerson* (1986), in which Robert Weisbuch describes what he calls the "American secret": "I believe that the American writer begins from a defensive position and that the achievements of British literature and British national life are the chief intimidations against which he, as American representative, defends himself" (ix, xii). Together, Bloom and Weisbuch, gave the weight of finality to the idea that American literature only becomes truly American, only achieves "independence" from the "burden of Britain," when its authors invent native forms capable of rendering the true character of a unique American experience.[4]

6. A closely related but significantly divergent position was mapped out by Leon Chai's *The Romantic Foundations of the American Renaissance* (1987), which articulates perhaps the most sophisticated version of the dependency and maturation hypothesis. Chai argues that "the American Renaissance [was] the final phase of a movement that begins with European Romanticism," a phase characterized by formal self-consciousness and even mannerism:

> After certain aesthetic or conceptual norms attain the level of conscious expression...they become fraught with extraordinary tensions that prevent the possibility of their perpetuation. What so often results might be described as a subjectivization of those norms, that is, their externalization into the medium of expression itself, and a simultaneous inner transformation of their content and significance. (xii)

While Chai implies a reversed valuation of the process of transatlantic influence, like Weisbuch, he accepts the logic of national competition. And both, together with Spender and Bloom, reduce what is a complex process of mutual, but unequal, influence, into tautological narratives of individuation, either of whole cultures, or of their individual representatives.

7. Three books, published almost simultaneously in the early 1990s, subjected what had gone before to rigorous reappraisal and set the study of transatlantic Romanticism on a definitive new tack. Perhaps the most absolute reaction against the nationalist consensus came in Richard Brantley's *Coordinates of Anglo-American Romanticism* (1993). In the course of an account of the influence of "the twin pioneers of transatlantic revivalism," John Wesley and Jonathon Edwards, on the "empirical evangelical methodology" of Emerson and Carlyle, Brantley argues that "the two national literatures are one." (8, 4, 6). Moreover, he turns a Bloomian narrative of maturation on the critical tradition itself, arguing that "American literature, now having come of age, having shed the 'adolescent' insecurity that demanded independence from tradition, no longer needs to insist on complete separation from the literature of England. 'Anglo-American' literature emerges as a valid concept" (1).[5] Similarly, Stephen Fender's *Sea Changes: British Emigration and American Literature* (1992) applies a post-national perspective to "the rite of passage in which the experience of emigration was inscribed," arguing that it "contributed to the formation of [American] national consciousness and the literature which reflected and conditioned it" (13). Fender describes what he calls "the discourse of anglophone emigration," showing how it "underpins the very self-definition of the United States of America" (5). At the same time, the *discourse* of emigration played a central role in the self-definition of Britain, for "after American independence, during the unrest that followed the Napoleonic Wars, British progressives and conservatives began to inscribe the domestic debate for and against reform within an argument about the viability of the new republic across the Atlantic, and particularly about the wisdom of emigrating there" (10).[6] Third, Paul Gilroy's *Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (1993) fruitfully complicates Brantley and Fender's internationalism by emphasizing the central importance of the Triangle Trade as a force for cultural mixing. But in doing so Gilroy, like Brantley and Fender, overcorrects. Attempting to produce an antidote to "the tragic popularity of ideas about the integrity and purity of cultures" (7), Gilroy overemphasizes figures of hybridity, producing a utopian retrospective of the period that threatens to erase the substantial differentials of cultural power around the Atlantic Rim.[7]

8. Two recent volumes have struck the fine balance so long needed, setting a new standard for empirical cultural analysis that is freed of nationalist distortions but closely attentive to the power of nationalism as one of the most fundamental structures of identity during the Romantic century. In *Transatlantic Insurrections: British Culture and the Formation of American Literature, 1730-1860* (2001), Paul Giles produces a cultural history of the period that, on one hand, speaks to the diversity of literary expression in English along the Atlantic Rim and, on the other, recognizes just how rigidly concentric that world was, just how solidly London sat at the center of the literary universe as it was then mapped both by the English, their subjects, and their former possessions. On one hand, Giles shows how "the emergence of autonomous and separate political identities during this era can be seen as intertwined with a play of opposites, a series of reciprocal attractions and repulsions between opposing national situations" (1). Giles dwells on "figures of mirroring and twinning," showing how "British and American cultural narratives tended to develop...as heretical alternatives to each other" (2). At the same time, he is careful not to erase the period's hierarchies of national power:

> To restore an American dimension to British literature of this period is to denaturalize it, to suggest the historical contingencies that helped formulate the dynamics of Augustan order and imperial control. Conversely, to restore a British dimension to American literature is to politicize it: to reveal its intertwinement with the discourses of heresy, blasphemy, and insurrection, rather than understanding that writing as an expression of local cultures or natural rights. (10-11) [8]

This is the kind of sensitively historicist approach we need to understand the period's complex and fluid co-evolution of British and American literary cultures and national identities. *Transatlantic Insurrections* demonstrates the transnational interdependence of national cultures, showing that it is "easier to see what American literature embraces and omits by comparing it to British literature, just as American literature from a reverse perspective manifests itself as British literature's shadow-self, the kind of culture it might have been, but wasn't" (195).

9. Richard Gravil's *Romantic Dialogues: Anglo-American Continuities, 1776-1862* (2000) describes the multivalent circulation of ideas around the Atlantic rim as driven by both broad historical trends and specific local events. The American Revolution provided an important catalyst for the crystallization of early British Romanticism and remained a touchstone for its later phases: "The terms of [British] political debate in the 1790s over France, and in the 1830s over reform, were set in large measure by the lines drawn in 1776: lines that were themselves predicated on that ancient fault line in British politics between Republicans and 'True Whigs' on the one side, and Tories and Royalists on the other" (3). Radical optimism was quickly replaced by explanations for the apparent shortcomings of the experimental republic: "Romanticism, frequently viewed as an internal compensation for the failure of the French Revolution, is quite as much a response to the different failures of the American Revolution —its partial failure, in some respects to *be* a revolution, and its more lamentable failure, from an English standpoint, to bridge the Atlantic" (21). American Romanticism, then, is "a delayed variation upon the literary awakening occasioned in England by the loss of America" (21). Significantly, Gravil's book is one of the first to focus not just on demonstrating that there is substantial transatlantic continuity in the culture of Romanticism, but also on explaining why:

> What made the impact of the Romantic poets especially powerful...was that in numerous respects the situation of idealistic Americans in 1823-1862...involved preoccupations and expectations strangely parallel to those of England in the period 1789-1819.... In America, Blake's 'mind-forged manacles' and his slave-trading manacles fused together for a generation appalled by the deadlock imposed upon social progress by a Constitution that they had been brought up to regard as the epitome of political wisdom if not the work of demi-gods. The dark Satanic mills, too, were now in evidence (xiii).

For Gravil, the flow of ideas and cultural formations around the Atlantic Rim follows the flow of modernization, and this insight grounds the spectacularly detailed historicity of his readings of the complex web of reciprocal literary influence:

> Just as Hawthorne and Dickens engage in a symbiotic exchange, with Hawthorne amply repaying his debts to Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Keats by helping to form the composite of fictional styles we know as Dickensian; and just as Emerson assists Carlyle in transforming Romantic insights into Victorian—and then Nietzschian—forms of Transcendence; so Whitman and Dickinson reshape and re-equip the lyric tradition as it essentializes itself in Tennyson, preparing the modernity of Hopkins, Eliot, and Lawrence. (xix)

In this mode, Gravil narrates a fully developed cultural history composed of multiple episodes and

vectors of ideological exchange. And while his selection of texts may remain somewhat narrowly canonical, he nevertheless synthesizes the insights of the preceding two decades of revisionist scholarship into what will long be recognized as a benchmark for the field.[9]

10. Gravil observes rightly that a complete mapping of what he calls the "lost continent of literary exchange that our artificially divided academic community has yet to recognize and explore...is work for a generation, not for a book" (xix, xviii). This collection of nine essays, *Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism*, is a contribution to that project. However, *Sullen Fires* is bigger than the sum of its parts. These essays were produced by a cohort of scholars for whom the internationalism of literary culture is no longer a hypothesis, but an axiom. That is to say, these scholars have moved beyond demonstrating that Romanticism *was* transatlantic, to documenting and exploring the startling range of its transmigrations. They have moved beyond the simple notation of literary influence or ideological parallelism, and are now performing a new functional taxonomy of Romanticism from the fresh perspective of transatlantic cultural studies.[10]

11. As a result, these essays collectively shed light on one of the most fundamental, and largely undiscussed, problems in the field of transatlantic studies, namely, why there is such pronounced parallelism between nations, but uneven chronology, in the development of Romantic habits of thought. It has been usual to describe a delay of about thirty years in the flow of ideas from England to America. But the picture is more complicated than that. After all, republicanism achieved its first full flowering during the American Revolution, then crossed the Atlantic to reinvigorate English radicalism and inspire the French Revolution. But heroism and idealism crop up first in Germany, then find their way to England, and much later to New England. Similarly, the romantic novel took shape in Scott's hands as a literary technology for the authorization of English colonial dominion over Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. Then it was imported to the New World, where first it was used by Cooper, Sedgwick, Child and others to justify the displacement of natives east of the Mississippi, but then was adapted by Hawthorne, Stowe, and others to the rhetorical needs of feminists and abolitionists. It was finally redeployed by Dickens, Thackeray, and others, who used it to represent the brutality of class oppression in industrial capitalist England. In other words, romantic genres and structures of feeling moved fluidly back and forth across the Atlantic. And there was no typical vector of national cultural development that simply began at different times in different places.

12. The very expectation that there should be national and chronological uniformity of cultural development follows from narrowly idealist and formalist modes of analysis, from the habit of thinking about Romanticism as an episode in the history of ideas whose coherence inheres in a diagnostic set of discourses (idealism, exoticism, individualism) or aesthetic patterns (sublimity, exoticism, organicism). While it is true some thoughts and tropes were more central than others during the period, I would argue that they were central because of their substantial value to a particular class at a particular time in its development. That is, the core of Romanticism was the ideology and rhetoric of the British and American bourgeoisies as they first conquered and then began to exercise political and cultural power commensurate with their long burgeoning economic and social power. Romanticism began with a structure of feeling and a set of rhetorical strategies deployed by the emergent bourgeoisie to authorize and direct its political and economic ambitions, and it then evolved into the ongoing post-revolutionary project of underwriting that class's wholesale restructuring of culture and society in its interests. This was the central and most powerful current. But substantial eddies and cross-currents complicate the picture. Forces loyal to the residual feudal order engaged in cultural debate, subverting, inverting, and diverting Romanticism at the margins of the new order. Likewise, new revolutionary forces and radical movements—abolition, feminism, working class organizations—immediately began to appropriate and redeploy the bourgeoisie's ideas and arguments, directing their force against their creators in their position as a new ruling class.

13. Moreover, the economic and political transformation that Romanticism both responded to and shaped occurred in fits and starts, and this is what accounts for uneven cultural development. In North America, where the power of the crown was attenuated by distance, the bourgeoisie and its allies were able to take power directly and completely. In the British Isles, on the other hand, a long and hard fought process of transfer and transformation produced a system in which the monarchy now functioned more in the interests of the urban mercantile, commercial, and manufacturing elite rather than the landed aristocracy. Throughout the period, Romantic ideology was adaptively and creatively deployed by cultural producers from all classes, but always in ways shaped by this irregular and unpredictable process. Romanticism, in other words, is not a cluster of ideas or forms, but a period in the history of cultural politics during which the most fundamental structuring trend, the dynamic center of gravity around which ideas and rhetorics organized themselves, was the revolutionary emergence and subsequent consolidation of capitalism in the British empire.

14. This materialist account is meant to establish a principle of coherence for the subject of this volume of essays, transatlantic Romanticism, but it does not delimit the critical approaches to that subject taken by our nine authors, who present a variety of close readings, generic accounts, literary historical approaches, and cultural materialist analyses. In other words, rather than impose an artificial unity or foreclose particular critical options, this argument about periodization is designed to ground an expanded range of interpretive possibility, enabling discovery of the full richness of this exciting field. That range is reflected in how the essays in *Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic* can be organized around three central questions: what is the nature of transatlantic cultural influence, how does gender operate outside the national marriage, and what is the future of transatlantic Romantic Studies?

15. The first three essays demonstrate the substantial variability in the transatlantic circulation of literary nationalism. Sarah Ferguson-Wagstaffe sets out to unpack what has long been no more than a "critical intuition" by examining several "points of contact" between William Blake and Walt Whitman, two poets who bracket the long Romantic century. Rather than attempt to demonstrate direct influence, she focuses on formal parallels that mark them as definitively Romantic. Both adopt the stance of the national prophetic poet and both maintain a commitment to a "revisionary poetics" that demanded a "lifelong practice of revising their previously printed works." Each poet, as a printer, was intimately familiar with the "material conditions of producing and revising a long poem" through alternating episodes of "contraction and expansion," and each produced texts in which poetic troping of this mode of production served as a metaphor for the revolutionary transformation of the nation.

16. Sohui Lee reconstructs the literary nationalism of John Louis O'Sullivan's *Democratic Review*, publisher of many of Nathaniel Hawthorne's short stories. At a time when American readers seemed to be in the grip of a dangerous "Anglomania," O'Sullivan argued that an authentic national literature could counteract the anti-democratic propaganda of the nation's rapidly developing elite and strengthen the broader reading public's dedication to Jacksonian democratic principles. Crucially, it was in sentimental terms that he called for such a literature. Domestic fiction and sentimental poetry were the best means to cultivate the moral sentiments of "human sympathy, optimism, and brotherhood" that could "connect America's disparate classes and ethnic groups in a democratic community of feelings" that was specifically opposed to the "specter of England."

17. This powerful combination of democratic radicalism and literary nationalism shaped the output of many Romantic writers to be sure, but others were quite skeptical. Scott Harshbarger describes how Nathaniel Hawthorne and Robert Burns reacted similarly to Scottish and American nationalists who called for the appropriation of oral-tradition folklore to create a national literature. Both authors created subversive counter-narratives which draw on "the content and technique of folk legend...illuminating with a devilish light the complex relationship between demons, demonizers, and nation-making." Burns's "Tam O'Shanter" and Hawthorne's "Young Goodman Brown" demonstrate how tales of the

witch's sabbat kept alive belief in a sinister Other, which could be used to forge a unifying fear and hatred. Most importantly, both texts focus satiric attention on elite manipulation of folkloric materials to create social cohesion through hatred and scapegoating.

18. The second set of three essays in *Sullen Fires* explores the surprisingly complex intersections of gender and nationalism in transatlantic Romantic culture. If cultural producers interrogated and in some cases rejected nationalist appeals, consumers too demonstrated a good deal of autonomy. Cree LeFavour uses Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* to open a window on the chaotic and decidedly transnational U.S. literary marketplace. *Vanity Fair* is a parody of the sentimental novel and it enjoyed massive popularity during the decade following its 1848 U.S. publication. LeFavour argues against the position, common to those who study "women's nationally identified literary production," that the "antebellum literary world" was dominated by American women's sentimental novels. Instead, she argues that "the borders between 'genteel' American-authored sentimental fiction, British reprints that fit into this category, those that didn't, and American originals not fit for 'ladies' were constantly shifting." The way that reviewers praised the "realism" of *Vanity Fair* and expressed wry appreciation of transgressive characters like Becky Sharp shows that working and middle-class readers of the period were capable of real "sophistication and self-consciousness" in their consumption of "an extremely diverse range of fiction." In all, while literary nationalists attempted to forge a unified national culture in the antebellum U.S., both writers and their readers often tenaciously maintained their independence and internationalism.

19. Jen Camden explores the cultural politics of what she calls the forgotten heroine, a little-noticed element of marriage plots that narrativize questions of national identity. Ann Radcliffe's *A Sicilian Romance*, Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*, and James Fenimore Cooper's *The Pioneers* all feature paired female protagonists. In each case, the literal or figurative sister who demonstrates sense or reason is left out of a novelistic conclusion that rewards the reeducation of the sister characterized by sensibility or sentiment. But these forgotten heroines are not merely foils or "narrative loose ends"; they are "transgressive figures that...allow room for alternate subjectivities." Radcliffe's Emilia, for instance, operates as part of "a pattern of narrative violation [that] teaches us to be disappointed in the tidy ending." Through Emilia, who in the end chooses the role of tutor to the children of Hippolitus and Julia, "Radcliffe authors and authorizes an alternative to marriage." Similarly, Cooper's generous and pious Louisa "exiles herself from the marriage plot" embodying the cost of forging a unitary and aristocratic early national identity out of the disparate elements of frontier culture. Thus, while these novels concern themselves mainly with policing women's marriage choices and containing chaotic sentiment within the orderly structure of the national family, they also stage the forgotten suffering required to consolidate a unified nation.

20. If the figure of the forgotten heroine allowed women readers visionary escape from the domestic sphere, manly naval officers could demonstrate the power of sympathy to bind together a well-ordered republic. James Crane explores representations of male authority in maritime romances by Walter Scott and James Fenimore Cooper, showing how these two novelists engaged in a debate over the problem of political authority. Scott's *The Pirate* (1821) and Cooper's *The Pilot* (1823) feature "manly heroes who exercise authority through a personal charisma that operates ineffably on other men." But these figures are deployed to very different ends by the two authors. Scott celebrates paternal government, and conflates democracy with piracy, echoing the period's conservative critique of republicanism as a step on the way to "destructive social leveling, violent anarchy, and the eventual dissolution of the protective authority of the state." Cooper on the other hand treats affective exchanges between men as sites for the production of a stable meritocratic social order based on sympathy: here "men among men faithfully recognize the merit of one another because—as good citizens—they love each other so much."

21. The last three essays in *Sullen Fires* explore the rich cultural history of literary exchange between

England and Latin America. In so doing, they expand the field of transatlantic Romanticism to include, as it should, the entire Atlantic Rim around which capital, people, and ideas circulated. Joselyn Almeida argues that "the Spanish American nexus that connected London, Kingston, and even Dublin with Spain, the Caribbean, South America, and Africa has been largely overlooked." And she sets out to demonstrate the workings of this nexus by reconstructing Simón Bolívar's tremendously complex and canny self-fashioning for British and South American participants in London's multilingual magazine culture. Alternative versions of a biographical sketch of Bolívar appeared in the January 1823 numbers of the *New Monthly Magazine* and *Variedades*. Both articles were vetted by José Blanco White, but the second acknowledges Bolívar's 1810 visit to London, while the first suppresses this image of the great liberator's political ties to imperial Britain. Similarly, Bolívar's "Jamaica Letter," written in Kingston in 1815 and published in *The Jamaica Quarterly and Literary Gazette* in 1818, "aims to create a textual alliance between Britain and Latin America" and "uses the language of abolition as a critique of empire to gain sympathy for the Latin American cause." In short, Almeida demonstrates that transatlantic Romanticism will not have been fully constituted as a field until we recognize that because "intercultural exchanges cross linguistic borders" as easily as geographic ones, we cannot "invoke the Americas, the Caribbean, and the Atlantic, and ignore the crucial presence of Hispano-Americans, whom Romantic authors themselves acknowledged."

22. If the case of Bolívar shows a canny manipulation of audiences at the imperial center, Andre Cardoso demonstrates how the first Brazilian novels negotiated the demands of potential readers who "avidly consumed European novels." Joaquim Manuel de Macedo's *A Moreninha* shows that instead of being "an automatic attempt to copy the latest trends of European literature, the appropriation of foreign models by the early Brazilian novel was highly selective." *A Moreninha* narrativizes the circulation of cultural forms in its love plot, but "poking fun at the sentimental model is less a criticism of this model than a refusal to take *any* literary model too seriously.... The process of appropriation borrows from Europe a history for the genre of the novel, still virtually inexistent in Brazil by the time A Moreninha was published, at the same time that it neutralizes this history in presenting the Brazilian novel as a child who has not yet fully absorbed its education and is still largely free from the dictates of any tradition." Macedo represents the Brazilian novel, and Brazil itself, as spaces of simultaneous awareness and freedom "on the margins of the sea of international commerce, retaining its childlike innocence and originality, but at the same time engaging in an intensive interaction with European civilization."

23. Finally, Rebecca Cole Heinowitz describes how Robert Southey's long poem *Madoc* narrativizes the discourse of "good colonialism." This liberal defense of empire was most influentially voiced by Edmund Burke during the trial of Warren Hastings, the notoriously corrupt Governor General of India. Burke argued in terms "at once radically universalist and radically chauvinistic" that the violence of the British dominion in India, like that of the Spanish rule of America, resulted from the failure of greedy and short-sighted colonizers to see their fundamental "sameness" with the colonized. Southey's *Madoc*, makes a similar liberal critique of imperialism by telling the tale of the exiled Welsh Prince Madoc and his people, refugees from the invading English, who forge an alliance with the Hoamen against oppressive Aztec warlords. After overthrowing the Aztecs, Hoamen natives and Welsh settlers amalgamate to form a utopian new society. "By asserting that the natives of Aztlan had been British from 1170 onwards, Southey could legitimate modern British intervention in the area as having a reference point historically anterior to (and morally superior to) Spain's." By banishing the violence of conquest from the poem and staging cultural hybridization through the self-transcending union of Malinal and Madoc, Southey imaginatively replaces "the scene of desperate native betrayal by the Spanish with one of enlightened native collaboration with the British." In other words, sameness calls for benevolent rather than mercenary conquest. Once that conquest has been completed, sameness helps to explain the seemingly inevitable fate of the conquered.

24. In *America: A Prophecy*, William Blake narrates the opening moments of the transatlantic Romantic century: "The Guardian Prince of Albion" stares at the blood red light of "Sullen fires across the Atlantic" where the American revolutionary army has gathered. There, Washington reminds his compatriots that "a heavy iron chain / Descends link by link from Albions cliffs across the sea to bind / Brothers & sons of America..." (5). A cataclysm of revolutionary violence follows, as it must, and Orc, the "lover of wild rebellion" (9), emerges from the dark clouds of war. Blake engraves him as a naked Adamic figure sprawled atop a moldering skeleton, looking confidently into clearing sky and singing a hymn to human liberation:

> Let the slave grinding at the mill, run out into the field:
> Let him look up into the heavens & laugh in the bright air;
> Let the inchained soul shut up in darkness and in sighing,
> Whose face has never seen a smile in thirty weary years;
> Rise and look out, his chains are loose, his dungeon doors are open.
> And let his wife and children return from the opressors scourge;
> They look behind at every step & believe it is a dream.
> Singing. The Sun has left his blackness, & has found a fresher morning
> And the fair Moon rejoices in the clear & cloudless night;
> For Empire is no more, and now the Lion & Wolf shall cease. (8)

Orc's revolutionary impulse is the driving force of transatlantic Romanticism. It shaped the political aspirations of the revolutionary bourgeoisie, aspirations voiced most influentially by figures like Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, William Godwin, and Mary Wollstonecraft. It also inspired the explosive insurgency of post-revolutionary movements for reform—abolition, women's rights, native American anti-imperialism, organized labor, utopian socialism, and more—that sought to broaden the horizons of freedom once the bourgeoisie had established itself firmly in power in the transatlantic capitalist world it had created. Thus, Orc's vision of liberation also structures the vibrant literary culture of a period marked by staggeringly inventive experimentation, with its declamatory calls for action on behalf of the oppressed, its sensitive delineations of human desire and subjectivity, its sweeping surveys of complex social orders and histories, and even its reactionary satires of revolutionary and reformist hubris. The essays in *Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism* draw nine transects through this exciting cultural field, nine lines of inquiry that intersect at a central point: the nation, the protagonist of both Romantic narratives of revolution and of critical narratives of Romanticism. Taken together, these essays demonstrate that transatlantic literary relations during the long Romantic century were far more intricate, far more nuanced, than a mere agon of national cultures.

Notes

[1] Marietta Messmer provides a thorough and compelling genealogy of literary historiographical nationalism in the US, and argues that it is time for the revisionist "intra-American cultural pluralism" of recent decades to be supplemented by studies of "America's transnational or global interliterary and intercultural relations" (50).

[2] For a preciously stuffy statement of the mid-century nationalist position, see Robert Hertz's "English and American Romanticism" (1965), which notes that "we characterize the Romantics of the United States as men of affirmation, optimism, and healthy vision of the certain glory which lies a little beyond. By implication, the English Romantics are brilliant but effete aristocrats rather than men of the People or great souls of quiet meditation and discovery" (81). See Russell Reising, Gerald Graff, and David R. Shumway for general accounts of the nationalistic impulses behind the disciplinary formation of American Literature.

[3] Another influential summary statement of the common sense of old historicism is Tony Tanner's essay, "Notes for a Comparison between American and European Romanticism" (1968), in one of the earliest issues of the journal of the British Association for American Studies. Tanner is mainly concerned to differentiate American practice from the known quantity of the European tradition. He observes that the Americans have an abiding sense of solitude in nature, a low regard for history, and, more surprisingly, that they do not have a "revolutionary social dimension," that is, an "energizing conviction that the poet's imaginative visions...could vitally influence and enhance the conditions of life of their fellow men" (97).

[4] Linden Peach makes a systematic argument of this position in his British Influence on the Birth of American Literature (1982).

[5] Brantley expands his argument in Anglo-American Antiphony: The Late Romanticism of Tennyson and Emerson (1994) and in Experience and Faith : The Late-Romantic Imagination of Emily Dickinson (2005).

[6] Two important earlier studies of reciprocity in the formation of American and British national identity are Christopher Mulvey's Anglo-American Landscapes (1983) and Transatlantic Manners (1990), both of which use travel narratives as their main body of evidence.

[7] Another way of complicating the easy tale of American Romanticism's rebellion against Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, and Keats has been to demonstrate that Emerson, Thoreau, Fuller, and the rest were consciously indebted to wholly other forebears. See, for instance, Susan Manning's two excellent studies of connections between Scottish and American literary cultures. Also see Robin Grey's account of the importance of 17th-Century English culture to the major authors of the American Renaissance.

[8] See also Giles's exploration of the term "transnational" along with his rereading of Emerson and Thoreau in the context of early national Anglophobia in "Transnationalism and Classic American Literature." An important complementary study of the way in which British nationalism developed as part of the rise of imperialism is Saree Makdisi's Romantic Imperialism (1998), which rereads the central Romantic poets in the context of developments in India, Africa, and the Arab world.

[9] Several recent collections of essays have begun to explore the field mapped most thoroughly by Gravil. Comparative Romanticisms: Power, Gender, Subjectivity (1998), edited by Larry H. Peer and Diane Long Hoeveler provides twelve case studies of the true internationalism of the three analytical categories listed in the title. These essays make connections around the entire Atlantic Rim and beyond, with readings of American, British, German, French, Italian, and Russian texts. A second collection of essays from the discipline of comparative literature, this one focusing more narrowly on connections between the British, French, and German Romantics, is Gregory Maertz's collection, Cultural Interactions in the Romantic Age (1998). Also important for its accounts of the internationalism of both natural history and republicanism and their literary consequences is Revolutions and Watersheds: Transatlantic Dialogues 1775-1815 (1999), edited by W. M. Verhoeven and Beth Kautz. More recently, Verhoeven has edited Revolutionary Histories: Transatlantic Cultural Nationalism, 1775-1815 (2002), an impressive volume centered on the Romantic keywords, "history" and "nation." Finally, the first half of Special Relationships: Anglo-American Affinities and Antagonisms, 1854-1936, edited by Janet Beer and Bridget Bennett offers a valuable selection of case studies in late Romanticism.

[10] See the two recent collections of essays in transatlantic studies edited by Will Kaufman and Heidi Slettedahl Macpherson for a sampling of the full range of concerns, outside the Romantic period, addressed by this new discipline.

Works Cited

Beer, Janet and Bridget Bennett, eds. Special Relationships: Anglo-American Affinities and Antagonisms, 1854-1936. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Blake, William. America: A Prophecy. Copy E: Electronic Edition. http://www.blakearchive.org/exist/blake/archive/copyinfo.xq?copyid=america.e

Bloom, Harold. The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Brantley, Richard. Anglo-American Antiphony: The Late Romanticism of Tennyson and Emerson. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1994.

Brantley, Richard. Coordinates of Anglo-American Romanticism: Wesley, Edwards, Carlyle & Emerson. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993.

Brantley, Richard. Experience and Faith : The Late-Romantic Imagination of Emily Dickinson. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Chai, Leon. The Romantic Foundations of the American Renaissance. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

Fender, Stephen. Sea Changes: British Emigration and American Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Giles, Paul. Transatlantic Insurrections: British Culture and the Formation of American Literature. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Giles, Paul. "Transnationalism and Classic American Literature." PMLA 118.1 (January 2003), 62-77.

Gilroy, Paul. The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness. New York: Verso, 1995.

Graff, Gerald. Professing Literature: An Institutional History. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Gravil, Richard. Romantic Dialogues: Anglo-American Continuities, 1776-1862. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Greenblatt, Stephen and Giles Gunn, eds. Redrawing the Boundaries: the Transformation of English and American Literary Studies. New York: MLA, 1992.

Grey, Robin. The Complicity of Imagination: The American Renaissance, Contests of Authority, and 17th-Century English Culture. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hertz, Robert. "English and American Romanticism." Personalist 46 (1965), 81-92.

Kaufman, Will and Heidi Slettedahl Macpherson, eds. Transatlantic Studies. Lanham, Md. : University Press of America, 2000.

Keach, William. "A Transatlantic Romantic Century," European Romantic Review 11.1 (Winter 2000), 31-34.

Macpherson, Heidi Slettedahl and Will Kaufman, eds. New Perspectives in Transatlantic Studies. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2002.

Maertz, Gregory, ed. Cultural Interactions in the Romantic Age. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Makdisi, Saree. Romantic Imperialism: Universal Empire and the Culture of Modernity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Manning, Susan. The Puritan-Provincial Vision: Scottish and American Literature in the Nineteenth Century. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Manning, Susan. Fragments of Union: Making Connections in Scottish and American Writing. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Messmer, Marietta. "Toward a Declaration of Interdependence: or, Interrogating the Boundaries in Twentieth-Century Histories of North American Literature." PMLA 118.1 (January 2003), 41-55.

Miller, Perry. "Thoreau in the Context of International Romanticism." The New England Quarterly 34 (1961), 147-59.

Mulvey, Christopher. Anglo-American Landscapes : A Study of Nineteenth-Century Anglo-American Travel Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Mulvey, Christopher. Transatlantic Manners: Social Patterns in Nineteenth-Century Anglo-American Travel Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Peach, Linden. British Influence on the Birth of American Literature. London: Macmillan, 1982.

Peer, Larry H. and Diane Long Hoeveler. Comparative Romanticisms: Power, Gender, Subjectivity. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1998.

Reising, Russell. The Unusable Past: Theory and the Study of American Literature. New York: Methuen, 1986.

Shumway, David R. Creating American Civilization: A Genealogy of American Literature as a Discipline. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Spender, Stephen. Love-Hate Relations: English and American Sensibilities. New York: Random House, 1974.

Tanner, Tony. "Notes for a Comparison between American and European Romanticism." Journal of American Studies 2 (1968), 83-103.

Verhoeven, W.M., ed. Revolutionary Histories: Transatlantic Cultural Nationalism, 1775-1815. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Verhoeven, W.M., and Kautz, Beth, eds. Revolutions and Watersheds: Transatlantic Dialogues 1775-1815. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999.

Weisbuch, Robert. Atlantic Double-Cross: American Literature and British Influence in the Age of Emerson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism

"Points of Contact": Blake and Whitman

Sarah Ferguson-Wagstaffe, Harvard University

1. On September 29, 1890 Whitman enclosed a rough sketch of his tomb in a letter to his literary executor, Richard Maurice Bucke. An outline of a house with a door is surrounded by design specifications: "Walt Whitman's burial vault—on a sloping wooded hill—grey granite—unornamental—surroundings trees, turf, sky, a hill everything crude and natural" (*The Correspondence* 5: 95; sketch reproduced bet. 212-213). Whitman based the design on William Blake's engraving "Death's Door," which he encountered in 1881 when he read Alexander Gilchrist's *Life of William Blake*.[1]

"Death's Door," Collection of Robert N. Essick. Copyright © 2005 *The William Blake Archive*

2. In "Death's Door," an old, bearded man hunched over a crutch steps inside the open doorway of a square, stone structure. The wind blows at the old man's back, rippling his garment and his beard; just inside the door is a rolled mat on a raised surface. As this dying physical body enters "Death's Door," a vibrant young man surrounded by rays of light crouches on top of the stone structure, representing the life of the soul.

3. Whitman's tomb is a compelling sign of connection between Blake and Whitman—two poets who printed and self-published multiple versions of poems that engage the imagination and grapple with issues of religion, sexuality, and politics. In this essay I attempt to illuminate a material point of contact between Blake and Whitman—Whitman's tomb—through a close reading of these poets' rhetorical points of contact. I also hope to reopen a transatlantic dialogue between Blake and Whitman through this formalist consideration of similarities in their poetic works. In order to understand the significance

of Blake's presence at Whitman's tomb, this essay will explore Whitman's responses to Blake in his letters and notes, their shared status as prophetic poets, and their poetics of revision.

Swinburne's Idea of Resemblance

4. Whitman, who was eight years old when Blake died in 1827, was probably introduced to Blake's works in 1868, the year Blake's *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*, *Poetical Sketches* and Algernon Charles Swinburne's book, *William Blake: A Critical Essay*, were published.[2] It is unclear when, or whether, Whitman read these books, but we do know that Moncure Conway, who reviewed *William Blake* in the *Fortnightly Review* (February 1868), made Whitman aware that Swinburne refers to him in his book. Whitman wrote to Conway,

> I have not yet seen the February Fortnightly—nor the book William Blake—but shall procure & read both. I feel prepared in advance to render my cordial and admirant respect to Mr. Swinburne—and would be glad to have him know that I thank him heartily for the mention which, I understand, he has made of me in the Blake. (Conway, 1: bet. 218-219) [3]

Swinburne more than mentions Whitman in *William Blake*: in his estimation, Blake and Whitman are uncannily similar. He writes,

> I can remember one poet only whose work seems to me the same or similar in kind; a poet as vast in aim, as daring in detail, as unlike others, as coherent to himself, as strange without and as sane within. The points of contact and sides of likeness between William Blake and Walt Whitman are so many and so grave, as to afford some ground of reason to those who preach the transition of souls or transfusion of spirits. (300)

Despite Swinburne's enthusiastic and flourishing prose style, he goes on to identify these "sides of likeness" in extremely broad terms. For example, he writes: "The great American is not a more passionate preacher of sexual or political freedom than the English artist"; "The words of either strike deep and run wide and soar high"; and "The divine devotion and selfless love which make men martyrs and prophets are alike visible and palpable in each" (300-1). These proclamations of near identity go on for a few pages, and even though for Swinburne there is almost nothing that could be said of one poet which could not be said of the other, he admits that Whitman's poetry is more accessible than Blake's: "Whitman has seldom struck a note of thought and speech so just and so profound as Blake has now and then touched upon; but his work is generally more frank and fresh, smelling of sweeter air, and readier to expound or expose its message, than this of the 'Prophetic Books'" (303).

5. Whitman's friend, John Swinton, agreed with Swinburne and tested his claim: he read Blake's poems aloud to friends and actually "passed them off" as Whitman's. In a letter to William and Ellen O'Connor (September 1868), Whitman writes,

> Swinton has lately been posting himself about William Blake, his poems—has the new London edition of W.B. in two vols. He, Swinton, gives me rather new information in one respect—says that the formal resemblance between several pieces of Blake, & my pieces, is so marked that he, S, has, with persons that partially know me, passed them off temporarily for mine, & read them aloud as such. He asked me pointedly whether I had not met with Blake's productions in my youth, &c—said that Swinburne's idea of resemblance &c was not so wild, after all. Quite funny, isn't it? (*The Correspondence* 2: 48-9)[4]

Though Swinton "pointedly" asked whether Whitman had previously "met with Blake's productions,"

the absence of an answer here is particularly evasive, but not uncommon—Whitman's sporadic and cursory comments about Blake typically refer more to himself, and none concerns Blake's poetry specifically. William O'Connor replied consolingly that *Leaves of Grass* resembles Blake's poetry as much as a "complex-melodied Italian opera, sung by voices half-human, half-divine" resembles "the Gregorian chant, bellowed by bull-necked priests with donkey lips" (*The Correspondence* 2: 49n). Whether we read Whitman's question, "Quite funny, isn't it?" ironically or not, it is clear that Whitman's originality is at stake when people take Swinburne's "idea of resemblance" seriously. Whitman reveals his uneasiness with attempts to pair him and Blake more openly in a short note written around the same time Swinburne's *William Blake* was published:

> Of William Blake & Walt Whitman. Both are mystics, extatics but the difference between them is this—and a vast difference it is: Blake's visions grow to be the rule, displace the normal condition, fill the field, spurn the visible, objective life, & seat the subjective spirit on an absolute throne, willful & uncontrolled. But Whitman, though he occasionally prances off, takes flight with an abandon & capriciousness of step or wing, and a rapidity & whirling power, which quite dizzy the reader in his first attempts to follow, always holds the mastery over himself, &, even in his most intoxicated lunges or pirouettes, never once loses control, or even equilibrium. To the pe[rfect] sense, it is evident that he goes off because he permits himself to do so, while ever the director, or direct'g principle sits coolly at hand, able to stop the wild teetotum & reduce it to order, at any a moment. In Walt Whitman, escapades of this sort are the exceptions. The main character of his poetry is the normal, the universal, the simple, the eternal platform of the best manly & womanly qualities. (*Faint Clews & Indirections* 53)

Here, he adopts the thin guise of a reviewer who is not Walt Whitman, and lays out the differences between Blake and Whitman in the assured diction of a literary critic. Though they may appear to be similar kinds of poets—"mystics, extatics"—he can tell the difference: Whitman is in control of his visions while Blake is not. Blake's visions lose sight of the "normal condition," ignore the "objective life," and turn the "subjective spirit" into a tyrant; Whitman, however, both authorizes and regulates his flights of fancy. Whitman's "escapades" are a dizzying dance, a performance balanced by a "direct'g principle" that is lacking in Blake's visions. Whitman-as-reviewer is also in control of Walt Whitman's poetic reception: this is what he wants the literary world to say about his relation to Blake. But we should not forget that Whitman's desire to distinguish himself from Blake remained private—a note to, and for, himself.

Passionate Preachers

6. Notwithstanding Whitman's distinctions, the prophetic dimension of Blake's and Whitman's poetry is perhaps their most familiar connection. Twentieth-century American poets Hart Crane and Allen Ginsberg first drew my attention to Blake and Whitman as prophetic poets: in Crane's *The Bridge*, Whitman is prominently featured in the "Cape Hatteras" section, and Blake provides the epigram for "The Tunnel" section; Ginsberg references Whitman formally, and Blake directly, in *Howl* when he talks about those "who passed through universities with radiant cool eyes hallucinating Arkansas and Blake-light tragedy among the scholars of war" (6). Ginsberg, of course, mentions Blake and Whitman in other poems, including "America," "Sunflower Sutra," and "Poem Rocket," in which he says, "Here I am naked without identity / with no more body than the fine black tracery of pen mark on soft paper / as star talks to star multiple beams of sunlight all the same myriad thought / in one fold of the universe where Whitman was / and Blake" (24-28).

7. Prophecy means to speak forth, before, or for, and prophetic writing attempts to communicate the

divine voice through a textual vision. Blake writes in "All Religions are One" that the "Poetic Genius is the true Man" who is also "every where call'd the Spirit of Prophecy," and again in his annotations to the Bishop of Llandaff's *An Apology for the Bible* that the prophet "utters his opinions both of private & public matters."[5] Ian Balfour explains that Blake's view of prophecy is similar to that in Protestant discourse of the seventeenth century, like Jeremy Taylor's *The Liberty of Prophesying* (1647), in which prophecy "has more to do with freedom of expression or sheer speaking on behalf of God than with prediction of the future" (131).[6] In a similar vein in his Preface to *Leaves of Grass*, Whitman states that "the greatest poet" is "a seer" and "every man shall be his own priest."[7] Biblical prophecy is especially important to both poets' works: among numerous examples, Isaiah and Ezekiel dine with the poet in Blake's *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, and "All flesh is grass" (Isaiah 40:6) resonates throughout Whitman's verse. Blake's mythological system is fundamentally biblical and, working on the third (1860) edition of *Leaves of Grass*, Whitman was involved in what he called "The Great Construction of the New Bible" (*Notebooks* 1:353).

8. That only a handful of essays on Blake and Whitman have been published (in the early 1980s) attests to the notion that their similarities are considered more a literary intuition than an avenue for critical exploration.[8] However, both Malcolm Cowley and Donald Pease provide us with useful terms of comparison. In his *Introduction to Walt Whitman's Leaves of Grass: The First (1855) Edition*, Cowley argues that Whitman's *Song of Myself* and Blake's illuminated works belong to a larger, prophetic canon that includes works ranging from the *Bhagavad-Gita* to Rimbaud's *Illuminations*.[9] Within such a canon, works deeply concerned with cultural politics would fall under the aegis of what Donald Pease calls "epic prophecies," or visions of "what is possible for a nation at a particular time in history" ("Blake, Whitman, Crane" 25). Both Blake's continental prophecies, especially *Visions of the Daughters of Albion, America, Europe*, and the unengraved *The French Revolution* can be considered alongside Whitman's writings on the Civil War, especially *Drum-Taps* and *Specimen Days*, the Independence Day publication of the 1855 *Leaves of Grass*, and the centennial 1876 *Leaves of Grass*.

9. The national and religious dimensions of Blake's poetic prophecy are markedly different from Whitman's. Several of Blake's poems tell the story of Orc, who represents "Revolution in the material world" (Damon 309). Blake's *America, A Prophecy* records the effect of the American revolution on Europe: Orc breaks free from his chains (Los, his father, bound him to a mountain), war enters the world, and he is rebuked as an unholy agent of liberty. Here, as well as in the continuation of this tale in *Europe, A Prophecy*, the spiritual world is reflected in the material world. Revolution in the material world will always lose touch with its original meaning and fail, unless it is led by Jesus, who, for Blake, was the original spiritual revolutionary. Therefore, national liberty can only be achieved through a specifically Christian vision. According to S. Foster Damon, the final three chapters of *Jerusalem* (which signifies Liberty in Blake's mythological schema)—addressed to the Jews, the Deists, and the Christians—"analyze man's progress through Experience until he reaches the Truth": the Jewish religion is that of "Moral Law" and "the childhood of the human race"; the Deist religion is that of "young manhood [which] retains the Moral Law, but substitutes Nature for God"; and the Christian religion is that of "maturity—particularly plagued by the errors of sex—the false ideal of chastity" (210). Jerusalem is a prophetic vision of the true religion, which Man can achieve once he moves through these stages, eliminates all these errors, and embraces God within himself. In the introductory address in *Jerusalem*, "To the Public," Blake expresses the hope that the reader will "be with" him, "wholly One in Jesus our Lord" (plate 3).[10] To "be with" Blake, as his reader, is to unite with Jesus, become part of the creative and illuminating process of the imagination, and ultimately recognize the divine and infinite within.

10. For Blake, an exclusively Christian vision of reunion with God must be adopted in order for humanity to be redeemed: the state of the nation depends on the spiritual state of its citizens and, ultimately, everyone is a citizen of Jerusalem. For Whitman, however, God is equal to, and exists in, everything:

> I have said that the soul is not more than the body,
> And I have said that the body is not more than the soul,
> And nothing, not God, is greater to one than one's-self is
> (. . .)
> I hear and behold God in every object, yet I understand God not
> in the least,
> Nor do I understand who there can be more wonderful than myself. (*Song of Myself* 1262-64, 1274-75)

Whitman's spiritual vision does not involve evolutionary stages of religion that lead to Christianity; rather, it includes all religions. In "Salut au Monde!" he hears "the Arab muezzin calling from the top of the mosque," "the Hebrew reading his records and psalms," "the rhythmic myths of the Greeks," "the tale of the divine life and bloody death of the beautiful God the Christ," and "the Hindoo teaching his favorite pupil" (*Leaves of Grass by Walt Whitman* 288). Christ—Whitman does not refer to him as Jesus in *Leaves of Grass*—represents the ideal of brotherhood, of the love of another as one's self, or comradeship: "Young man, I think I know you—I think this face of yours is the face of the Christ himself, / Dead and divine and brother of all, here again he lies" ("A Sight in Camp in the Daybreak Gray and Dim," *Leaves of Grass by Walt Whitman* 441).[11] Whitman believes, like Blake, that humans are divine, but he also believes that they are equally as divine as God and such knowledge requires no mediation. Whitman's address to the reader in the Preface to *Song of Myself* is not expressed as a hope, but rather as a directive that does not include a specific religious reference: he says, "You shall stand by my side and look in the mirror with me" (13). Within this lateral structure of perception, both author and reader are reflected. Indeed, it is this imperative and necessary relationship between author and reader that Whitman's poem traces: the trajectory of *Song of Myself* moves from "I" to "you"—from "*I* celebrate myself" to "I stop somewhere waiting for *you*." Whitman's desire for, and performative declaration of, reciprocity takes place through the text in which we see both I and you. The state of the nation, according to Whitman, depends as much on the spiritual state of its citizens as it does on their citizenship in the human race.

Revisionary Poetics

11. Both Blake and Whitman engaged in the lifelong practice of revising their previously printed works. The nature of their poetic revision is complex and wide-ranging, and we will glimpse only a narrow view of it here by focusing on tropes of the practice of revision—contraction and expansion—in each poet's work. Before we look at contraction and expansion, we should note that Blake and Whitman revised their poems in many different ways. Blake rewrote particular stories in several different poems and he also produced multiple copies of his poems. Each copy of one of his poems is unique: variation among them includes plate order, design, and coloration. For example, only two of the eight copies of *The Book of Urizen* contain all the plates Blake etched for the poem, and in each copy the full-page designs are ordered differently. Each poem is, in effect, all the different copies of that poem; and each copy represents a different way of seeing that necessarily includes other versions in its purview. There is considerable disagreement among critics about whether variations in Blake's works are intentional changes, or inherent consequences of his method of production (etching, inking, printing, washing in watercolors, etc.). In "The Text, the Poem, and the Problem of Historical Method," Jerome McGann claims that Blake produced unique copies of *Jerusalem* purposefully, unfettered by artistic limitation: variations are not "merely accidental, and unimportant for the 'meaning' of Blake's work. Certainly to Blake they seemed immensely consequential" (276). Alternatively, Joseph Viscomi argues that variation is a consequence of the way in which Blake produced copies of a poem, but it is not a consequential part of the poem's meaning: the "assumption that variants were intended or perceived by Blake as meaningful, produced deliberately to destabilize the text and to make every copy of a book a

separate version, is based on a misunderstanding of Blake's mode of book production and its ruling paradigm . . . variation—in the form of states, proofs, prints before letters, size and type of paper, and so on—was inherent to the aesthetics and economics of conventional print production . . .The differences are in emphasis and detail, not in the nature of phenomenon" (*Blake and the Idea of the Book* 167, 169).[12] I would argue that McGann's and Viscomi's positions are not mutually exclusive: Blake's method of production probably resulted in unintentional variations, and Blake might have changed, for example, the order of plates in a copy of a poem on purpose. Both kinds of variation have implications for our reading of multiple copies of one of Blake's poems.

12. Whitman's revision of *Leaves of Grass* spanned over more than thirty-five years, during which he added poems, excised poems, created "clusters," changed titles, and added supplements. For example, the 1855 version contains twelve untitled poems; the 1856 version contains thirty-two poems (all with titles); the 1860 version contains one hundred and forty-six new poems (all grouped into clusters); and the 1881 version contains final cluster titles and sequences of poems within clusters.[13] Unlike Blake, who did not designate one particular copy of a poem for publication, Whitman clearly states his preference for the final edition of *Leaves of Grass*. At the beginning of the 1891-2 edition he writes, "As there are now several editions of L. of G., different texts and dates, I wish to say that I prefer and recommend this present one, complete for future printing, if there should be any"; moreover, shortly before he died he issued a statement that the 1892 edition should "absolutely supercede all previous ones" (*Leaves of Grass by Walt Whitman* 148, 703).

13. In this last section, we will look at the appearance of tropes of revision in scenes of crisis in Blake's and Whitman's poems. Both Blake's characters and Whitman's subject encounter a crisis of perception that threatens their expansion. These subjects in Blake's poetry are, of course, allegorical or mythic figures enacting a story, while in Whitman's poetry the subject is, as John Berryman puts it, a voice "for himself [and] for others *as himself*" (246). In Blake's story of limited perception in *The Book of Urizen*, characters become what they behold: contraction is a result of fallen perception, but such a state is actually necessary for imaginative expansion. In *Song of Myself*, the speaker overcomes the daybreak's threat to his expansion by becoming what he beholds through his vision and his voice. In both Blake and Whitman, then, subjects overcome (actual or potential) contraction by becoming what they behold in order to expand.

14. To see how contraction and expansion are figured in Blake, it is necessary to first rehearse the creation myth of Urizen. *The Book of Urizen* actually describes two creation myths: that of Los (the imagination) and that of Urizen ("your reason," limitation, and law). In seven ages, reminiscent of the seven days of biblical creation, Los forged and limited Urizen into physical form: his spine "writh'd in torment" and ribs "froze / Over all his nerves of joy" in the first Age (9.37, 39-41); a heart shot out veins and arteries in the second Age; his "nervous brain shot branches / Round the branches of his heart" and formed two eyes "fixed in two little caves," or eye-sockets, in the third Age (10.11-12, 14); two ears formed in the fourth Age; two nostrils "bent down to the deep" in the Fifth Age (12.1); a "Tongue / Of thirst & of hunger appeard" in the sixth Age (12.8-9); his arms shot out to the north and south, and his feet "stampd" the "nether Abyss" in the seventh, and final, Age (12.16). At the beginning of Chapter V (Plate 12), Los "shrunk" in "terrors" from his task (12.20),

> Then he look'd back with anxious desire
> But the space undivided by existence
> Struck horror into his soul.
> 6. Los wept obscur'd with mourning
> His bosom earthquak'd with sighs
> He saw Urizen deadly black
> In his chains bound & Pity began

7. In anguish dividing & dividing
For pity divides the soul
In pangs eternity on eternity (12.45-54)

After lamenting the separation between himself and eternity, "the space undivided by existence," Los perceived Urizen, bound in chains. Los' division results both from seeing Urizen as divided from himself and from the emotion associated with this realization. Los became the division and separation he beheld. "Pity" began in Los as emotion and became a "round globe of blood / Trembling upon the void" (12.58-59) that "branched out into roots" and fibres, and eventually became a "female form trembling and pale" (16.2, 7).[14]

15. Los' initial division does not cease: he continues "dividing & dividing / For pity divides the soul" (13.52-53). In the fallen world of time and space, Pity also redeems, or reunites the soul, but Pity "cannot reunite unless there has been a previous division." (Damon 327). Pity, later called Enitharmon (Los' emanation, or female counterpart), is Blake's Eve figure. Leopold Damrosch notes that although she "tantalizes and frustrate[s]" Los later in *The Book of Urizen*, Enitharmon is "considered a merciful limit to the fall" (183). In theological terms, Eve/Enitharmon secures the eventual embodiment of Jesus Christ; the repetition of generation will produce God incarnate, through whom humanity might be redeemed. Contrary to the denial of resemblance inherent in a contracted perception that sees only the horror of individuation and limitation, the Divine Vision entails an expansive vision through which one sees a similitude between the Divine and the human. Blake's concept of Christian redemption can be understood in terms of perception: reunion is made possible through the figure of Jesus, in whom Blake's characters see "the Eternal Vision! the Divine Similitude!" at the end of *Jerusalem* (34[38].11). In Jesus, one can see both human and divine, and for Blake, this is the realization that expands our perception to include seeing the divine in ourselves.

16. While the mythic characters in Blake's poems contract and expand through perception, Whitman, or a version of Whitman, in *Song of Myself*, contracts and expands through touch. Whitman's lexicon of expansion is extensive: for example, in *Song of Myself*, he "chant[s] a new chant of dilation" (428), he is "Partaker of influx and efflux," (462), and flies as "the fluid and swallowing soul" (799). It is also important to note that Whitman, as the subject of *Song of Myself*, is multiple: he incorporates "other" voices through and as his own. Ronald Beck explains that "At times the speaker seems to be a persona named Walt Whitman, at other times the voice of all mankind, at other times the voice of the mystical unity at the center of all being. Not only does the point of view shift, but it is often difficult to tell exactly when it shifts, and it is sometimes impossible to tell which voice is speaking" (35). The speaker in *Song of Myself* expands into a kosmos: "Walt Whitman, an American, one of the roughs, a kosmos, / Disorderly fleshy and sensual" (499-500). "Many long dumb" and "forbidden voices" filter out through his expansive body, and then, in a moment reminiscent of Blake's "Human Form Divine" and his assertion that "every Minute Particular is Holy: / Embraces are Cominglings: From the Head even to the Feet," Whitman proclaims, "Divine I am inside and out, and I make holy whatever I touch or am touched from" (Jerusalem 69.42-3, *Song of Myself* 526).[15] Whitman, as poet of the body and of the soul, figures the relationship between self and other in sacramental and physical terms. He has "instant conductors" all over his body that "seize every object and lead it harmlessly" through him; he need only "press" with his fingers to be happy (614-16). But this touching, in which he "merely stirs," also limits Whitman's expansion: "To touch my person to some one else's is about as much as I can stand" (617). He continues, "Is this then a touch? .... quivering me to a new identity," and an intensely visceral and sexual description of forced physical contact follows: "On all sides prurient provokers stiffening my limbs / Straining the udder of my heart for its withheld drip" (622-23).[16] His "fellow-senses" are personified as "sentries" who were "bribed to swap off with touch, and go and graze at the edges" of him (628-9). "Touch" has turned his other senses into traitors; he loses his wits and admits that he is "the greatest traitor" (637). When Whitman's senses leave their posts, "villain touch" overwhelms him

to the point where he can hardly breathe (639). Whitman acquiesces, "You are too much for me" (640).

17. In the middle of Whitman's expansion and contraction here, he experiences a crisis of perception. Whitman beholds the daybreak, but before he can see the sun itself, he sees its rays: "Something I cannot see puts upward libidinous prongs, / Seas of bright juice suffuse heaven" (557-8). When he sees the sunrise, it threatens to annihilate him: "Dazzling and tremendous how quick the sunrise would kill me, / If I could not now and always send sunrise out of me" (562-3). The speaker circumvents the threat of potentially fatal contraction by becoming like the sun, by becoming what he beholds: "We also ascend dazzling and tremendous as the sun," and the daybreak is suddenly "calm and cool" (564-5). Then, remarkably, the speaker sends the sunrise out of himself through his voice: "My voice goes after what my eyes cannot reach, / With the twirl of my tongue I encompass worlds and volumes of worlds" (566-7). Whitman becomes what he beholds through vision, and then reaches beyond what he beholds through his voice, making expansion possible. Moreover, Whitman becomes what we behold: a sunrise whose rays reach us through his voice.

Death's Door of Perception

18. When Whitman read Gilchrist's *Life of Blake* in 1881, Blake was no longer a potentially threatening poetic rival. In a January letter to George and Susan Stafford he wrote that Gilchrist's two volumes "are queer books, the very finest of printing & paper & some odd pictures"; two weeks later he wrote, "though they are very queer in the story of Blake's life and works, there is a deal that is interesting & good to chew on—then they are such beautiful specimens of paper & printing, it is a pleasure to read them" (*The Correspondence* 3: 206, 208). Gilchrist's book succeeded in capturing Whitman's attention through both the story of Blake and the reproductions of his plates.[17] What finally drew Whitman to Blake was the *material beauty* of the book about Blake. Whitman beheld Blake's "Death's Door" in Gilchrist's book and decided to use it as a model for his tomb.

Whitman's tomb, Harleigh Cemetery, Camden, New Jersey.
Photograph by Sarah Ferguson-Wagstaffe.

19. The inscription on the roof of Whitman's tomb—simply, "Walt Whitman"—points to the immortality of the soul, represented by the shining young man atop the stone structure in Blake's design. Whitman's tomb is not only a version of Blake's "Death's Door," it is also a door of perception for us, through which he has already passed.

Notes

I would like to thank Reeve Parker, Debra Fried, and Marlon Kuzmick for their careful reading of earlier

versions of this essay.

[1] In "Chats with Walt Whitman," Gilchrist's daughter, Grace, confirms that Whitman's burial house is a "design he himself chose from Blake's fine engraving of Death's Door" (212). Alexander Gilchrist's wife, Anne, is a particularly interesting point of contact between Blake and Whitman: she finished *Life of William Blake, "Pictor ignotus"* (1863), after her husband died suddenly in 1861; read *Leaves of Grass* in 1869 and became enamored with the poet; published a defense of *Leaves of Grass* in an anonymous article entitled, "An Englishwoman's Estimate of Walt Whitman" (*The Radical*, May 1870); corresponded with Whitman for six years before moving to Philadelphia (with three of her children) in 1876; and, from 1876 to 1878, became one of Whitman's dearest friends.

Blake produced several versions of "Death's Door"; Gilchrist's *Life of William Blake* includes the version Blake etched for Robert Blair's *The Grave* (1808) in both the 1863 edition (1: 224) and the 1880 edition (1: 269). For other versions see *America* 6*, The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* 21, and *The Notebook of William Blake* N16 and N17 (also the frontispiece to *Jerusalem*). See also Makdisi's reading of *America* 6 in the context of *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* and the *Grave* illustrations: he argues that Blake's rejection of conventional commercial practice of engraving an image whose copies are identical, or standardized, opens up the possibility of reading repetition in his works as a "site for a reunification of aesthetic and political-economic analysis" (*William Blake and the Impossible History of the 1790s* 181).

[2] Blake's *Songs of Innocence and of Experience* and *Poetical Sketches* were published in 1868 by Pickering and edited by R.H. Shepherd.

[3] I am indebted to Morton Paley's "The Critical Reception of *A Critical Essay*" for this reference. Paley notes that Conway also "acted as the friendly intermediary in the correspondence that led to the first volume of Whitman's poems to be published in England . . . edited by William Michael Rossetti, and published in 1868 by John Camden Hotten" (34). Swinburne dedicated *William Blake* to W. M. Rossetti.

[4] Miller notes that the "two vols." are Blake's *Songs of Innocence and of Experience* and *Poetical Sketches* (1868).

[5] *The Complete Poetry & Prose of William Blake* 1, 617.

[6] See Balfour's discussion of the intersection of the prophetic and the poetic in Blake in *The Rhetoric of Romantic Prophecy* 127-136, esp. 135-6.

[7] *Walt Whitman's Leaves of Grass*, *The First* (1855) *Edition* 11, 22.

[8] Essays on Blake and Whitman include Donald Pease, "Blake, Whitman, Crane: The Hand of Fire," *William Blake and the Moderns* 15-38; Pease, "Blake, Crane, Whitman, and Modernism: A Poetics of Pure Possibility," *PMLA* 96.1 (1981): 64-85; Martin Bidney, "Structures of Perception in Blake and Whitman: Creative Contraries, Cosmic Body, Fourfold Vision," *ESQ* 28.1 (1982): 36-47; and Denise T. Askin, "Whitman's Theory of Evil: A Clue to His Use of Paradox," *ESQ* 28.2 (1982): 121-132.

[9] Cowley's list includes the *Bhagavad-Gita,* the *Upanishads*, Christopher Smart's *Jubilate Agno*, Blake's prophetic books, Rimbaud's *Illuminations*, and Nietzsche's *Thus Spake Zarathustra*—texts Whitman "could not have read, because they were not yet written, or not published, or not translated into English" (xi).

[10] Blake also calls the reader into being in "To the Public" as "[lover] of books! [lover] of heaven!" With

respect to "[lover]" under erasure, see *Jerusalem* copy 3, which bears the marks of Blake's fraught relationship to his readers, or possibly one (potential) reader: Paley notes, "At some point, Blake attacked the copper plate, gouging out words and entire passages that suggested intimacy with the reader" (*Jerusalem* 11).

11 See also "The Base of all Metaphysics" and "Chanting the Square Deific" (*Leaves of Grass by Walt Whitman* 275, 559-61).

12 See also Stephen Leo Carr "Illuminated Printing: Toward a Logic of Difference," *Unnam'd Forms* 177-96; Robert N. Essick, "How Blake's Body Means," *Unnam'd Forms* 197-217; Joseph Viscomi, *Blake and the Idea of the Book* 163-76, and a summary of the above in Edward Larrissy, "Spectral Imposition and Visionary Imposition: Printing and Repetition in Blake," *Blake in the Nineties* 64.

13 Clusters are poems grouped together based on theme or idea and a supplement is a group of poems published separately in a pamphlet with a title page and copyright (*Leaves of Grass: A Textual Variorum of the Printed Poems* I: xvi-xvii).

14 Blake's revision of this episode in *Milton* is more abbreviated, and he adds the phrase, "he became what he beheld" (3.29); in *Jerusalem* the episode itself contracts into the repeated phrase, "they became what they beheld" (Plates 34-36). This scene also appears in *Vala, or The Four Zoas* (Blake's attempt to incorporate his myths into a "single narrative," abandoned in 1804 when he began *Milton* and *Jerusalem*) in Night the Fourth, pg. 53, 22-24 [IV 180-207] and Night the Fourth, pg. 55, 21-3 [Second Portion IV 280-95] (Erdman 336, 338). Elsewhere I argue that Blake's practice of revising this episode by contracting it is essential to the meaning of the textual repetition of "they became what they beheld" in the *Jerusalem* version.

15 Also see Blake's repeated assertion that "every thing that lives is holy" in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* 25, *Visions of the Daughters of Albion* 8.10, *America* 8.13, and *The Four Zoas:* Night the Second, Page 34, line 80.

16 For a discussion of this passage which opens up the possibility that Whitman's poetry allows for the reader to speak prophetically, see Bertolini's argument in "'Hinting' and 'Reminding': The Rhetoric of Performative Embodiment in *Leaves of Grass*" that the lyric persona tropes "his own thought, affect, and activity display[ing] modes of self-relation which are offered to the reader for a kind of subjective reinscription" and that we might read "Is this then a touch?" as a question "uttered with the reader's tongue" (1067, 1071).

17 It seems even more likely that Whitman did not read Swinburne's *William Blake* when we consider that although Swinburne includes and discusses Blake's "pictures" and biography, Whitman does not comment on either until he reads Gilchrist's book in 1881. Swinburne refers widely to the first edition of Gilchrist's *Life of William Blake* (1863), discusses two engravings from Blair's *The Grave*, "The Reunion of the Soul & the Body" and "The Soul hovering over the Body reluctantly parting with Life" (56-58), but does not reproduce or specifically discuss "Death's Door," and includes nine facsimiles: the frontispiece is a reduction of *Jerusalem* 70; the title page is "A design of borders selected from those in *Jerusalem* (plates 5, 19, &c.) with minor details from *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* and *The Book of Thel*"; *The Book of Thel* title page (200); *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* title page (204); *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* 8 (208); *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* 20 (224); *Milton* 8 (258); *Jerusalem* 81 (276); and a reduction of *Jerusalem* 33 [37]. Whitman briefly mentions Blake only once in his published works in *Good-Bye My Fancy* (1891) when he imagines that Blake's "half-mad vision—would have revell'd night or day, and beyond stint, in one of our American corn fields!" (*Prose Works* 1892, 2: 670).

Works Cited

Askin, Denise T. "Whitman's Theory of Evil: A Clue to His Use of Paradox." *ESQ* 28.2 (1982): 121-132.

Balfour, Ian. *The Rhetoric of Romantic Prophecy*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2002.

Beck, Ronald. "The Structure of 'Song of Myself' and the Critics." *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review* 15.1 (1969): 32-38.

Berryman, John. "'Song of Myself': Intention and Substance." *Walt Whitman: The Measure of His Song*. Ed. Jim Perlman, Ed Folson, and Dan Campion. Duluth: Holy Cow! P, 1998.

Bertolini, Vincent J. "'Hinting' and 'Reminding': The Rhetoric of Performative Embodiment in *Leaves of Grass*." *ELH* 69.4 (2002): 1047-82.

Bidney. Martin. "Structures of Perception in Blake and Whitman: Creative Contraries, Cosmic Body, Fourfold Vision." *ESQ* 28.1 (1982): 36-47.

Blake, William. *The Notebook of William Blake*. Ed. David V. Erdman, with the assistance of Donald K. Moore. Rev. Ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977.

---. *The Complete Poetry & Prose of William Blake*. Ed. David V. Erdman. Rev. Ed. New York: Doubleday, 1988.

---. *William Blake: Jerusalem*. *The Illuminated Books*, v. 1. Ed. Morton Paley. Princeton: Princeton UP in conjunction with The William Blake Trust, 1991.

---. *William Blake: The Urizen Books*. *The Illuminated Books,* v. 6. Ed. David Worall. Princeton: Princeton UP for The William Blake Trust, 1995.

Clark, Steve and David Worall, eds. *Blake in the Nineties*. New York: St. Martin's, 1999.

Conway, Moncure Daniel. *Autobiography*. 2 vols. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1904.

Damon, S. Foster. *A Blake Dictionary*. Rev. Ed. Hanover and London: New England UP, 1988.

Damrosch, Leopold, Jr. *Symbol and Truth in Blake's Myth*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980.

Essick, Robert N. and Morton D. Paley. *Robert Blair's "The Grave," Illustrated by William Blake*: *A Study with Facsimile*. London: Scolar Press, 1982.

Gilchrist, Alexander. *Life of William Blake*. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., 1880.

Gilchrist, Grace. "Chats with Walt Whitman." *Temple Bar Magazine* CXIII, Jan.-Apr. 1898.

Ginsberg, Allen. *Selected Poems 1974-1995*. New York: Harper Collins, 1996.

Hilton, Nelson and Thomas A. Vogler, eds. *Unnam'd Forms: Blake and Textuality*. Berkeley: California UP, 1986.

Makdisi, Saree. *William Blake and the Impossible History of the 1790s*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2003.

McGann, Jerome. "The Text, the Poem, and the Problem of Historical Method," *New Literary History* 12.2 (1981): 269-88.

Paley, Morton. "The Critical Reception of A Critical Essay." *Blake Newsletter: An Illustrated Quarterly* 8 (1974) 32-7.

Pease, Donald. "Blake, Crane, Whitman, and Modernism: A Poetics of Pure Possibility." *PMLA* 96.1 (1981): 64-85.

---. "Blake, Whitman, Crane: The Hand of Fire." *William Blake and the Moderns*. Ed. Robert J. Bertholf and Annette S. Levitt. Albany: SUNY P, 1982.

Swinburne, Algernon Charles. *William Blake: A Critical Essay*. London, 1868.

Whitman, Walt. *The Correspondence*. Ed. Edwin Haviland Miller. 6 vols. New York: New York UP, 1961.

---. *Faint Clews & Indirections: Manuscripts of Walt Whitman and His Family*. Ed. Clarence Gohdes and Rollo G. Silver. Durham: Duke UP, 1949.

---. *Leaves of Grass: A Textual Variorum of the Printed Poems*, Ed. Sculley Bradley, Harold W. Blodgett, Arthur Golden, and William White. 3 vols. New York: New York UP, 1980.

---. *Leaves of Grass by Walt Whitman*. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.

---. *Notebooks and Unpublished Prose Manuscripts*. Ed. Edward F. Grief. 6 vols. New York: New York UP, 1984.

---. *Prose Works 1892*. Ed. Floyd Stovall. 2 vols. New York: New York UP, 1964.

---. *Walt Whitman's Leaves of Grass: The First (1855) Edition*. Intro. Malcolm Cowley. New York: Penguin Classics, 1986.

Viscomi, Joseph. *Blake and the Idea of the Book*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.

Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism

"An Anti-Democratic Habit of Feeling": Nationalism and the Rhetoric of Toryism in O'Sullivan's *Democratic Review*

Sohui Lee, Stanford University

1. America's well-known quest for national literature began, as Benjamin Spencer relates, with the new republic's search for a surrogate British identity, making the great problem of American literature a problem of ontology—that is, a problem of being, as Poe observes, "a literary colony of Great Britain" (Poe 1044). For some nineteenth-century American thinkers, the unavoidable consequence of their colonial relationship with Britain was derivative literature: it was a question of whether American literature exists or could ever be established. D. H. Lawrence continued to marvel in 1923 how American writers seemed desperate to produce "true American" writing (Lawrence, foreword). Lawrence may also have been right to point out America's obsession with "slough[ing] the old European consciousness completely" (58): this process of "sloughing" and the concern over the literary development of a nationalist text has been a long-standing subject of critical literary discussions. For early twentieth-century scholars who wrote about nationalism in American literature, their story of literary nationalism featured American's ultimate flowering. Van Wyck Brooks's *America's Coming of Age* (1915), V. L. Parrington's *Main Currents in American Thought* (1927-30), F. O. Matthiessen's *American Renaissance* (1941), Robert E. Spiller's *Literary History of the United States* (1953) variously addressed and established the prevailing narrative in which American romantic literature finished its "sloughing" and achieved a uniqueness that distinguished it from the writings of Europe. Spiller's account of American literary history, in particular, deserves notice as the American dilemma was resolved in the development of an "indigenous" strain of nineteenth-century American romanticism (Spiller 344, 345). More recently, Robert Weisbuch in *Atlantic Double-Cross* (1986) revisits arguments like Spiller's and finds a persistent insecurity in the heart of the American romantic writer who struggles to redefine the British text. While this particular perspective tells an important story of the imaginative and psychological process of writing, another complicated story of American nationalism emerges from a discrete, contextual study of magazine literature. In this essay I'd like to offer one more way of thinking about antebellum literary nationalism and America's obsession with "sloughing" by examining nationalism in John Louis O'Sullivan's *Democratic Review*, one of the most prestigious and influential magazine of the period.

2. By shifting the issue of nationalism from writers and anxieties of aesthetic independence to national anxieties about American readers and ideological dependency, I hope to show how the *Democratic Review* introduced a particular brand of democratic personality and aesthetics which was reinforced by the literature printed in its pages. Antebellum nationalism, as it surfaced in Jacksonian rhetoric of the 1830s and early 1840s, acknowledged the aesthetic problem of originality and dependency, but it also turned to a separate, though related, critical concern: the popularity of British books and its effect on American readers. A material study of creative works in the *Democratic Review* alongside the writings of its editor O'Sullivan reveal a nationalist strategy that focused on combating British literary power over American readers. The popularity of British literature was less an issue of national pride than one of political influence. For O'Sullivan, national literature doubly counteracted British influence: by visualizing a morally distinct American identity determined by affective ties amongst its people and by fashioning a British Tory identity dramatically opposed to the American Democrat's. This essay explores O'Sullivan's vital contribution to Jacksonian nationalism and, specifically, the importance of

the misanthropic Tory figure to the nationalist imaginary in the *Democratic Review*. In writing articles as well as publishing works by authors as diverse as Hawthorne and Paulding, O'Sullivan assembled literary support for a political strain of American literary nationalism that needed to imagine Britain as the moral and sympathetic antithesis to the United States.

I. Transatlantic readers and American nationalism

3. Despite the political transition from colony to republic, Anglo-American readers of the early Republic, especially in its Northeastern communities, were famously known for preferring the literature of their former colonizer. Although Robert Weisbuch explains this preference in terms of America's Bloomian transatlantic anxiety, a prolific and dominant British publishing industry serving a transatlantic audience of American and British readers no doubt exacerbated such psychological connections. Clarence Gohdes remarks that "publishers in the United States found more profit in pirating the books of well-established English writers than in gambling upon the success of new American authors and paying them royalty to boot" (Gohdes, *American Literature*, 15). In the absence of international copyright laws, Michael T. Gilmore asserts that "[a]bout three-quarters of the books published in the United States before 1820 were of English origin" (Gilmore 547). Even in 1850, the pirating of British literature—conducted by American as well as British booksellers—continued to out-print American ones; one contemporary report, pointing to America's great love of British books and journals, claims "about ten times as many copies [of British fiction] are sold in the United States as in Great Britain" (Zinke 574).[1] Hence, the *Athenaeum*'s insightful and portentous twist on Sydney Smith's 1820 sally "Who reads an American book?" seemed to merit the revised question: "Who reads an American book *in America*?" ("Literature of the Nineteenth Century" 9, my italics).

4. The answer to the question posed by the *Athenaeum* in 1835 was, in reality, thornier than Smith's pat response that Britain produced superior talents.[2] When Fisher Ames forecasted in 1801 that "[l]iterary curiosity will become one of the new appetites of the nation" ("American Literature" 442), he little knew how strong that reading appetite would become or how their appetite for British literature would affect middle-class readers of British-American society before and after the Revolution.[3] The taste for British literature was encouraged on at least two levels. First, as William Spengemann notes, "British books made up the bulk of every colonial library. Throughout the colonial period, the great majority of books offered for sale in American cities were written by Englishmen, and Americans constituted a large part of the readership for the periodical literature that has been called 'the most important missionary of British culture' abroad" ("American Writers" 219). In addition, eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Anglo-Americans faced entrepreneuring English booksellers, armed with finer printers and established literary trade, who targeted and nurtured an American market for British books. James Raven's well-documented study of the transatlantic book trade points to an early colonial and post-colonial reliance on English printers and booksellers.[4]

5. For William Ellery Channing, this robust transatlantic book market seemed to be the source of America's identity problem. Before Emerson's "American Scholar" speech of 1837, William Ellery Channing, Emerson's mentor and friend, declared in an oration delivered in Philadelphia in October of 1823, that American readers unknowingly allowed themselves to be captivated by British literature—their fascination resulting in a mass behavior of consumption which Timothy Flint derisively called "Anglo-mania" (Flint 512).[5] Though often overshadowed in academic criticism by his more famous student, Channing delivered a speech that was as critical as Emerson's in his trenchant censure of American writers and his assessment of the habits of American readers. Like Emerson, Channing was, as Richard Gravil discerns, a "disciple of Wordsworth and Coleridge," who also studied the works of Godwin, Price, Locke, and Blair (Gravil 41). While a great admirer of liberal British thinkers and their writings, Channing worried about the general negative effect of Anglo-mania to America's emergent

national identity. The Anglophilic reading public, Channing noticed, were undisciplined consumers whose practice fueled Britain's colonization of America's imagination.[6] Popular zeal for English books pointed to the reading public's continual internalization of English culture. Only national literature could bring American readers up to a level of ideological awareness so that they could "counteract and [. . .] use wisely the literature [they] import" (Channing 89). In addition to Anglomania, Channing raised a concomitant problem of the ideology disseminated by British literature. "We boast of our political institutions," he revealed, "and receive our chief teachings, books, impressions, from the school of monarchy" (Channing 83). Because literature acted as a cultural vehicle of the political system which it inhabits, it was doubly dangerous for Americans of a democracy to read books from a monarchy—texts that would "bear [. . .] the traces of this inward degradation" (Channing 91).

6. Channing's seminal speech on political ideology hidden in British literature prepared the ground for nationalist arguments in the ensuing decades of the 1830s and 1840s; Democrats like John Louis O'Sullivan asserted that nationalist literature would not only help distinguish the literary culture of the United States from England's but also would strengthen America's foundational democratic principles. Of course anti-British American patriotism frequently inhabited newspapers and journals before 1837, but O'Sullivan's nationalism as articulated in the *Democratic Review* defined an emergent political position that made his nationalist agenda distinct from previous nationalisms: he attempted to characterize American nationality by its moral difference to British monarchy and by its political adherence to Jacksonian Democratic political values. This nationalism, which helped shape Whitman's *Democratic Vistas* as well as the modern rhetoric of American identity, must be understood as emerging directly from Jacksonian political thought.

7. Distrusting Whig "internal improvements" projects and believing that their programs favored monopolies and advanced aristocratic privilege, Jacksonian Democrats advocated a reformed government whose laissez-faire economic and social principles were exemplified by the motto featured on every cover of the *Democratic Review*: "The best government is that which governs least." It is precisely these Democratic values that framed O'Sullivan's literary nationalism in the *Democratic Review*. O'Sullivan and his Democrats promoted not only American works but also a populist version of the "Democratic" ethos by contrasting its "true principles" of laissez-faire egalitarian democracy against what was conceived as a monopolist class system of monarchal Britain. O'Sullivan's attack on Britain was thus a means of emphasizing the superiority of a particular political and economic order of social relations. Consequently, in Democratic writings British Toryism plays a critical figure through which populists might assume the mantle of a more appropriate American identity and form of government.

II. Whigs, Tories, and the Dissolution of Democracy

8. In August of 1837, Ralph Waldo Emerson delivered "The American Scholar" to the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Harvard College, chastising his audience for their intellectual dependency on British and European writers. Approximately two months later in Washington, D.C., O'Sullivan added a populist layer to the already familiar theme of nationalism. O'Sullivan worked as the literary and political editor of the *Democratic Review* while Samuel Langtree, co-owner of the magazine, primarily took care of publishing (Miller 11-12); political ideas and the aesthetic championed by the magazine are usually attributed to O'Sullivan. O'Sullivan's multiple roles as owner, editor, and writer of fit the standard profile of American editors of the time. According to Charles Bristed, the editor of an American magazine is "owner, part-owner, at least, of the establishment. He does nearly all the original writing himself [. . .]. As representing and embodying his paper, he becomes an important political personage" (Bristed 680).

9. Although O'Sullivan is better known as the coiner of "manifest destiny" and, among Hawthorne scholars, as the editor of *Democratic Review* under whose "glorious reign" a large portion of Hawthorne's short stories were printed (Miller 333), O'Sullivan was an important literary and political editor who, through his careful selection of topical articles and recruitment of excellent writers, built the *Democratic Review* into an influential and prominent journal. The *Democratic Review* rarely reprinted creative works and generally printed original material. In addition to Hawthorne and Whitman, other contributors during O'Sullivan's editorship between 1837 and 1845 read as a list of "Who's Who" of antebellum American literature, including William Cullen Bryant, Edgar Allan Poe, John Green Whittier, Alexander H. Everett, Catharine Sedgwick, Benjamin F. Butler, James Kirke Paulding, Lydia H. Sigourney, Elizabeth F. Ellet, Park Benjamin, William Gilmore Simms, Charles Taber Congdon, and James Russell Lowell. While his magazine did, on rare occasions, print original works by British poets (one by Sir Alfred Tennyson and another by Elizabeth Browning), it primarily focused on publishing American works.

10. Both as a literary and political journal, O'Sullivan's magazine was well received and popular amongst the American literati. Noting that the "*Democratic Review* in 1837 had become the most successful political magazine in the country," Rufus Griswold stressed the review's creative contents and emphasized that it "published a better grade of material and was read by both parties alike" (Tassin 142). In 1842, Poe admitted that O'Sullivan's magazine featured the highest quality of American literature:

    > Were it not for its ultraism in politics, we should regard it as the most valuable journal of the day. Its editor is a man of fine matter-of-fact talents, and principal contributors are Brownson, the new-light philosopher, Bancroft, Whittier, Bryant, Hawthorne, and Miss Sedgwick. [. . .] Most highly do we esteem the *Democratic Review*, and take it all in all, we acknowledge only three as its superiors in any country; namely, *Tait's Magazine*, *Frazer*, and *Blackwood*, and these it will fully equal when it has the advantage of their experience. (Qtd. in Tassin 142)

    Interestingly, Poe's own assessment of the *Democratic Review* points to the typical habit of American critics in reviewing the quality of American works through transatlantic comparisons, a practice which inevitably favored British writers and writing: here, while Poe flatters the *Democratic Review*, he draws three "superior" British exceptions. By 1842, Whitman, already a regular contributor, claimed in the New York *Aurora* that the *Democratic Review* was the "leading magazine published this side of the Atlantic" (Widmer 82).[7] While hailing the magazine, Whitman, like Poe, is cautious to emphasize its importance relative to its British counterparts on the other "side of the Atlantic."

11. Despite the magazine's importance to contemporary writers and despite scholars' acknowledgement of the magazine's prominent role in the nation's political and cultural discursive sphere, there have been very few significant studies on the *Democratic Review* in terms of its ideological rhetoric or aesthetics. While Spencer observes the "democratic implications and emphasis" provided in the *Democratic Review* (133), Spencer's reading of the magazine, although more in-depth than most scholarly references to the magazine, typifies the critical misapprehension of the magazine's ideological history and distinct nationalist origins. For instance, Spencer notes that its "conceptions of literature" arise from the expansionist "triumphs" of the 1830s and 40s (133), when in actuality the literary mission, announced with the magazine's inception, well preceded O'Sullivan's rhetorical turn toward "manifest destiny." More modern historian Edward L. Widmer in *Young America: The Flowering of Democracy* in New York (1999) mistakenly conflates Duyckinck's nationalism through "Young America" with O'Sullivan's nationalist program in the *Democratic Review*.[8] While in 1845 O'Sullivan would argue for America's "manifest destiny" to challenge British imperialism through a vigorous democratic expansion[9], his focus in 1837 was an expansion of democratic principles through national literature.

And unlike Duyckinck, O’Sullivan aggressively forwarded a nationalist mission which declared the literary as inextricably tied with the political.

12. During O’Sullivan’s tenure as editor, he frequently wrote or published essays that identified and reminded readers of the nation’s problem of forgetting its political distinctiveness from the rest of the world. Not only did national literature create narratives and mythologies that invoke "one of the strongest bonds of common feeling" among the people ("American Poetry" 430), such literature emphasized the nation’s uniqueness and, thus, transnational difference. A country such as America whose identity was founded on liberal ideology was at risk if its reading publics were not taught and reminded of their political commitments. In 1839, an anonymous essay entitled "The Great Nation of Futurity" appeared in the November issue that condemned the cosmopolitan practice of America’s educated classes who read and consumed "foreign" goods. For the writer (most likely O’Sullivan), the biggest sin fell upon the "literati" who failed to appreciate America’s extraordinary "destiny": "Why cannot our literati comprehend the matchless sublimity of our position amongst the nations of the world—our destiny—and cease bending the knee to foreign idolatry, false tastes, false doctrines, false principles" ("Great Nation of Futurity" 428). What distinguishes American "principles" from European principles is what significantly differentiates American nationality from Europe or England’s. Unlike Europe, whose nationality is defined by place and blood, America’s "true nationality" is "not of soil" or "ancestry." Instead, its nationality is characterized by civic ideology, the political beliefs of the American people in "personal enfranchisement," "individual equality," and "political liberty" ("Great Nation of Futurity" 429). The "natural fruit" of such a nation must be literature that is inspired by these principles. But such literature, the writer complained, was yet to be written. Articles like "Great Nation of Futurity" pointed to a new kind of nationalism advocated by the *Democratic Review*, one that moved away from romantic nationalism (which ties blood and race with land) toward a more civic understanding of one’s relationship with the nation. Like O’Sullivan, who adopted the U.S. as his own, the new American citizen no longer needed to be "born" in America to be American; he only needed to accept and assume the democratic philosophy.

13. The first issue of O’Sullivan’s magazine opens with a similar pedagogically themed article entitled "Introduction": the essay not only introduces the magazine’s political and literary agenda but also warned readers of existing "anti-democratic" literature from abroad and at home. First, he observes the proliferation of a "decided anti-democratic bias" in American periodicals and among educated youths ("Introduction" 10). Such propaganda, O’Sullivan argues, needs to be combated directly. Although the existing Presidential administration under Van Buren was Democratic, O’Sullivan worries about the disproportionate number of magazines, journals, and newspapers which were Whig run or owned: "[T]he anti-democratic cause," O’Sullivan writes of the American Whigs, "possess at least two-thirds of the press of the country, and that portion of it which best supported by talent and the resources of capital, under the commercial patronage of our cities" ("Introduction" 13).

14. O’Sullivan, however, reserves the most "potent [negative] influence" on American democracy for last, the problem of literary consumption. The popularity of British works continued to erode American democracy. He observes, "We depend almost wholly on Europe, and particularly England, to think and write for us, or at least to furnish materials and models after which we shall mould our own humble attempts [. . .]. Our mind is enslaved to the past and present literature of England" ("Introduction" 13). Like Channing, who worried that British literature carried with it political propaganda for monarchy, O’Sullivan sees a corresponding relationship between the popularity of English literature in America and the popular view of the British system of government. He warns that currently Americans "look upon [English literature], as we do upon the political system of the country, as something magnificent, venerable, splendid, and powerful, and containing a considerable infusion of the true principle; yet the one no more suitable to be adopted as our own, as a model for slavish imitation than the other" ("Introduction" 14). As British monarchy is an unsuitable model for American government, O’Sullivan

reasons, so is British literature an unsuitable model for American literature.

15. O'Sullivan and his ideological fellows strategically point out that those who have falsely directed American readers to favor British texts were American Whig writers. These Americans were not only responsible for favoring British literature over American ones, but also for nurturing "antidemocratic" thinking and attitudes they acquired from British writers. The "Whig party" in America is, according to O'Sullivan and his cohorts, the "antidemocratic opposition" whose tenets are "founded on an irreconcileable [sic] hostility to the popular and liberal principles" of American democracy ("Sober-Thought" 280). In an essay within the same issue, a contributor to the *Democratic Review* argues that the American Whig party not only rejects democratic values but also appears to be identical "in principle" with "the Tories of Great Britain" ("European Views" 106). O'Sullivan faults these "better educated classes" of Whigs for "drink[ing] in an anti-democratic habit of feeling and thinking from the copious, and it must be confessed delicious, fountain of the literature of England; they give the same spirit to our own, in which we have little or nothing that is truly democratic and American" ("Introduction" 14). O'Sullivan's assertion connects Whiggish habits with derivative writing that is doubly damaging, revealing a need to liberate American literature from British writing style as well as British ideological thinking.

16. Thus what makes O'Sullivan's complaint different from many others before him, including Emerson, is the motivation articulated in the passage above: while Emerson pointed to the creation of the "bookworm" and the loss of genius in ersatz American writing ("American Scholar"), O'Sullivan observes that the deferential custom of Whig writers inhibits not only the growth of distinctive or original "American" writing, but also the transference of "democratic" ideas. In addition, O'Sullivan's nationalist campaign is distinctive in its adherence to a particular strain of Jacksonian politics and its symbiotic relationship with literature. Publishing articles and literature that were in line with his nationalist philosophy, O'Sullivan guided the *Democratic Review* with a unique nationalist program: no other contemporary magazine argued for such an interconnected relationship between politics and literature nor so powerfully reinforced its aesthetic theories in editorial statements and essays with forms of creative works that supported its national vision. In the following sections, I will discuss the critical component of O'Sullivan's aesthetic and its manifestation in nationalist literature in his magazine.

III. Democratic Sympathy

17. Jacksonian nationalists like O'Sullivan characterized Democratic Americans with a particular sympathetic relationship; but before I explain this strain of sympathy and its political incarnation, I will relate how their arguments are drawn from theories of British moral philosophers such as Adam Smith and David Hume. As Kristin Boudreau notes, British moral philosophers like Adam Smith and David Hume saw sympathy as a conservative "mechanism of social control": "By seeing another person's suffering through one's own eyes, one might respond privately to scenes that would bring different selves together in sympathetic union" (Boudreau 6). This union does not dissolve differences of class or gender or politics, but rather lubricates social relations amongst people. Hume argues, "[W]e every day meet with persons who are in a situation different from us, and who could never converse with us were we to remain constantly in that position and point of view" (Hume 44). While sympathy, according to Hume, provides a bridge to "greater social intercourse and familiarity" (44), it inevitably builds in the sympathizer "some general unalterable standard" of moral taste. This awareness of distinction (i.e. those "different from us"), Lucinda Cole points out, support rank and social order (Hume 44; Cole 109).

18. Americans also viewed this sympathetic communion as a means for providing social stability; but

rather than reinforcing social hierarchy and relations, sympathy became a means for shared political connection and later, for Jacksonians, a conductor of nationalism. Americans like Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Rush who "avidly read Hutchenson, Hume, and Smith" found sympathy useful in a similar way, "to provide the fundamental bond of political union" or even reason for dissolution (Boudreau 7). According to Jay Fliegelman, Jefferson's strategic "aestheticized politics of pathos" stressed a difference in feeling between Americans and their "British brethren"—a loss of consanguinity that logically led to the termination of America's relationship with Britain (Fliegelman 190). For American readers of the following century, Elizabeth Barnes explains, "[s]ympathy, as both felt emotion and cognitive press, became the mode by which familial, social, and even national bonds were reinforced; it represented the affective foundation of democratic society" (Barnes 25).

19. Like the generation of readers before them, Americans familiarized themselves directly with Hume's and Smith's moral and aesthetic discourses, which were still popular in the antebellum period amongst middle-class readers. While Hume was known more famously in United States as a historian whose essays were universally studied by "reading people," [10] essays and reviews directly addressing Hume's *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* in the *North American Review* (1819), *Democratic Review* (1840), *New Englander and Yale Review* (1843) and *The Living Age* (1846) all suggest that antebellum American readers actively revived and engaged with his ideas of moral sense and its shaping of individual character.[11] Adam Smith's book *Theory of Moral Sentiments* was better received, its popularity reflected in the fact that the first American edition of the work was printed as early as 1817 in Philadelphia. Evert Duyckinck, an enterprising publisher as well as nationalist contributor and literary editor to the *Democratic Review*, also reprinted Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* in New York in 1822.

20. The 1819 article in the influential *North American Review*, which claimed to be the first to "formally examine" Smith's theoretical work on moral sentiments (372), highlights critical points about Smith's theory of sympathy that shaped the thinking and writing of sentiments cultivated by Jacksonian nationalists. First, the *North American* reviewer sees the foundation of Smith's moral sympathy in social interaction. He writes, "The great basis of moral sentiments, according to Dr. Smith, is sympathy. Sympathy is that principle of our nature, which leads us to enter into the feelings, affections and motives of other men. Hence it follows, that a being perfectly solitary,—as there would be none with whom he could sympathize,—could have no notions whatever of right or wrong, of merit or demerit." (374). Second, an individual identifies with others only through feelings that he already learned to value. "The sympathies of any individual, then," the reviewer argues, "must depend very much on the previous constitution of his habits and tastes. The ambitious will sympathize with the votaries of ambition; the voluptuary with the voluptuous; the avaricious with the greedy of gain" (377).

21. The first point of social interaction would become critical for Jacksonian nationalists like O'Sullivan who read sympathy through a Democratic lens: he and other nationalists interpret social sympathy as that emotional tie of religio-political feeling of brotherhood and equality. The second observation would reinforce O'Sullivan's point of political inculcation: if there were no "previous constitution" of democratic habits and tastes, it can only emerge in the active cultivation of democratic sympathies. Believing that one of the primary functions of national literature was democratic pedagogy, O'Sullivan thus turns to sentimental literature, one of the most popular genres of the day, to become the ideal vehicle of democratic education through feeling. While the *Democratic Review* published sentimental poetry and fiction that clearly propped the domestic and sometimes drew conservative roles for women in sentimental arguments for "Republican public mothers" (Baym 70), [12] this essay focuses on elements of Democratic rhetoric underlying sentimental language in the magazine's essays, poetry, and short stories.

22. Heavily influenced by the theories of eighteenth-century moral philosophers such as Hume and Smith,

who argued for the virtuous nature of intuitive human feelings or "moral sentiments," as well as the literature of early and late British Romantics like Godwin, Wordsworth, and Coleridge, whose narratives illustrated the individual's emotional capacity to transcend oneself to experience the Other (cf. McCarthy 10), O'Sullivan and other Jacksonian writers in the *Democratic Review* contend that moral sympathy is crucial for nurturing interpersonal and, consequently, communal relationships that characterize American democracy. The importance of moral sentiments lies in the ability of feelings to help the individual evaluate moral and political virtue (nearly synonymous in the magazine) and to connect America's disparate classes and ethnic groups in a democratic civic community of feelings. [13] In his "Introduction," O'Sullivan lists three primary Christian feelings experienced and articulated by writers who are "truly democratic and American": human sympathy, optimism, and brotherhood. The first creed of human sympathy, which he calls the "cause of Humanity," is rooted in the Christian belief in the "fundamental goodness" of human nature and represents a crucial moral basis of the Democratic faithful that distinguishes them from elitist Whigs ("Introduction" 11). The second, optimism, is a variation of the first, "a cheerful creed, a creed of high hope and universal love, noble and ennobling" ("Introduction" 11). Finally, brotherhood reinforces the moral principle of human sympathy by evoking a sense of kinship amongst community members. Such kinship metaphors were a common sentimental strategy in American literature (cf. Barnes x). For O'Sullivan, however, metaphors of "brothers" and "sisters" represent the deep common interests of the community, illustrating the feelings not only of fellow members of humanity but also of citizens of the State. For Democrats, brotherhood suggests that each see of their relationship with each other as moral and social equals. Consequently social sentiments are rendered into powerful ideological position-statements, one that associates Christian sympathy with Democrats in contrast to the misanthropic elitism of "gloomy and selfish" British Tories and their American Whig counterparts. As another contributor put it, "Democracy is the only creed which does justice to man, or that can bind the entire race in eternal chains of brotherhood and love" ("Democracy" 215).

23. No doubt reflecting on the power of popular sentimental literature by British female authors like Felicia Hemans and Maria Edgeworth, O'Sullivan forwards an American version of sentimental literature that carries a more pronounced ideological agenda. Although O'Sullivan argues that democratic principles should be taught and rationally understood, he also encourages political inculcation. O'Sullivan notes in various essays that these political beliefs were best supported through common "habit[s] of feeling" ("Introduction" 15)—ritualized habits that turn political notions into a natural and reflexive way of responding and thinking. These habits of feeling were nurtured and disseminated through sentimental narratives of the home and family by male and female writers, who "appeal to the *reason* and *conscience* and *heart* of man" ("Democracy" 217, my italics; see also "American Poetry" 430). Consequently, he hails American authors like Catharine Sedgwick as "thoroughly *American* and *Democratic*"—model writers of national literature who combine domestic subjects, sentimental techniques, and Democratic morals in their works to inculcate readers to Democratic modes of thinking and feeling ("American Women" 130).

IV. Tragic Toryism

24. Whereas Democratic writers are obligated by their beliefs and feeling to produce literature that engaged with Democratic views of Christian sympathy, human progress, and political egalitarianism, American Whig and British Tory writers are, according to O'Sullivan and Jacksonian nationalists, influenced by the elitist premise of their political organization. Accordingly, literature by Whigs illustrate deep "distrust of mankind" and presuppose the existence of "original superiority [of one group] [. . .] above the great mass of the community in intelligence and competence for the duties of government" ("Introduction" 14). Tory politics and writings reflect the social sins of pride, gloom, arrogance, and the rejection of "human sympathy." This rejection, more importantly, is depicted as

unnatural conditioning—a learned and purposive behavior that was the chilling result of Tory indoctrination. As one *Democratic* reviewer asserts, pessimism toward life is one tragic effect of "gloomy" Toryism. "For what does High-Toryism in England mean, but despair of humanity?" the writer asks, "It looks around and abroad over the mass of men with no eye of hope, no heart of love. It distrusts, it fears, it despises, it hates. [. . .] It recognises no equality, no brotherhood, and but faint and feeble human sympathy, with those wretched ninety-nine. It hardens its heart against them, and shuts its ear to the moaning of their misery." ("Motherwell" 20-21). In his description of Toryism, the author applies key terms that are common in the Democratic vocabulary but are absent in the language of Toryism: "equality," "brotherhood," and "human sympathy" with the masses. Employing a type of "aestheticized politics of pathos" that Fliegelman describes of Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, this author also stages the differences between Tory Britons and Democratic Americans in terms of separate moral and political sensibility that must then inevitably result in the incompatibility of British aesthetics with American life.

25. Many of Hawthorne's short stories suggest a variation of this theme: a fascination with (presumably Whig) individuals who, like Tories, reject social sympathy to become moral and social outcasts in American society. F. O. Matthiessen points to a curious set of sketches from 1842 and 1843 that appear to show Hawthorne's concern with "human nature in the mass" (Hawthorne qtd. in Matthiessen 239). While Matthiessen lists stories such as "The Intelligence Office", the "Christmas Banquet, "The Hall of Fantasy," and "Earth's Holocast," we could easily include in this list earlier short stories such as "Lady Eleanore's Mantle" which also relate another story of a sin against general humanity: misanthropy. Hawthorne records his interest in this theme as early as 1835 in his notebook. He describes one idea in the following paragraph:

> The story of a man cold and hard-hearted, and acknowledging no brotherhood with mankind. At his death, they might try to dig him a grave, but, at a little space beneath the ground, strike upon a rock, as if the earth refuse to receive her unnatural son into her bosom. Then they would put him into an old sepulcher [. . .] Then the body would petrify; and he having died in some characteristic act and expression, he would seem, through endless ages of death, to repel society as in life; and none would be buried in that tomb forever. (Hawthorne's Lost Notebook 16)

26. For his sin of sympathetic disengagement, this particular misanthrope is cut off from social sympathy in death as well as in life. Hawthorne, however, made more explicit connections between misanthropy, sympathy, and politics in the sketches published in the *Democratic Review*, particularly in his descriptions of a misanthropic "moral monster" in "The Christmas Banquet" (87). Appearing in the *Democratic Review* in January 1844, "The Christmas Banquet" relates a tale of young, wealthy Gervayse Hastings, who appears to "possess all that other men have [. . .] [but] have really possessed nothing, neither joys or griefs" ("Christmas Banquet" 87). An allegory of a Tory soul, Hastings is appropriately cursed with a "cold heart" ("Christmas Banquet" 87), unreceptive to the loving touch of wife or the "sympathy" of mankind ("Christmas Banquet" 86). As the aristocratic Eleanore of Hawthorne's "Lady Eleanore's Mantle" who suffers in lonesome misery due to a deadly disease brought about by what many in the story speculate as her rejection of "human sympathies" ("Lady Eleanore" 326; Lee), Gervayse falls victim to a similar Tory curse—the want of social feeling. Moreover, Gervayse like Eleanore is good looking, young, and (at least figuratively) aristocratic. In fact, Gervayse is crowned the sovereign of an annual Christmas Banquet ("Christmas Banquet" 78), wearing "a wreath of cypress" that symbolizes his "wofullest" claim to human misery ("Christmas Banquet" 79). Gervayse's connection with misery represented in the symbol of monarchy suggests Hawthorne's play on O'Sullivan's anti-Tory rhetoric in the *Democratic Review*—a magazine he referred to later in the year as "*La Revue Anti-Aristocratique*" ("Writings of Aubépine" 545). [14]

27. Although short fiction representing the "anti-democratic habit of feeling and thinking" of Whigs was less common in the pages of the *Democratic Review* than the depictions of industrious, moral, and charitable Democrats, when they did appear they sometimes traced the inevitable foreign origins of anti-democratic manners and taste to England or Europe. Another example of a narrative illustrating anti-democratic Americans is James Kirke Paulding's "The School of Reform; A Domestic Tale," published in March 1838. A frequent contributor to the *Democratic Review* and Secretary of the Navy in Van Buren's cabinet, Paulding provides a morality tale of a self-indulgent American Frank Weatherhead and the eventual reform of his dissipation. However, frequent readers of the *Democratic Review* may have seen the story of Weatherhead as satire on the American Whig through his Jacksonian perspective on Eurocentrism (Paulding 426).

28. My interest in this story is Paulding's epistemology of Weatherhead's extravagant follies and taste, cultivated both by a class lifestyle and by his excursions to Europe. In light of O'Sullivan's earlier complaint that Whigs "drink in an anti-democratic habit of feeling and thinking," Paulding not only illustrates such anti-democratic habits but describes how such habits are acquired. Weatherhead is "indulged to excess" as a child of an upper-class family and does what many privileged and ambitious Americans have done when they come of age—travel abroad to further their education. Of course, traveling abroad itself is not a national sin; nor is it a sin to study European art. The sin—or, at least, Weatherhead's sin for Paulding is the absolute rejection or disavowal of American art due to his blind preference for European works. Paulding writes of Weatherhead, "Having seen all the fine pictures and statues of Europe, [Weatherhead] valued himself on his taste, and did little but find fault with every thing he saw on his return home. In short, he was mentally and personally vain, ireful, impetuous, extravagant and overbearing" (Paulding 425).

29. Ultimately, "Europe" is the site of his dissolute and derivative aesthetic as well as political education; this point is further emphasized in the comparison between Weatherhead and Lord Byron. Paulding asks readers to evaluate Weatherhead's extravagance alongside the "false taste as well as false principles" of the famous English poet—not only to suggest that Weatherhead's arrant social taste is analogous to the loose moral principles of this British aristocrat, but also to remind readers of the connection between aesthetic taste and national politics. Other writers like William Gilmore Simms, who supported this Jacksonian notion that "one's country" and politics shaped both the disposition of the writer and the quality of his/her writings, also related Bryon's faulty character with British nature: "Lord Byron's egotism and passion—his vain pride—[. . .] declare the genuine English character." [15] In pairing "false taste" alongside "false principles," Paulding points the American reader back to the familiar argument of Hugh Blair and other early nineteenth-century rhetorical theorists who believed that "the acquisition of taste, or the development of critical judgment" influences the growth of intellectual, moral, and civil virtues (Johnson 34). But for Paulding and the writers of the *Democratic Review*, taste did not merely direct intellectual, moral, and civil virtues. It shaped and was shaped by political principles. Good taste, then, for Jacksonian Democrats, is like "feeling"; it is an observable social phenomenon that belies one's ideological commitment to Jacksonian democracy. Ultimately in this tale, Weatherhead's journey away from America to Europe allegorizes not only his wayward cultural preference for European art but also his wayward political philosophy, hinting of British Toryism.

30. Weatherhead appears to be a Democratic caricature of an American Whig, representing the majority of ailments that O'Sullivan complained of in the "better classes." He is "vain"; he pays "little or no respect to the feelings of others" (Paulding 429); he is "extravagant"; and finally, he believes that all American art is inferior to that of European art. Although the surface narrative relates Weatherhead's reform from profligacy to prudence, Pauldling's "The School of Reform" carries another message. The story is a tale of politics by way of aesthetics, demonstrating not only the incompatibility of British-style elitism in democratic America, but also the aesthetic consequence of foreign "taste" and aristocratic

connoisseurship on wealthy, impressionable young Americans—the rejection of homespun art and writing.

V. Conclusion

31. In defining national literature as Democratic popular writings, O'Sullivan deliberately excludes the works of Whigs. Moreover, nationalist writers who sympathized with O'Sullivan's aesthetic populate their tales with American Whigs who, as alienated, misanthropic Anglophiles, seem synonymous with British Tories. Yet, despite the overwhelming depictions of conservative, monarchist Britain, the magazine's numerous references indicate both its unavoidable fascination with British liberal thinkers and writers and its rejection of the political system of the "mother-country." The *Democratic Review*'s own rhetorical ambivalences and its often unacknowledged indebtedness to British thinkers reflect a lettered America whose intellectual hybridity reveals profound, continual engagement with British literary culture. Consequently, the nationalist rhetoric within the *Democratic Review* cannot be seen as merely a reactionary response to Britain, but rather a discursive consequence of a transatlantic public sphere, or what O'Sullivan himself calls the "universal 'Republic of Letters'" ("Literary Properties" 308).

32. Although O'Sullivan, like many of his early twentieth-century predecessors, would deny the effect of this "sphere" by claiming that "every nation is a separate being" ("Literary Properties" 308); the best and worst imaginings of Whig and Democratic America require the specter of England, for it is this projected "alternity," to borrow Paul Giles's term, that gives meaning and purpose to O'Sullivan's nationalism. Giles may be right to assert that transnational texts in America and Britain build "narratives of dislocation and alternity" with discursive responses transcending the conceptual category of nationalism and single national identities (Giles 1). "Transnationalism [. . .]," Giles writes, "positions itself at a point of intersection [. . .] where the coercive aspects of imagined communities are turned back on themselves, reversed or mirrored, so that their covert presuppositions and ideological inflections become apparent" (Giles 17).

33. More productive transatlantic studies of American and British writings, then, seek not only to reveal the intellectual, commercial, political, or personal connections between these two nations, but also to illuminate and investigate what Susan Castillo calls the "transatlantic dynamic [. . .] an irresistible force of attraction and repulsion, absorption and distinction" in transnational discourse (Will Kaufman and Heidi Macpherson xix). Early Democratic nationalism demonstrates this type of "transatlantic dynamic" in a rhetoric that reveals double strategies to distract readers from what might be the horrific —but not so shocking—truth, that Americans can be elitist, selfish, and gloomy; or that the British might be liberal, cheerful, and charitable Christians.

34. This story of alternity identifies the smoke and mirrors itself as a heuristic; it is the visible which reveals the hidden. A remarkable example of this alternity can be found in Hawthorne's story "Howe's Masquerade," also published in the *Democratic Review* in 1838. Hawthorne's tale involves the last British royal governor, Sir William Howe who holds a lavish masquerade near the conclusion of the Revolutionary War. In order to distract his audience from the reality of Britain's imminent defeat, Howe sets up "scare-crows" of George Washington and his officers. The procession of "scare-crows" is necessary in the narrative for it foreshadows the real spectral procession of past royal governors, which inevitably exposes their collected celebration to be as phony as the straw persons they've created.

35. Unlike Howe's scarecrows, O'Sullivan's are English, and the spectral procession, which readers observe in the *Democratic Review*, tell of a different type of façade. The spectral procession in the magazine appears in the form of reviews of Byron, Scott, Dickens, Wordsworth and Bentham within a four months period in 1842. This procession of characters, however, is not of writers whose politics

support the Democratic imaginary of Britain, but of British writers whose liberal views actually undermine it. The "great poet" Wordsworth is charged for supporting a political cause that is inconsistent with the humanitarian spirit that generally pervades his poetry; Dickens is hailed for illustrating the "idea of human equality"; Bentham is lauded for his "benevolent" and liberal principles ("The Reception of Mr. Dickens" 317; "Early Life of Jeremy Bentham" 546). [16] At such moments, the chimera of alternity fades, and the *Democratic Review*, like Hawthorne's narrator in "Howe's Masquerade," calls attention to its failed attempt to throw a tinge of Democratic romance over the realities of these transnational literary scenes. And at such moments, when we are again reminded of the intellectual commonality nurtured in the outgrowth and exchange of Anglo-American Romanticism, we realize, as Richard Gravil shrewdly discerns, that "America did share in the genesis of Romantic ideology" (Gravil 37).

36. Yet, American Romantic ideology, as it emerged in the *Democratic Review* through the use of civic nationalism and sentiment, fostered the notion that a radical split from Britain was not only aesthetically desired but also ideologically necessary if its literature was to appear as an original, inspired, and autochthonic thing. To the problem of the ever-threatening and pervasive presence of British thought and social values in America, the editor and his adherents in the *Democratic Review* offered literature as the solution. As writings in the magazine identified the problem of Anglophilic texts and justified the need for national literature, the *Democratic Review* proffered itself as an edifying instrument, providing the remedy for that curious national ailment known as "Anglo-mania."

Notes

Many thanks to Joel Pace for feedback on earlier drafts and my Stanford reading group, especially Mark Feldman, Naomi Greyser, and Chris Phillips, for their constructive comments.

[1] Cheap, pirated editions fueled the reading market in America. For example, cheap editions of Macaulay's *History of England* (1848) sold at highest $4 (16s.6d.) and at lowest 50 cents (2s.) Zincke finds the accessibility of literature to be the prime proponent of America's high literacy. Gohdes, in *American Literature in Nineteenth-Century England* points to evidence that English booksellers might also be literary pirates, although this practice lessened by the second half of the century (25).

[2] For a reading of Sydney Smith's article and its periodical context (*Edinburgh Review*) see chapter 3 in Richard Gravil, *Romantic Dialogues: Anglo-American Continuities 1776-1862* (New York: St. Martin Press, 2000).

[3] David S. Shields, "British-American Belles Lettres" in *The Cambridge History of American Literature*, ed. Sacvan Bercovitch, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994): 309-343. Shields's "British American society" refers to the colonial reading community of British Americans before the Revolution.

[4] James Raven, "The Export of Books to Colonial North America," *Publishing History* 42 (1997): 21-49.

[5] William Ellery Channing, "Remarks on National Literature." Oration delivered before the Philadelphia Society at the University of Philadelphia, 18 October 1823. From *The Works of William Ellery Channing, D. D*. (Glasgow: Richard Green and Co., 1885): 83-95.

[6] In the same way, Channing was horrified by the proliferation of "cent papers" that were dangerously "adapted to the most uncultivated minds" to exploit the imagination and purse of the people. See "An Address on Self Culture," in *The Works of William Ellery Channing, D. D*. (Glasgow: Richard Green and Co., 1885):

243-263, 258.

[7] Whitman published short stories as "W.W." and "Walter Whitman." See "Death in the School-Room—A Fact," *Democratic Review* 9 (August 1841): 177-181; "Wild Frank's Return," *Democratic Review* 9 (November 1841): 476-481; "Bervance; or Father and Son," *Democratic Review* 9 (December 1841): 560-567; "The Tomb-Blossoms," *Democratic Review* 10 (January 1842): 62-68; "The Last of the Sacred Army," *Democratic Review* 10 (March 1842): 259-263; "The Child-Ghost; A Story of the Last Loyalist," *Democratic Review* 10 (May 1842): 451-459; and "Angel of Tears," *Democratic Review* 11 (September 1842): 282-283.

[8] Historians have noted, of course, the magazine's connection with the Young America nationalist movement in the mid-1840s. Edward L. Widmer's *Young America* (1999) claims that the *Democratic Review* was a vehicle of "Young America," a circle of New York writers promoting literary nationalism. "Young America" founder Evert Duyckinck did not begin to write in the *Democratic Review* until a year after the magazine moved its printing office to New York in November of 1840. "Young America" contributors included William Gilmore Simms, Cornelius Mathews, and William A. Jones. Moreover, while noting the Locofoco tenor of the magazine, Widmer does not distinguish O'Sullivan's Locofocoism from the goals of Young America. O'Sullivan's and Duyckinck's politics, for instance, were sometimes at odds. Duckinck seemed to have little patience for Locofoco-type radicalism and O'Sullivan's magazine editorials indicate that it did not support Young America's petition for the International Copyright Act.

[9] See John Louis O'Sullivan, "The Texas Question," *Democratic Review* 14 (April 1844): 423-430. Also, Sohui Lee, "Manifest Empire: Anglo-American Rivalry and the Shaping of U.S. Manifest Destiny." Manuscript. In *Romantic Border Crossings*, eds. Jeffrey Cass and Larry Peer. Forthcoming.

[10] "Causes of Poverty," *Democratic Review* 5 (May 1839): 448-466, 457.

[11] Hume's writing seemed to gain more attention from American reviewers during the 1840s. See "Smith's Theory of Moral Sentiments," *North American Review* 8 (March 1819): 371-396; "The History and Moral Relations of Political Economy," *Democratic Review* 8 (October 1840): 291-311; "Hume, Voltaire, and Rousseau," *New Englander and Yale Review* 1 (April 1843): 169-184; "Life and Correspondence of David Hume," *The Living Age* 10 (August 1846): 249-265.

[12] For a historian's argument on Republican motherhood in America see Joan R. Gunderson, *To Be Useful to the World: Women in Revolutionary America, 1740-1790* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1996). In addition to Smith's notion of moral sentiments, texts in the *Democratic Review* also channeled arguments on domesticity that connected domestic roles of women with the development of political consciousness and national loyalty. Poems in the *Democratic Review* like the anonymously published "Psyche" suffused woman's world with republican duty and significance. For the poet of "Psyche," the moral and political worth of woman's world is grounded in the fact that man's "[p]atriotism [. . .] grew" in "home's sweet scenes." "Psyche, a Poem," *Democratic Review* 2 (April 1838): 17-31, 27 and 25.

[13] Recent works on the politics of sympathy include Elizabeth Barnes, *States of Sympathy: Seduction and Democracy in the American Novel* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997). In addition to Glenn Hendler's *Public Sentiments* (2001), see also Kristin Boudreau, *Sympathy in American Literature: American Sentiments from Jefferson to the Jameses* (Gainesville, Fl.: University Press of Florida, 2002).

[14] For an extended argument about Hawthorne's connection with O'Sullivan's magazine and his political rhetoric please refer to Lee, "Hawthorne's Politics of Story Telling: Two 'Province-House' Tales and Anglomania in the *Democratic Review*."

[15] William Gilmore Simms, "The Epochs and Events of American History, as Suited to the Purposes of Art in Fiction," 53.

[16] [John L. O'Sullivan] "Wordsworth's Sonnets on the Punishment of Death" *Democratic Review* 10 (March 1842): 272-288. The abolition of capital punishment was one of O'Sullivan's pet political projects and the Wordsworth article should be considered in light of the publication of O'Sullivan's tract on capital punishment a month earlier. A month earlier, the *Democratic Review* notified its readers: "Mr. O'Sullivan's 'Report on the Abolition of Capital Punishment' has also attracted considerable attention. We hope that this important subject, which is now again before the Legislature of this and several other States, will awaken that interest which it so well deserves." *Democratic Review* 10 (February 1842), 201.

Works Cited

"American Periodical Literature." *Eclectic Review*. ns 5 (February 1839): 215-35.

Ames, Fisher. "American Literature" in *Works of Fisher Ames*, vol. 2. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1854. 428-42.

"American Poetry" *Democratic Review* 8 (November 1840): 399-430.

Barnes, Elizabeth. *States of Sympathy: Seduction and Democracy in the American Novel*. New York: Columbia UP, 1997.

Baym, Nina. "Reinventing Lydia Sigourney" *Redefining Lydia Sigourney*. Ed. Susan K. Harris. Knoxville, TN: U of Tennessee P, 1995. 43-65.

Boudreau, Kristin. *Sympathy in American Literature: American Sentiments from Jefferson to Jameses*. Gainesville, Fl.: UP of Florida, 2002.

Bristed, Charles Astor. "The Political Press in America." *Fraser's Magazine* 52 (December 1855): 678-85.

Bryant, William Cullen. *Prose Writings*. Ed. Parke Godwin. 2 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964.

"Bryant's Poems" *Democratic Review* 6 (October 1839): 273-86.

"Causes of Poverty" *Democratic Review* 5 (May 1839): 448-66.

Channing, William Ellery. "Remarks on National Literature." Oration delivered before the Philadelphia Society at the University of Philadelphia, 18 October 1823. From *The Works of William Ellery Channing, D. D*. Glasgow: Richard Green and Co., 1885. 83-95.

Cole, Lucinda. "(Anti)Feminist Sympathies: The Politics of Relationship in Smith, Wollstonecraft, and More." *ELHM* 58.1 (Spring 1991): 107-140.

"Crisis in the American Trade." *Edinburgh Review* 65 (July 1837): 221-24.

"Early Life of Jeremy Bentham." *Democratic Review* 10 (June 1842): 545-59.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "The American Scholar" *Selections from Ralph Waldo Emerson*. Ed. Stephen E. Whicher. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960. 63-80.

---. *English Traits and Representative Men*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1883.

"European Views of American Democracy" *Democratic Review* 1 (October 1837): 91-107.

Flint, Timothy. "Sketches of the Literature of the United States." *The Athenaeum*, no. 401 (4 July 1835): 511-12.

Giles, Paul. *Virtual Americas: Transnational Fictions and the Transatlantic Imaginary*. Durham and London: Duke UP, 2002.

Gilmore, Michael T. "Letters of the Early Republic" in *The Cambridge History of American Literature*. Ed. Sacvan Bercovitch. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. 541-57.

Godhes, Clarence. *American Literature in Nineteenth Century England*. Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois UP, 1944.

Gravil, Richard. *Romantic Dialogues: Anglo-American Continuities 1776-1862*. New York: St. Martin P, 2000.

"The Great Nation of Futurity" *Democratic Review* 6 (Nov 1839): 426-30.

Godwin, Parke, ed. *Prose Writings of William Cullen Bryant*, 2 vols, 1889, (New York: Russel & Russel Inc., 1964).

Hawthorne, Nathaniel. "The Christmas Banquet." *Democratic Review* 14 (January 1844): 78-87.

---. *Hawthorne's Lost Notebook 1835-1841*. Intro. Hyatt H. Waggoner. University Park and London: Pennsylvania State UP, 1978.

---. "Lady Eleanore's Mantle," *Democratic Review* 3 (December 1838): 51-59.

---. "Tales of the Province-House, No. 1. Howe's Masquerade." *Democratic Review* 2 (May 1838): 128-40.

---. "Writings of Aubépine." ("Rappaccini's Daughter"). *Democratic Review* 15 (December 1844): 545-60.

Hendler, Glenn. *Public Sentiments: Structures of Feeling in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina P, 2001.

"The History and Moral Relations of Political Economy." *Democratic Review* 8 (October 1840): 291-311.

Howe, Daniel Walker. *The Political Culture of the American Whigs*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1979.

Hume, David. *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*. Ed. Tom L.Beauchamp. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

"Hume and His Influence Upon History." *The Living Age* 1 (June 1844): 161-188.

"Hume, Voltaire, and Rousseau." *New Englander and Yale Review* 1 (April 1843): 169-84.

Johnson, Nan. *Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric in North America*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1991.

Kaufman, Will and Heidi Macpherson. *Transatlantic Studies*. New York and Oxford: UP of America.

Lawrence, D. H. *Studies in Classic American Literature* (1923). London and New York: Penguin Books, 1977.

Lee, Sohui. "Hawthorne's Politics of Storytelling: Two 'Tales of the Province House' and the Specter of Anglomania in the *Democratic Review*." *American Periodicals* 14: 1 (April 2004): 35-62.

"Life and Correspondence of David Hume. John Hill Burton, Esq." *The Living Age* 10 (Aug 1846): 249-65.

"Literature of the Nineteenth Century. America." *The Athenaeum*. No. 375. (3 January 1835): 9-13.

"Love's Dominion," *Democratic Review* 3 (December 1838): 333.

Matthiessen, F. O. *American Renaissance*. London and New York: Oxford UP, 1941.

McCarthy, Thomas. *Relationships of Sympathy: The Writer and the Reader in British Romanticism*. Hants, England: Scholar Press, 1997.

Miller, Perry. *The Raven and the Whale: Poe, Melville, and the New York Literary Scene*. (1956). Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1997.

"Motherwell's Poems," *Democratic Review* 10 (January 1842): 17-24.

[O'Sullivan, John Louis] "American Women," *Democratic Review* 6 (August 1839): 127-42.

---. "Introduction" *Democratic Review* 1 (October 1837): 1-15.

---. "Democracy," *Democratic Review* 7 (March 1840): 215-24.

---. Letter to George Bancroft. 27 May 1847. Bancroft Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.

---. "Literary Property." *Democratic Review* 2 (June 1828): 289-311.

---. "Nature—A Prose Poem." *Democratic Review* 1 (February 1838): 319-329.

Paulding, James Kirke. "The School of Reform; A Domestic Tale." *Democratic Review* 1 (March 1838): 424-30.

Poe, Edgar Allan. "About Critics and Criticism." *Graham's Magazine* (Jan 1850), rpt. *Essays and Reviews*. Ed. G. R. Thompson. New York: The Library of America, 1984. 1044.

Raven, James. "The Export of Books to Colonial North America." *Publishing History* 42 (1997): 21-49.

"The Reception of Mr. Dickens" *Democratic Review* 10 (April 1842): 315-20.

"Smith's Theory of Moral Sentiments." *North American Review* 8 (March 1819): 371-96.

"The Sober-Second Thought of the People" *Democratic Review* 3 (November 1838): 276-288.

Spencer, Benjamin T. *The Quest for Nationality*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1957.

Spengemann, William. "American Writers and English Literature." *ELH* 52.1 (Spring 1985): 209-38.

Spiller, Robert E. "Critical Standards in the American Romantic Movement." *College English* 8 (April 1947): 344-52.

Stansell, Christine and Sean Wilentz, "Cole's America" in *Thomas Cole: Landscape into History*. Ed. William H. Truettner and Alan Wallach. New York and London: Yale UP, 1994.

Tassin, Algernon. *The Magazine in America*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1916.

"The Taste for Poetry" *Democratic Review* 6 (September 1839): 219-22.

"To a Lady Reading" *Democratic Review* 3 (November 1838): 232.

Thistletwaite, Frank. *The Anglo-American Connection in the Early Nineteenth Century*. Philadelphia, U of Pennsylvania P, 1956.

---. "Atlantic Partnership." *The Economic History Review New Series* 7:1 (1954): 1-17.

Waldstreicher, David. *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820*. Chapel Hill and London: U of North Carolina P, 1997.

Widmer, Edward L. *Young America: The Flowering of Democracy in New York City*. New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.

"Wordsworth's Sonnets on the Punishment of Death" *Democratic Review* 10 (March 1842): 272-88.

"The Workingmen." *The New-England Magazine* 1.2 (August 1831): 150-153.

Zincke, F.B. "The United States of America" *Fraser's Magazine* 42 (May 1850): 564-78.

Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism

National Demons: Robert Burns, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and the Folk in the Forest

Scott Harshbarger, Hofstra University

1. As Carol McGuirk has demonstrated, Robert Burns' influence on nineteenth-century American culture (literary and otherwise) was pervasive. She goes so far as to compare Burns to Elvis, in that "mere celebrity has been transcended and cult status achieved" (137). This essay compares one of Burns' most popular poems, "Tam O'Shanter," with one of Hawthorne's most famous stories: "Young Goodman Brown." Hawthorne's interest in Burns, the possible date of composition of "Young Goodman Brown," and the striking similarities between story and poem suggest direct influence. A comparison of the two works also sheds light on the strategies the authors developed in adapting folk materials in a critical milieu which regarded such appropriation as intrinsically bound up with literary nationalism. If literary nationalism is often intended to celebrate the native glory of an exceptional people, these works, drawing on the content and technique of folk legend, reveal the flipside of that project, illuminating with a devilish light the complex relationship between demons, demonizers, and cultural nation-making.

2. Although no critic to my knowledge has considered "Tam O'Shanter" a precursor of "Young Goodman Brown,"[1] there are several indications of direct influence. To start, all four volumes of Burns' poetry and songs were checked out to the Hawthorne household in November of 1828 (*Hawthorne's Reading* 46), the earliest conjectured year for the composition of "Young Goodman Brown" (Newman 333). Several similarities between the two works also suggest direct influence. Both Goodman Brown and "Honest" Tam O'Shanter ignore their wives' warnings and, heading into the night, witness a demonic rite performed by witches and presided over by the devil himself. While setting and action are similar, so are other thematic and narrative elements: journey, isolation, initiation, and a kind of strategic ambiguity, manifested on one level as a blurring of dream and reality. Wavering between skepticism and belief, the narrators of both tales leave it up to the reader to decide what really happened to Tam or Brown.

3. There is no doubt that both authors were regularly attracted to folk material in fashioning their respective works. Born into a mid-eighteenth-century rural peasant class, Burns achieved a mastery of folk legend and song that positioned him to take advantage of a thriving Scottish nationalism.[2] Set in motion by the Act of Union in 1707, Scotland's national yearnings, writes Marilyn Butler, help explain "why an apparently local writer using a provincial idiolect at once found a receptive audience, and why the conditions were right for him to become a *national*, that is a Scottish poet" (103). In many ways, Burns seems an embodiment of the developing eighteenth-century conception of The Bard, "a figure who," writes Katie Trumpener, "represents the resistance of vernacular oral traditions to the historical pressures of English imperialism and whose performances brings the voices of the past into the sites of the present" (33).

4. Presented to the literate elite in December of 1786 by Henry Mackenzie with what Manning calls "an air of patriotic duty" (162), Burns would become the rustic darling of Scottish nationalists: "Burns' subsequent exertions as a song collector in his own right sprang from a similarly motivated antiquarian and editorial desire to preserve and restore native Scot culture" (*Fragments* 162). Referring specifically

to the Act of Union, Burns published one of his most angry songs in 1791, a year after composing "Tam":

> O would or I had seen the day
> That treason thus could sell us,
> My auld grey head had lien in clay,
> Wi' Bruce and loyal Wallace!
> But pith and power, till my last hour,
> I'll mak this declaration;
> We're bought and sold for English gold,
> Such a parcel of rouges in a nation! (17 - 24)

Burns' resentment of English rule would only be exacerbated by the repressive measure taken by the central government to stifle dissent, including the banning of native dress as well as the deportation of resistance leaders.[3]

5. Nevertheless, Burns was skeptical of the decades-old movement which, suffering military disaster in 1745, continued to call for armed struggle against the English:

> Ye Jacobites by name, give an ear, give an ear,
> Ye Jacobites by name, give an ear;
> Ye Jacobites by name
> Your fautes I will proclaim,
> Your doctrines I maun blame, you shall hear . . . .
>
> What makes heroic strife, fam'd afar, fam'd afar?
> What makes heroic strife fam'd afar?
> What makes heroic strife?
> To whet th' Assassin's knife,
> Or hunt a Parent's life
> Wi' bluidy war? (1-5, 13-18)

Though clearly opposed to English rule, Burns directs his wrath at his own countrymen: those who were bribed into allowing Scotland to become a province of Great Britain, as well as those who persisted in a movement that, receiving new inspiration from the French Revolution, encouraged violent resistance. Although Burns would always retain his faith in the Scottish "folk," he found himself increasingly at odds with both the political elite and its militant opposition. As Leth Davis and others have argued, Burns' ambivalent nationalism found expression in much of his poetry and songs, including "Tam O'Shanter."[4]

6. Much has been written on the longstanding connection between Scottish and American intellectual and political culture.[5] Though writing decades later, Hawthorne, like Burns, came of age in a country dominated by nationalist ideology. Whereas Burns' national sensibility was conditioned by Scotland's political domination by an imperial power, Hawthorne's was influenced by an America that, emerging victorious from the War of 1812, set about expanding the franchise and enlarging the country. However, democratic empowerment would be limited to white males, and annexation of territory was accomplished through a brutal "Indian Removal" policy. "The metaphor of a peaceful nation which now turned its face toward the West is historically sound," writes George Dangerfield in *The Awakening of American Nationalism: 1815-1828*, adding a qualifier evocative of "Young Goodman Brown": "but only if one concedes that this nation was constantly looking over its shoulder" (12).

7. Born on the Fourth of July, Hawthorne would have many occasions to reflect on the uncritical celebration of the nation. Moreover, he would never forget that he was the descendent of two imposing figures of American history who brought the spirit of persecution to public service, one famous for violently driving a Quaker woman out of Salem, the other for helping to preside over the Salem witchcraft trials. Hawthorne's attitude toward the national government would perhaps find its most direct expression in his description, appearing at the beginning of *The Scarlet Letter*, of the "truculent" and "unhappy" national symbol presiding over the entrance to Salem's Custom-House. Though occasioned by his political removal as Inspector in 1848, the statement has a vividness that suggests the boiling over of feelings that had been simmering for quite some time: "She has no great tenderness, even in her best of moods, and, sooner or later,—oftener sooner than later,—is apt to fling off her nestlings with a scratch of her claw, a dab of her beak, or a rangling wound from her barbed arrows" (2-3).

8. Hawthorne's suspicion of public authority was complemented by an awareness that "the people" were susceptible to a variety of moods and manipulations, a fact evident in the many disturbing crowd scenes that appear in his fiction, from "My Kinsman Major Molineux" to *The Marble Faun*. Using Hawthorne's work as prime example, Nicolaus Mills notes that "In the midst of an era of nationalism and expansion [the classic American novel] reflects an abiding fear that in America democratic men are the enemy of democratic man" (12).[6] Given his family history and the current national proclivities, it is perhaps not surprising that, while his closest friends became prominent politicians, Hawthorne himself cultivated an almost pathological privacy.

9. Like eighteenth-century Scotland, early nineteenth-century America sought to define its national culture by turning to apparently indigenous American folk sources. Influenced by Herder,[7] such prominent writers as James Kirke Paulding, William Cullen Bryant, John Neal, Rufus Choate, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow were among the those calling for an original American literature (Bland 78; Doubleday 450). Delivering the oration at Hawthorne's graduation from Bowdoin in 1825 , Longfellow remarked,

   > We are thus thrown upon ourselves: and thus shall our native hills become renowned in song, like those of Greece and Italy. Every rock shall become a chronicle of storied allusions: and the tomb of the Indian prophet be as hallowed as the sepulchers of ancient kings, or the damp vault and perpetual lamp of the Saracen monarch. (qtd. in Bland 78).

   Indeed, around the time Hawthorne may have composed "Young Goodman Brown," Paulding, Bryant, and Neal attempt to create an authentic American literature by drawing on witch lore and legend.[8]

10. Although not embedded in the world of oral tradition in the same way Burns was, Hawthorne did have a deep and abiding interest in folklore and storytelling. Coleman Tharpe has argued that the oral narrators who appear in Hawthorne's novels, "represent a unique refinement of Hawthorne's earlier artistic experiments with the oral folk tradition, particularly his experiments with the oral folk narrator" (205). From his projected story collection, "The Story-Teller," to the evocatively titled "Twice-Told Tales," to the oral aspects of *The Scarlet Letter*, Hawthorne consistently evinced a fascination with folk tradition, and the power of the spoken word in its many forms.[9] As Lauren Berlant writes in her discussion of Hawthorne's construction of a "national symbolic," "[the] early tales can illuminate the later national tales and novels: first, because they all center on a scene of oral transmission that demonstrates the tangled relations between discursive power and 'native'-historical knowledge" (35).

11. Like "Tam O Shanter," "Young Goodman Brown" portrays the tangled relations between the author, the folk material he has chosen to adapt, and the literary nationalism very much in the air. However, as Frank Doubleday saw years ago, Hawthorne made a "significant departure" from the program of

literary nationalism laid out by such writers as Rufus Choate:

> [Hawthorne] will not use the past only to glorify and idealize it. Choate’s motives are worthy enough; he believes that historical fiction would foster a corporate imaginative life and reassemble "the people of America in one fast congregation": ‘Reminded of our fathers, we should remember that we are brethren.’ He urges a selection from the varied materials of history to achieve artistic unity; but he urges, too, a selection in which all that is regrettable in Puritan society be suppressed. (451)

Doubleday sees in Hawthorne’s story "P’s Correspondence" the author’s ultimate rejection of Sir Walter Scott’s celebratory form of literary nationalism: "Were he still a writer," avers the narrator of Hawthorne’s story, "and as brilliant a one as ever, he could no longer maintain anything like the same position in literature. The world, nowadays, requires a more earnest purpose, a deeper moral, and a closer and homelier truth than he was qualified to supply it with" (qtd. in Doubleday 453). Hearing the calls for a nationalist literature, Hawthorne would turn from Scott and, following a course closer to Burns’, compose tales which reflect and comment on the problematic and ambiguous nature of nationalism itself.

12. While some interpreters of nationalism regard it as a product of the Enlightenment and French and American Revolutions,[10] and others find its roots in the Renaissance or earlier,[11] most acknowledge the various contradictory and problematic strands of what would come to be one of the most potent and vexing forces of the modern world. While Herder and other eighteenth-century writers had advocated the progressive aspects of a folk-based organic nationalism, the subsequent histories of many nationalist movements have proven to be much more troubling. Regardless of their political motivations or consequences, nationalist movements require narrative, a story that endows the "nation" with some kind of authentic native authority. Several interpreters of nationalism have stressed the fictive aspects of such narratives. Writes Ernest Gelner: "The cultural shreds and patches used by nationalism are often arbitrary historical inventions. Any old shred and patch would have served as well" (66). However, as Anthony Smith points out, such "shreds and patches" only serve the nationalist story if they have emotional resonance. Their appeal, writes Smith, "has nothing to do with their ‘innovative qualities,' let alone their truth-content, and everything to do with the traditions of popular ethnic myths, symbols and memories which nationalisms habitually evoke, and invoke" (83). By focusing on "the analogy between political Union and personal integration" Manning also relates political to personal identity: "In both cases, ‘union’ is about narrative—telling a single story of nation or self—and about how the mind stabilizes conditions of flux sufficiently to realise the continuities on which such a story would depend" (*Fragments* 11). Burns and Hawthorne, I would argue, are less concerned with the literal truth of such legends than they are with their "emotional resonance," and the role such resonance plays in entwining the political with personal, for good or ill.

13. In "Tam" and "Brown," Burns’ and Hawthorne’s explorations of the dark side of folk nationalism begin with their protagonists’ ignoring their wives’ prophetic warnings. Tam’s wife Kate "prophesied that late or soon / Thou would be found deep drown’d in Doon; / Or catch’d wi’ warlocks in the mirk, / By Alloway’s auld haunted kirk." (558). "’Dearest heart,' whispered [Faith], softly and rather sadly, when her lips were close to his ear, ‘pr’y thee, put off your journey until sunrise, and sleep in your own bed tonight. A lone woman is troubled with such dreams and such thoughts, that she’s afeard of herself, sometimes'" (74). Just as women play a key role in both tales so have they been crucial to the development of the nation state. Foya Anthias and Nira Yuval-Davis identify several ways in which "women have tended to participate in ethnic and national processes and in relation to state practices," in particular, as "transmitters of culture," "biological reproducers of members of ethnic collectivities," and "reproducers of the boundaries of ethnic/national groups" (7). The women in both tales represent an aspect of the social story associated with wives’ tales, young or old, their warnings pregnant with the

events to come. Representing the homely, the familiar, the domestic on the one hand, and the wild and disturbing on the other, wives and witches symbolize the boundaries both men will cross on their wayward journeys. Writes Manning: "Goodman Brown's unstable allegorizing mind is polarized; to him his wife Faith *is* purity. He cannot allow her (in his mind) to have any connection with evil" (*Puritan-Provincial* 99). Faith's admission "that she's afeard of herself, sometimes" hints at her role in collapsing the boundaries of Brown's dichotomized world at the heart of Hawthorne's story.

14. Impelled originally by the antiquarian Francis Grose's request that Burns contribute to a volume that would record for national posterity the various stories associated with Aloway Kirk,[12] Burns dramatizes the profound effect of such stories by having Tam ride by various reminders of local legend:

> By this time he was cross the ford. . . past the birks and meikle stane, Whare drunken Charlie brak's neck-bane; And thro' the whines, and by the cairn, Whare hunteres fand the murder'd bairn [child]; And near the thorn, aboon the well, Whare Mungo's mither hang'd hersel.—(89-96)

The evocative specificity of these rural legends helps ground the story in local and personal associations: having come from an extended stay in the Tavern, Tam should be especially affected by the mention of drunken Charlie's legendary demise. The fact that such legends keep alive the victims of these rural tragedies suggests the kind of cultural haunting that Manning equates with tradition itself: "Tradition, like a ghost, is a mnemonic and an admonition to the present. A kind of platonic anamnesis, or reminiscence of former existence, it attempts to create and sustain a communal cultural memory in potentially hostile circumstances" (*Fragments* 167). Local, particular, and tragic, the incidents that Burns memorializes through Tam's ride foreshadow the even darker legend to come.

15. While Burns seeks to reclaim a national tradition posed against "the potentially hostile circumstances" of English hegemony, Hawthorne uses the stuff of history and legend to formulate what Lauren Berlant, following Foucault, calls "counter memory": "the residual material that is not identical with the official meanings of the political public sphere—for instance, the material of popular memory in which public or national figures, bodies, monuments, and texts accrue a profusion of meanings" (6). What Mary Ellen Brown remarks of Burns and "Tam O'Shanter" can be applied to Hawthorne as well: "Burns not only used legend content, he also recreated in the poem aspects of the legend context, the situation of legend exchange" (65). The power of such exchange hinges on intimacy and the potential for identification between speaker and audience. Such intimacy and identification is underscored by the narrator's observation that the figure Brown had arranged to rendezvous with in the forest, bore "a considerable resemblance to him, though perhaps more in expression than features. Still, they might have been taken for father and son" (76).

16. The invoking of kinship ties suggests a parodic inversion of the ancestral genealogy underlying many "proto-" or "primordial" nations.[13] This figure, though "simply clad as the younger, and as simple in manner too" but having "an indescribable air of one who knew the world" serves as intermediary between the common man represented by Brown and the world of nations represented by "King William's court" (76). Manning finds such "familial analogies" essential to account for the personal and political dynamic involved in Scottish and American nationalism: "In both Scottish and American contexts, England-as-parent was the prior given which made it inevitable that separate identity would be articulated in resistance and reaction" (*Fragments* 22). In a post-colonial American context, such a father figure may represent the ghostly memory of the British monarch, or it could suggest the birth of an analogous authoritarian system. That he is not only a father but also a devil, intent on passing his snake-like staff down to Brown, suggests that Hawthorne is suspicious of any process that attempts to bind the common and the elite in intimate community through ties of blood, real or imaginary.

17. Ironically, and subversively, the intimacy the devil wishes to establish with Brown is based on stories and events that, while evoking Hawthorne's ancestral story, suggests nationalism's persecuting spirit. Some historians have attempted to understand this dimension by contrasting a liberal "civic" nationalism with its illiberal "ethnic" counterpart,[11] the former characterized by "inclusive tolerance," the latter by "conflict" and "exclusion" (Marx viii). However, as Anthony Marx has argued, even apparently inclusive "civic" nationalism typified by England and America has its roots in state manipulation of religious conflict, involving the exclusion of a demonized other. To help explain this phenomenon, Marx turns to the political scientist Arthur Stincombe:

    [nationalism] is a wish to suppress internal divisions within nation and to define people outside the group as untrustworthy as allies and implacably evil as enemies . . . It is on the one hand a generous spirit of identification . . . a love of compatriots . . . But it is on the other hand a spirit of distrust of the potential treason of any opposition within the group and a hatred of strangers (qtd. in Marx 23).

    In short, "To legitimate state rule requires cohesion of those included as a nation, against some other" (23). A "conceptual structure of polarities," characteristic of Calvinism and "the psychological state it induces in the believer," (Manning, *Puritan-Provincial* 7) would also encourage a nationalism predicated on the conceptual necessity of a damned other. In "Tam" and "Brown" Burns and Hawthorne explore and critique this powerful narrative means of forging group identity through demonization.

18. Responding to Brown's claim that he was first in his family to rendezvous with the devil, this figure observes: "I helped your grandfather, the constable, when he lashed the Quaker woman so smartly through the streets of Salem. And it was I that brought your father a pitch-pine knot, kindled at my own hearth, to set fire to an Indian village, in King Philip's war" (77). Hawthorne uses legend-telling—a process which Choate and others wished would be used to buttress national glory—to enshrine the process by which societies cohere around the persecution of various others, here, Quakers and Indians. By having the Devil avow the role he has played in the Puritan settlement since its founding, Hawthorne is able to foreshadow the climax of the story by hinting at the kernel of social truth revealed through legend telling.

19. Again, moving beyond the mere borrowing of folk material, Hawthorne explores the rhetoric of legend at the heart of nation-making, a rhetoric which is most effective when insinuating, rather than imposing, belief. What would become a hallmark of Hawthorne's mature style—what Mathiessen referred to as his "device of multiple choice" (276)—can be viewed as deriving from the story teller's anticipation, and manipulation, of responses from a diverse oral audience. Brown cycles through a number of interpretations and responses, from naive skepticism to cynical certainty, while the narrator invites the reader to judge the ultimate reality of the story in any number of ways: "Had Goodman Brown fallen asleep in the forest, and only dreamed a wild dream of a witch-meeting?" (89) This medley of interpretation highlights the social construction and negotiation of "truth" within the various interpretive communities in which legends—and nations—develop.

20. His faith in the wholesomeness of the community narrative seriously threatened by his encounters in the forest—not only with the devil, but with Deacon Gookin, the minister, and Brown's Sunday School teacher—Brown perceives a dark mass floating overhead. Full of "confused and doubtful voices," this cloud becomes a symbol of legend itself, along with the forms of belief it engenders:

    Once, the listener fancied that he could distinguish accents of town's-people of his own, men and women, both pious and ungodly, many of whom he had met at the communion-table, and had seen others rioting at the tavern. The next moment, so indistinct were the sounds, he doubted whether he had heard aught but the murmur of the old forest,

> whispering without a wind. Then came stronger swell of those familiar tones, heard daily in the sunshine, at Salem village, but never, until now, from a cloud of night. (82)

Brown's perception of and participation in this dark cloud of voices reflects the content of folk tradition—familiar and strange, homely and sinister—as well as the unreliable but effective process by which it survives.

21. A number of folklorists have argued that folktales are largely the product of communal projections.[14] The same process by which an audience responds personally to folktale helps explain Brown's response to the murmuring cloud. Into this murky mass of imagined voices Brown projects his greatest fear of all: "There was one voice, of a young woman, uttering lamentations, yet with an uncertain sorrow, and entreating for some favor, which, perhaps, it would grieve her to obtain" (82). Brown's fate is sealed when his call for Faith brings "a scream, drowned immediately in a louder murmur of voices, fading into far-off laugher, as the dark cloud swept away . . . . something fluttered lightly down through the air, and caught on the branch of a tree. The young man seized it, and beheld the pink ribbon" (82). The aural counterpart of the "specter evidence" represented by the pink ribbon,[15] the dark cloud of murmuring voices is used by Hawthorne to dramatize how conviction of utmost certainty can arise from the nebulous murmurs of the social imagination. More specifically, this incident foreshadows the loss, in Brown, of his faith in official community, and the narratives that support it.

22. Hawthorne underscores the intensity of Brown's growing alienation from the communal story by making him audience to a gathering symphony of perverse utterance—real or imagined—quite different from the whisperings of Faith that begin the tale: From the devil's laughter to the strange mumblings of the Sunday School teacher; to the "solemn old tones" of the minister and Deacon Gookin "talking so strangely in the empty air"; to the voice of a young woman "uttering lamentations, yet with an uncertain sorrow"; to Brown's response, mocked by the echoing forest, "crying—'Faith! Faith!' as if bewildered wretches were seeking her, all through the wilderness"—all contribute to Brown's mental and social bewilderment (81-82). Brown's despairing exclamation that "there is no good on earth; and sin is but a name" (83) is followed by his own nihilistic laughter, which, echoing the devil's, prompts nature to respond in kind: "The whole forest was peopled with frightful sounds; the creaking of the trees, the howling of wild beasts, and, the yell of Indians; while, sometimes, the wind tolled like a distant church-bell, and sometimes gave a broad roar around the traveler, as if all Nature were laughing him to scorn . . . ." In a perverse form of call and response, Brown rises to nature's profane challenge: "'Ha! ha! ha!' roared Goodman Brown, when the wind laughed at him. 'Let us hear which will laugh loudest!'" (83). The forest having become an echo chamber of his social despair, Brown is ready for his encounter with the remaining folk in the forest.

23. Perhaps the most spectacular example of powerful legendary belief having no basis in actual fact is the conviction, held in Scotland, England, the Continent, and Colonial America that those dedicated to Evil meet on a regular basis to plot and celebrate the overthrow of all things good and holy. Writes Robin Briggs: "The stories of the [witch's] sabbat represented a fusion between the persecuting stereotypes elaborated by clerics and judges and the various older folkloric traditions of the peasantry" (32). She continues:

> The idea of secret meetings where orgies take place and evil is planned must be one of the oldest and most basic human fantasies. Charges of nocturnal conspiracy, black magic, child murder, orgiastic sexuality and perverted ritual were nothing new in Europe when they were applied to witches. . . . The stereotype is obvious; it consisted of inverting all the positive values of society, adding a lot of lurid detail (often borrowed from earlier allegations), then throwing the resulting bucket of filth over the selected victims. (32)

If nationalism derives much of its power by tapping into the same ideas and emotions associated with other forms of worship,[16] the Witch's sabbath can be viewed as a demonic version of the national religion.[17] It is, at once, the opposite of the ruling national order as well as the projected, symbiotic enactment of the other on which that order is based.

24. Indeed, the witchcraft persecutions have been correlated with the rise of the nation state. Supported by the nationalist combination of elite claims and popular sentiment, the crime of witchcraft, as Christina Larner has pointed out, "went on the statute books, or became otherwise the responsibility of secular powers, at a time when jurisdictions were becoming more centralized and more rationalized . . . ." (205). The link between the rise of nationalism and the witchcraft of hysteria of the sixteenth and seventeenth century supports Anthony Marx's contention that early forms of nationalism require the identification and persecution of a reviled other. Although British nationalism was formed primarily by demonizing Catholics, "Sometimes, such attacks were directed instead against 'witches,' with any form of heresy, non-conformity, or effect of blood seen as inviting of intolerance and treatment as scapegoats" (96). Through the witch persecutions, the role of women in the nation state as definers of national boundaries would be used to define the categorically unacceptable.[18]

25. In Scotland there would be even greater opportunity for using "witches" as scapegoats. Writes Manning: ". . . after the departure of James VI to the English throne in 1603 had deprived the people of a divinely ordained focus for their loyalties, the periodic witch hunts became a way of reaffirming defensively the precarious theocratic solidarity of the Scottish nation" (*The Puritan-provincial Vision*, 21). While Calvinism's polarizing tendencies referred to earlier would encourage a nationalism predicated on the damned and the elect, its foundational focus on original sin would also create lingering misgivings about any form of social organization rooted in "the people."

26. As Katherine Briggs observes, "In Scotland we find tales of the witches' Sabat and more instances than in England of the diabolic compact" (326). Accordingly, Burns is able to provide a fully fleshed-out account of the sabbat Tam encounters:

> And, vow, Tam saw an unco sight!
> Warlocks and witches in a dance;
> Nae cotillion brent new frae France,
> But hornpipes, jigs, strathspeys, and reels,
> Put life and mettle in their heels . . .
> There sat auld Nick, in shape o'beast;
> A toozie tyke, black, grim, and large,
> To gie them music was his charge:
> He screw'd the pipes and gart them skirl,
> Till roof and rafter a' did dirl— (114-118; 120-24)

Employing the vernacular, Burns presents an emphatically Scottish scene, the Devil himself providing the appropriate folk music. In this depiction, the Scottish instruments, music, and the dance they inspire are put into service of a devilish celebration, wherein the national mind projects a parallel tradition of evil—the feared yet necessary other—through which the imagined community of Scotland may cohere.

27. If, as Tom Nairn writes, "through nationalism the dead are awakened" (4), the process of such awakening often involves memorializing the hideous manner in which such deaths were effected. The role that folk tradition can play in such awakening is suggested by Burns' catalogue of gruesome details:

> Coffins stood round, like open presses,

That shaw'd the dead in their last dresses;
And by some devilish cantraip slight
Each in its cauld hand held a light.—
By which heroic Tam was able
To note upon the haly table,
A murderer's banes in gibbet airns;
Twa span-lang, wee, unchristen'd bairns [children];
A thief, new-cutted frae a rape [rope],
Wi' his last gasp his gab did gape,
Five tomahawks, wi' blude red-restued;
Five scymitars, wi' murder crusted;
A garter, which a babe had strangled;
A knife, a father's throat had nabled,
Whom his ain son o' life bereft,
The grey hairs yet stack to the heft'
Wi' mair o' horrible and awefu',
Which even to name wad be unlawfu'. (125-142)

Illumined by the coffined dead, the scene reveals the grisly content of many a folk tale or song—murder, execution, infanticide, parricide—along with the bloody implements by which these violent acts were accomplished. Examples of the kind of "cultural haunting" that, for Manning, suggests the disciplinary function of tradition (*Fragments* 167), such stories arouse and make available a variety of shades of fear and loathing, ready to inspire nationalist purposes not imagined by Herder.

28. It is at this point that the heroes of both tales focus their attention on the female celebrants, or in Brown's case, inductee. Here the gendered aspect of the witchcraft hysteria comes to the fore, supporting the theory that the rise of the nation involves the reestablishment of patriarchy.[19] The patriarchal demand for submissive women is reinforced by imagining its opposite: sex with the devil, one of the most striking legendary sabbat practices. As Anthia and Yval-Davis point out, "Women are controlled [by the state] not only by being encouraged or discouraged from having children who will become members of the various ethnic groups within the state. They are also controlled in terms of the 'proper' way in which they should have them" (314). In projecting one version of the ultimate other, the nationalist mind imagines a form of diabolical sexual behavior—the ultimate in female insubordination—most threatening to the patriarchal order.

29. Although sex with the devil would have to qualify as something "Which even to name wad be unlawful" (Grose's volume was intended for a respectable middle-class audience), Burns does eroticize Tam's encounter with the Sabbath witches. In doing so he creates an ironic version of this aspect of the witch's sabbath, thereby revealing his ambivalent attitudes toward the nationalist project to create an unredeemable other. Drawing closer, Tam observes a particular young witch, whose short skirt turns him from shocked witness, to voyeur, to prospective participant:

There was ae winsome wench and wawlie,
That night enlisted in the core . . .
Her cutty sark [short shirt] , o' Paisley harn,
That while a lassie she had worn,
In longitude tho' sorely scanty,
It was her best, and she was vauntie [in high spirits]. . .
And how Tam stood, like ane bewitch'd,
And thought his very een enrich'd;
Even Satan glowr'd, and fidg'd fu fain,

> And hotch'd and blew wi' might and main:
> Till first ae caper, syne anither,
> Tam tint his reason a' thegither,
> And roars out, "Weel done, Cutty-sark!!" (164-174; 183-189)

In a Burnsian twist on the sabbath legend, a mere witness to the sexually charged satanic ritual becomes a potential participant, the teasing techniques of legend-telling becoming a kind of foreplay leading to Tam's ejaculatory "Weel done!" Burns reveals his ambivalence to the nationalist project—or its mirror opposite—by having his hero be by turns repelled and seduced.

30. Suggesting his own ambivalence toward the nationalistic uses of a folk-inspired other, Hawthorne also has his hero witness or imagine his own Satanic gathering. Like Tam's encounter, Brown's is bathed in a diabolic light: "the mass of foliage, that had overgrown the summit of the rock, was all on fire, blazing high into the night, and fitfully illuminating the whole field" (86). The burning bush makes visible a "numerous congregation," which alternately shines forth and disappears into the shadows—the visual equivalent of the ambiguity of legend-telling. Hawthorne's sabbath is also filled with music, although here, instead of Scottish jigs, we hear Puritan hymns, but with a twist: "Another verse of the hymn arose, a slow and mournful strain, such as the pious love, but joined to words which expressed all that our nature can conceive of sin, and darkly hinted at far more. Unfathomable to mere mortals is the lore of fiends" (85). Like the strains of Burns's sabbath, this music provides a familiar means to a diabolical end. Although they may not seem as spirited as Scottish jigs, the Puritan hymns, when combined with "words which expressed all that our nature can conceive of sin," become a powerful "anthem" (86) composed of the sacred and the profane. Brown's encounter with the folk in the forest is analogous to Hawthorne's encounters with the light and dark of the folk imagination, a microcosm of proto-nationalist forces created and revealed through the "lore of fiends."

31. Such heterogeneous mixing is echoed in the motley crew that makes up Hawthorne's black sabbath:

> Irreverently consorting with [the] grave, reputable, and pious people, these elders of the church, these chaste dames and dewy virgins, there were men of dissolute lives and women of spotted fame, wretches given over to all mean and filthy vice, and suspected even of horrid crimes. It was strange to see, that the good shrank not from the wicked, nor were the sinners abashed by the saints (85).

To suggest the nature of such sins, Hawthorne details his own catalogue of crime, reminiscent of Burns': "how many a woman, eager for widow's weeds, had given her husband a drink at bed-time, and let him sleep his last sleep in her bosom; how beardless youths have made haste to inherit their fathers' wealth; and how fair damsels—blush not, sweet ones!—have dug little graves in the garden, and bidden me, the sole guest, to an infant's funeral" (287). Again, we find a kind of "counter-nation," the symbiotic partner of the nationalist project, fueled by "lore," to which all are invited: "Welcome, my children . . . to the communion of your race" (86).

32. Whereas Both Burns and Hawthorne used the stories of the folk in their writing, and did not shrink from including the grisly and the grotesque, their attitudes toward such dark tales, revealed by the tone of their narrators, seem significantly different. Burns' tale emerges toward the end of a career characterized by multiple uses of folk tales legends, and song. That Burns in many respects felt at home in this tradition is reflected in the rollicking denouement of the poem:

> The carlin [old woman] caught her [Tam's horse] by the rump,
> And left poor Maggie scarce a stump.
> Now, wha this tale o' truth shall read,

> Ilk man and mother’s son take heed:
> Whene’er to drink you are inclin’d,
> Or cutty-sarks run in your mind,
> Think, ye may buy the joys o’er dear,
> Remember Tam o’ Shanter’s mare. (117-224)

Tam’s tussle with the witches can be seen as parallel to Burns' encounters with the nationalistic implications of folktale: anxious, exciting, and frightening, the tradition had left its mark: and thereby hangs, or does not hang, a tail/tale. Nevertheless, that Burns could forswear his encounters with the folk is as likely as that Tam could swear off drink or cutty-sarks.

33. While both authors were to contribute to nation-making by drawing on folklore, the nature of such folklore, and the hysteria it could inspire, inspired Hawthorne to create his own subversive tale, but with a difference: though Brown, like Tam, snaps the spell with an impulsive shout—"’Faith! Faith!’ . . . ‘Look up to Heaven, and resist the Wicked One!’"—his is less an ejaculation and more a form of *national interuptus*. With his shout, the imagined community predicated on the exclusions of a distinct other ceases to exist. Since this is the only community Brown seems capable of conceiving, he becomes a "stern, a sad, a darkly meditative, a distrustful, if not a desperate man," so that, at the end of his life, "they carved no hopeful verse upon his tomb-stone; for his dying hour was gloom" (90).

34. Whereas Burns seems content to play with the dichotomies upon which the Scottish nation might be constructed—his hero comically impervious to any attempt to define a detestable other—Hawthorne seems much more worried by any project which might rest on such a strategy. As mentioned, such wariness was no doubt informed by the role played by his ancestor in the trial and execution of dozens of people during the Salem witchcraft hysteria as well as the dark forces of a truculent American eagle unleashed by a gathering Jacksonian nationalism. Hawthorne does respond to the call to use folk culture to propel a national literary project, but in a way that demonstrates an understanding of that culture far beyond that possessed by those calling for its simple exploitation. If, as Nairn writes, "the substance of nationalism as such is always morally, politically, humanly ambiguous" so are the folk whose stories can be manipulated to propel nationalist literary projects. Any writer’s attempt to forge national worship through folk legend and belief is considerably complicated, and, perhaps, subversively inspired, by the strange and mournful tales of "folk" themselves—whether we find them in the jolly tavern, the Scottish Kirk, or a New England forest.

Notes

[1] For a summary of conjectured sources, see Newman, 333-336. While most of the sources Newman summarizes are literary, he also points to oral tradition: "The witch folklore transmitted through oral tradition is difficult to document, yet during the course of growing up in the environs of Salem, Hawthorne had to have been exposed to some of the local folk beliefs" (333).

[2] Writes the folklorist Mary Ellen Brown: "Burns’ focus in his early work on local topics, his frequent use of traditional material, his acceptance of the fluidity of texts, his stress on audience and the oral socialization of his own works, and his articulated views on the function of composition—all suggest Burns’ strong and largely intuitive ties to the traditional and particularly oral matrix of late eighteenth-century Ayrshire" (6).

[3] "The pacification of the Highlands involved deliberate attempts to eradicate traditional forms of culture in order to root out remaining sources of indigenous identity and national pride" (Trumpener 29).

[4] See Davis 72-73.

[5] See, for example, Manning: "Scotland underwent—debated, theorized, experienced, resisted, imagined—union before the American colonies; the literature that emerged from this experience inevitably proved potent when the colonists began to formulate their own responses to a crisis in their relationship with England" (*Fragments* 4).

[6] See also Larry J. Reynolds' account of the effect that European history had on Hawthorne's attitude toward revolutionary "mobs."

[7] "A nation's formal literature needs to be based on the creative accomplishments of its folk, regardless of how crude that body of materials may seem to the sophisticated classes of society . . . . the sense of nationality is derived from the unsophisticated folk poetry of the people" (Herder, qtd. in Bluestein 5).

[8] See Bland, 79-99.

[9] See Bayer.

[10] "Beneath the decline of sacred communities, languages and lineages, a fundamental change was taking place in modes of apprehending the world, which, more than anything else, made it possible to 'think' the nation" (Andersen 22).

[11] See Anthony Marx.

[12] In a letter to Francis Grose (401 summer 1790) Burns recounts three of "the many Witch Stories I have heard relating to Aloway Kirk" (22).

[13] Smith cites Walker Connor's view that "nations, like ethnic groups, are phenomena of mass psychology and ultimately of felt kinship" (72).

[14] See Dundes: "Projection is one of a number of psychological defense mechanisms which provides an unconscious screen or arena for display of the causes of anxiety and it is for this reason that folkloristic projections are so indispensable" (45).

[15] In "Shadows of Doubt: Specter Evidence in Hawthorne's 'Young Goodman Brown,'" Levin shows how Brown, and perhaps the reader, falls for the same kind of "ocular deceptions" used to convict witches during the Salem trials.

[16] Smith argues that nations can be traced to "popular participation in large-scale cults and rituals, in the performance of ethical and religious obligations which bind a community of presumed ancestry into a community of faith and worship, in the sense of community evoked by symbols and myths of ethnic origins and election, and in shared memories of ancestors and heroic deeds" (Smith 111).

[17] Manning calls the Devil's oration in "Young Goodman Brown" "a demonic inversion of Dimmesdale's Election Day sermon in *The Scarlet Letter*" (*Puritan-Provincial* 101).

[18] Writes Larner: "A witch was, by definition, an abnormal person. The execution of a witch was a demonstration of group solidarity. It removed the provocative deviant and redefined the boundaries of normality to secure the safety of the virtuous community . . . . Witchcraft was more than crime for the practitioner was an enemy and witch process was directed against the eradication of public enemies" (206).

[19] Writes Marianne Hester: "The accusation of women was not merely a reflection of an age-old stereotype, not merely the by-produce of a patriarchal society; the witch-hunts were a part of, and one example of, the ongoing mechanisms for social control of women within a general context of social change and the reconstruction of a patriarchal society" (276).

Works Cited

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1991.

Bayer, John G. "Narrative Techniques and the Oral Tradition in *The Scarlet Letter*" *American Literature* 52.2 (1980): 250-63.

Berlant, Lauren. *The Anatomy of National Fantasy: Hawthorne, Utopia, and Everyday Life*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991.

Bland, Robert. "The Role of Folklore in Hawthorne's Literary Nationalism." Diss. U of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1976. *DAI* 37 (1976): 2868A.

Briggs, Katherine. *British Folk-Tales and Legends*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Briggs, Robin. *Witches and Neighbors: The Social and Cultural Context of European Witchcraft*. New York: Penguin Books, 1998.

Brown, Mary Ellen. *Burns and Tradition*. U of Illinois P, 1984.

Burns, Robert. "Letter to Francis Grose." June 1790. *The Letters of Robert Burns*. Ed. J. Delancey Fergusson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1931.

---. *The Poems and Songs of Robert Burns*. Ed. James Kinsley. 3 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Butler, Marilyn. "Burns and Politics." *In Robert Burns and Cultural Authority*. Ed. Robert Crawford. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1997. 86-112.

Dangerfield, George. *The Awakening of American Nationalism: 1815-1828*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Davis, Leith. "Re-presenting Scotia: Robert Burns and the Imagined Community of Scotland," *Critical Essays on Robert Burns*. Ed. Carol McGuirk. New York: G.K. Hall. 63-76.

Dundes, Alan. *Interpreting Folklore*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1980.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *The Scarlet Letter. The Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Eds. William Charvat, et al. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1962.

---. "Young Goodman Brown." *Mosses from an Old Manse*. *The Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Eds. William Charvat, et al. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1962.

Kesselring, Marion L. *Hawthorne's Reading; 1828-1850; A Transcription and Identification of Titles Recorded in Charge Books of the Salem Athenaeum*. New York: New York Public Library, 1949.

Kohn, Hans. *The Idea of Nationalism*. New York: Macmillan, 1944.

Hester, Marianne. "Patriarchal Reconstruction and Witch-Hunting." *The Witchcraft Reader*. Ed. Darren Oldridge. London: Routledge, 2002. 276-88.

Larner, Christina. "The Crime of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe." *The Witchcraft Reader*. Ed. Darren Oldridge. London: Routledge, 2002. 205-12.

Levin, David. "Shadows of Doubt: Specter Evidence in Hawthorne's 'Young Goodman Brown.'" *American Literature* 34.3 (l962): 344-52.

Manning, Susan. *Fragments of Union: Making Connections in Scottish and American Writing*. Palgrave: New York, 2002.

---. *The Puritan-provincial Vision: Scottish and American Literature in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge UP, 1990.

Marx, Anthony W. *Faith in Nation*. Oxford UP, 2003.

Matthiessen. F.O. *The American Renaissance*. New York: Oxford UP, 1941.

McGuirk, Carol. "Haunted by Authority: Nineteenth-century American constructions of Robert Burns and Scotland." *Robert Burns and Cultural Authority*. Ed. Robert Crawford. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1997. 136-58.

Mills, Nicolaus. *The Crowd in American Literature*. Louisiana State UP, 1986.

Nairn, Tom. *Faces of Nationalism: Janus Revisited*. Londson: Verso, 1997.

Newman, Lea. "Young Goodman Brown." *A Reader's Guide to the Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Boston: GK Hall, 1979. 333-48.

Noble, Andrew. "Burns and Scottish Nationalism." *Burns Now*. Ed. Kenneth Simpson. Edinburgh: Canongate Academic, 1994. 167-92.

Reynolds, Larry J. "The Scarlet Letter and Revolutions Abroad." *American Literature* 57.1 (March 1985): 44-67.

Tharpe, Coleman W. "The Oral Story Teller in Hawthorne's Novels." *Studies in Short Fiction* 16 (1979): 205-14.

Trumpener, Katie. *Bardic Nationalism*. Princeton UP, 1997.

Yuval-Davis, Nira and Floya Anthias. Introduction. *Woman-Nation-State*. London: MacMillan, 1989.

Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism

Acting "Natural": *Vanity Fair* and the Unmasking of Anglo-American Sentiment

Cree LeFavour, New York University

1. A popular hit in the United States, W.M. Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* is useful for underlining how one of the staples of the sentimental novel—the training of the mind and "heart" that Thackeray so mercilessly mocks as artificial—is itself implicated in so many mid-nineteenth century Americans' expression of anxiety over female novel-reading. In this context, Becky Sharp's "naturalness" and her explicit rejection of books and female self-improvement at once invite a reconsideration of the naiveté and simplicity critics have often assumed in their discussions of American domestic fiction, while at the same time drawing attention to the contentious debates over the moral status of novels themselves and the kind of cultural work they did.

2. I have chosen *Vanity Fair* as an example of a popular British reprint during this period because Thackeray's cynical manipulation of the sentimental genre invites analysis of the period's dominant historiography that posits a literary landscape dominated by American sentimental fiction. *Vanity Fair*'s strong presence in the American market invites the dissolution of the monochromatic sentimentality that critics still too often expect of American women's novels at mid-century, while Thackeray's novel's popularity in the U.S. provides an opportunity to examine what critics, and presumably readers, valued about novels and why. In other words, I use Becky Sharp to approach the problem of how British reprints alter the popular American literary market precisely because she is such an overtly anti-sentimental character. Becky raises the question of the place of feminine individualism in literature, or, as Gillian Brown writes, "the alignment of the individualistic self and its representations with anti-sentimentalism" (Brown 136). The traditional identification in American literary history of popular literature with a tame, feminized domesticity, and of individualism and the integrity of self with more "literary," masculine works of fiction, is nicely spliced by a figure such as Becky. Because she is so self-interested, a reading of her in the American context invites an analysis of the relation between her authenticity or "naturalness" as represented by Thackeray and her status as a popular, if reviled, female figure in a wider spectrum of reading. In turn, the value of Thackeray's narrative being perceived as "true to life" or "realistic" by antebellum American critics is placed in opposition to the troubled representation of authenticity in American sentimental culture.

3. Put very simply, it is the struggles with natural passion and raw impulses, and the training of the mind and "heart," that is at the center of much of this period's "sentimental" writing, just as the same struggle with passions—in which the battle is lost—predominates the widely read sensation and subversive fiction that David Reynolds has identified in *Beneath the American Renaissance*. *Vanity Fair's* explicit rejection of female self-improvement in this context invites a reconsideration of the naiveté and simplicity critics have often assumed in their discussions of American domestic fiction. Indeed, sustaining the construct of an enclosed body of "domestic" or "sentimental" fiction that comprised the whole of American women's reading has long since been shown to be untenable. And yet, the idea that popular female reading was quite explicitly defined in terms of British reprints throughout the 1850s remains untested.

4. Reprinted in the United States by Harper & Brothers in 1848, the first volume of *Vanity Fair* was

issued on July 29, with volume two on August 19 of the same year. For this first American edition, illustrated by the author, one hundred pounds was probably paid for proofs. Later that year, Harper issued a one-volume edition, which sold for $1 in paper and $1.25 in cloth (Dzwonkoski 195). In the absence of a copyright agreement with England, under the period's "courtesy of the trade" agreements, Harper's payment should have secured their sole right to publish *Vanity Fair* in the American market. As was frequently the case, this "courtesy" was not entirely respected. In fact, even in the relatively civilized publishing atmosphere of the late 1840s, it did not take long for other editions of *Vanity Fair* to appear, each priced at $1. The first is advertised from the Cincinnati firm H.B. Pearson in 1854, and the other is from the New York publisher, Bunnel and Price, available no later than 1854 (Tidball 7; Vose 124). In addition, the German firm Tauchnitz did not adhere to what it regarded as an American practical agreement, even though Tauchnitz did publish its books in the United States. The three-volume Tauchnitz edition of *Vanity Fair* was advertised in the book industry trade paper of the day, *The Publisher's Circular and Weekly Gazette* in 1857 at 40 cents a volume, along with the works of Dickens and Brontë (*Publisher's Circular* 27).

5. Harper's right to exclusive publication of *Vanity Fair* was not maintained, and yet Harper's market share of the reprint business was high and, despite the presence of two or more small competitors, it is apparent that Harper itself did a brisk business in printing and reprinting *Vanity Fair* throughout the 1850s, including multiple printings dated 1848, 1857, and 1860 (*Union Catalog* 512-3). This does *not* mean that Harper only issued the novel in these years. Rather, it means Harper issued the novel with a new title page in these years, reusing the initial printing's 1848 title-page plate in subsequent printings for reissue through 1857. It is impossible to say, therefore, how many times Harper published *Vanity Fair* during these years. *Vanity Fair* was issued again and again by Harper over the course of the 1850s but because the general dating practices of the period are inconsistent, finding a complete count of either various publishers' editions or Harper copies of *Vanity Fair* is not possible.

6. In the absence of absolute numbers, reconstructing *Vanity Fair's* rank in the marketplace argues for a brief analysis of that marketplace during this period as well as an assessment of the novel's critical and cultural impact in print. The novel's sales in the United States arose in no small part out of American readers' long dependence on British fiction, which in turn was in part a result of market conditions.

7. Thackeray, whose fame as a novelist was made on both sides of the Atlantic by *Vanity Fair*, did not simply achieve fleeting recognition but became an important cultural referent in a nation preoccupied with propriety, sincerity, and the moral dangers exemplified by Bunyan's and Thackeray's *Vanity Fair*. High rates of literacy in the United States compared to England helped to create a healthy publishing industry that was largely dependent on reprinting British books. As I have argued, this fact forms the foundation of debates over the passage of an international copyright law, with laborers' concerns, and concerns about sustaining the industry from top to bottom, providing the most consistent and compelling reasons for opposing passage of what might seem (and certainly seemed to Dickens) to be a just and fair law. But Thackeray and Dickens both benefited enormously from the reprinting of their books in the United States: they were paid for advance sheets, rights to serial reproduction, and later their American tours were money-making ventures.

8. As might be expected of such a widely read work, *Vanity Fair* was frequently referenced and reviewed, but it was given decidedly mixed notices from critics. Not only was the novel noted in short and long reviews when first published, it was discussed again and again as critics surveyed Thackeray's work as a whole during his lecture tours and compared it with his subsequent novels, including *Pendennis*, *The Virginians*, and *The Newcomes* (Flamm 56-9). These often contradictory reviews document the novel's visibility and presence in the American market, which I will discuss at greater length below, and they provide an opening into the values and priorities of the era's reviewers. While these values are certainly not identical to readers' values, some correspondence can be claimed where dominant themes can be

recognized and shown to be widely shared. I want to underline two points: first, the emphasis on and appreciation of "realism" and second, the predominant interest in the morality or immorality of Becky Sharp and her perceived effect on readers.

9. These two points may seem disparate, but they are in fact linked by the still somewhat tenuous positioning of novels in the culture. Because morality is frequently characterized by critics and commentators as an intrinsic quality of a text that cannot be separated from that text's social effects, these effects are perceived as ineffective in the absence of "realism." What I mean by this is what must be called "literary" standards cannot be separated from moral judgment. Given the still-contingent status of novels as a legitimate form of culture, their perceived role in shaping female morality and decorum, the positive social effects of novel reading were linked to certain standards of verisimilitude and were not seen to occur at all in overwrought, implausible, or absurd narratives. Realism, then, was cause for praise, as a reviewer notes in an article titled "Novels of the Season" in *The North American Review* (October 1848):

> Of all the novels on our list, *Vanity Fair* is the only one in which the author is content to represent actual life. His page swarms with personages whom we recognize at once as genuine. It is also noticeable, that Thackeray alone preserves himself from the illusions of misanthropy or sentimentality, and though dealing with a host of selfish and malicious characters, his book leaves no impression that the world is past praying for. (*North Amercan Review* 369)

In this formulation, morality and authenticity are central to the literary—both insofar as the entwined registers of its "use" for readers are concerned as well as insofar as its more general "value" for the culture is concerned. *Vanity Fair* is understood to be more morally and socially useful than the other novel under review because it accurately represents characters and situations from life, presumably making it possible for readers to glean useful lessons from the text. As *The North American Review's* critic notes, the realism is accomplished without "misanthropy" or "sentimentality"—each a form of "illusion" that distorts reality.

10. The acceptance of Becky Sharp as a literary character, and the widespread admiration of her in the American press, is based in large part on reviewers' perceptions of her as a true or accurate type; as George Curtis writes in a lengthy discussion of *Vanity Fair* in his 1853 *The Potiphar Papers*, "'to hold a mirror up to Nature,' is still the most potent method of shaming sin and strengthening virtue" (Curtis 12). Becky is not only appreciated for being true to a real type of scheming female, but more importantly, her whole persona is based on a certain kind of raw authenticity that is esteemed for its truth value. As the writer of *Harper's* "Easy Chair" writes: "The 'ideal,' in the sense usually intended by the word, is as foolish and unnatural in literature as it is in art. The sharp-sighted and pure-minded artists have long ago seen that the utmost reach of art is the most rigorous obedience to nature."

11. Linking this laudable "obedience to nature" to Becky, he proceeds to defend Thackeray against "many of the gentle sex who have hitherto refused allegiance to him on the ground that all his women were either fools or knaves." As he writes of Becky, underlining her sins and bad character as evidence of Thackeray's affection for truly virtuous women: "no man could draw Becky Sharp so dexterously who did not most exquisitely conceive and reverence the opposite of that character" (*Harper's* 840). Referring to Thackeray's novel as "the best we have ever seen from his pen," the reviewer for *The Knickerbocker* (September 1848) writes a bit more equivocally in a six page review:

> One of the best drawn characters is that of REBECCA, the scheming governess; sly, cunning, clever, unprincipled, and a thorough 'woman of the world,' in the worst acceptation of the term. Her career forms an admirable lesson, but we cannot even indicate

> it. (*Knickerbocker* 249)

Here, *The Knickerbocker's* critic playfully teases the reader with the problem of the "admirable lesson" Becky indicates, while the *Democratic Review*, in October 1848, gamely embraces her and her wickedness, while noting that the story is told "with the most marvelous richness of lively detail, elegant phrases and humorous situation. . . Clever, keen, pliant little 'Becky.' What though she is heartless, selfish, designing, intriguing; we love her because she is talented, energetic,—and successful" *(Democratic Review* 379, 378). In a dissenting view, the critic for *The Christian Examiner* intoned that "no modern writer had done more to strip the very name of woman all associations of moral beauty" than Thackeray in *Vanity Fair* (Baym 105).

12. For the most part reviewers responded not with outrage or revulsion to *Vanity Fair*, but with appreciation of the spirit and even of the cynical but successful knavery of Thackeray's character. The emphasis was frequently on Becky's success and her wily manipulation of the characters and situations in which she finds herself. Nor did the novel surprise or offend these critics' sensibilities (with the one exception) as might be expected in an era, the literary history of which is often characterized as wholly dominated by gentle and sentimental American domestic fiction. The writer for *North American Review* (1848) applauds Thackeray's willingness and ability to represent the breadth of humanity, good and bad, while referring to Becky as "the finest character in the whole novel. . . an original personage, worthy to be called the author's own, and as true to life as hypocrisy, ability, and cunning can make her. . . the very impersonation of talent, tact, and worldliness, and one who works her way with a graceful and effective impudence unparalleled among managing women" ("Novels" 369). That Becky Sharp did not offend, and was widely admired for her wicked success, must be seen in the context of a more accurate representation of the literary marketplace; one flooded not only with the sensation fiction Reynolds has so carefully documented but also with reprints of British novels that were seen as far more damaging to readers' morals than was Thackeray's ultimately moral purpose in *Vanity Fair*. The writer for *The North American Review*, in fact, singles out *Vanity Fair* as an admirable work (not only socially or morally, but in literary terms as well) from among eight other British reprints reviewed in the same article, including the Brontës' *Jane Eyre*, *Wuthering Heights*, and *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall*, Lady Georgiana Fullerton's *Grantley Manor*, Edward Lytton Bulwer's *Harold, the Last of the Saxton Kings*, and *Hawkstone*. While these novels are by no means outrageous in the vein of Eugene Sue or the early Bulwer, some of them stretched the boundaries of propriety, as well as reality, in ways that were objectionable to some reviewers, with *Wuthering Heights* being the greatest offender in this group ("Novels" 354-69).

13. Thackeray's representation of Becky and her treachery is quite tame in comparison with either the sensation fiction that purported to reform readers with the demonstrated misdeeds of characters caught up in nefarious vices. *Vanity Fair*, while containing a representation of a morally repugnant character who engages in some fairly explicit sexual misdeeds, did not stand out—or rather, the representation of Becky stood out as an example of well-developed character in a novel with an ultimately moral purpose. Thackeray's satire was generally recognized for what it was. As Frederick Cozzens writes in his book of social and literary criticism, *Prismatics*, in 1853: "Mr. Thackeray is one of the most genial and amiable of men. But however brilliant his wit, it has no warm, sunny side. He succeeds in creating very detestable people in his novels, for whom one does not feel the least sympathy. The satire, however, is perfect" (232). Taking this understanding of Thackeray's purpose, and parsing the definition of satire is Curtis, the author of *The Potiphar Papers*, who writes:

> It is called a satire, but after much diligent reading, we cannot discover the satire. A state of society not at all superior to that of *Vanity Fair* is not unknown to our experience; and, unless scalding tears of sorrow, and the bitter regret of a manly mind over the miserable spectacle of artificiality, wasted powers, misdirected energies, and lost opportunities, be

satirical; we do not find satire in that sad story. (11)

Like this critic, many understood *Vanity Fair* and its representation of the foibles of "society" as truth. While the greater truth of these depictions only strengthens the satire, rather than eliding it with sadness, the point remains that the novel's moral purpose, recognized by many and exemplified by Charlotte Brontë as she dedicated the second edition of *Jane Eyre* to Thackeray and his role as "the first social regenerator of the day"— a role recognized by many Americans as well (36).

14. *Vanity Fair's* reviews appeared in publications that are best identified as part of the general press and not as exclusively "lady's" journals. These publications also reviewed the American women's domestic fiction of the period, including *The Wide, Wide, World*, *The Lamplighter*, and *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. *Vanity Fair* did not, in other words, enter the American market in isolation—it was judged side by side with American women's domestic fiction, and in a market flooded with sensation novels. Nor was it ignored or overlooked in the predominantly feminine presses, including *The Southern Literary Messenger*, *Godey's Lady's Book*, and the *Literary World*, all of which also commonly reviewed and ran advertisements for American domestic fiction alongside those for British reprints.

15. While many of these reviews lack critical analysis—they are composed in large part according to conventions of the genre, of long excerpts from the novel under review—they situate these novels in a particular market; when *Vanity Fair* was reviewed or noted by *The Knickerbocker*, *The Democratic Review* or *Godey's Lady's Book* and other popular American originals were reviewed there as well (as they were), we can place them in the same, or at least in a very similar, literary culture, made up of texts, publishers, books, and readers. While I do not intend to reconstruct a general body of readers, or their reception of *Vanity Fair* beyond the select and certainly non-representative response of a few, predominantly northeastern reviewers, I do want to emphasize the significance of the fact that British reprints, including *Vanity Fair*, *David Copperfield*, and *Jane Eyre*, existed alongside American domestic fiction and were very much a part of the same, fluid literary market. This means they were read by the same class of readers that other critics including Nina Baym, Lora Romero, Jane Tompkins, and Anne Douglas (to name a few of the first to do so) have established as the primary consumers of American sentimental fiction—white, middle- and upper-class females, as well as by the men that made up the presumed market for sensational fiction. That is, these novels were reviewed and discussed in the same magazines and newspapers, they were published and sold alongside one another, and while British reprints were often less expensive than American originals, the advertisements for them, their binding, and the quality and quantity of illustration were comparable. Some critics have argued that the sensation literature of the 1850s, the precursor to the dime novel of the 1860s, was in fact the true popular literature of the day and that the above sentimental literature was genteel female reading, but I want to argue that the boundary between these genres and forms had not yet solidified by the 1850s. As the review history indicates, British fiction, as far as the press was concerned, was comparable to so-called "sensation" and "sentimental" fiction—none of which existed in its own market.

16. By establishing *Vanity Fair's* full participation in the literary market and culture of the period I do not mean to imply that it was welcomed by all segments of that culture, nor that there was one unified literary culture at the time. The point I want to make is that the borders between "genteel" women's fiction, British reprints that fit into this category, those that didn't, and American originals not fit for "ladies," were constantly shifting. These borders help to identify how British reprints have for so long been overlooked in American literary history, and in particular in the history of women's fiction during this period. For it has been primarily through the study of women's nationally identified literary *production* that critics have approached the popular fiction of this period. In doing so, most critics have demarcated a fairly rigid boundary around the texts that *women* who were writing or living in the United States produced, thereby creating a category of fiction based on a specific kind of gendered,

geographically specific production. This category is useful in many ways, but its limitations are revealed when this somewhat arbitrary category of producers and their goods become the object of the study of a group of nationally identified (presumed) gendered consumers. The once useful border around American gendered producers then becomes too circumscribed, as by its very definition it cannot accommodate fiction written by non-American women, even if this fiction is equally, if not more, important for the study of popular consumption.

17. From this perspective of consumers in a busy and chaotic transatlantic print market, I want to use *Vanity Fair* to focus on the shifting debates over morality, realism and literary value and on the kinds of changes these values underwent over the course of the 1850s. In addition, I'll undertake a brief analysis of what was considered appropriate for antebellum American women to read and why, and begin to talk about the predominantly British novels around which debates over female reading circulated. How were these novels aligned and/or misaligned with American domestic/sentimental fiction—in other words, how do these novels change the way we view the literary history of the period?

18. The following passage underscores my point that it is impossible, or at least irresponsible, to comprehend female literary consumption in antebellum America without including British reprints in the discussion. Appearing in *Godey's* in 1847, just prior to the peak of consumption and production of American domestic fiction, the "Editor's Table" took up the question of "Courses for Reading for Ladies," with but three references to American authors. The remainder of the column is taken up by advice to women on the virtues and dangers of British novels:

> Read all of Walter Scott's if you choose; and [G.P.R.] James is as safe a friend as any novel-loving young lady can find—none of his novels need the *tabu*. . . . all the novels by Mr. [Robert Plumer] Ward, and all by Charles Dickens can be marked free. We wish we could say so of all written by [Lytton] Bulwer and [Benjamin] D'Israli. In the perusal of these, a young lady should consult her judicious friends. It is not wise to give public prohibitions and yet there are cases when the advice of a wise and delicate-minded friend is of great advantage to a young lady in her reading. (213)

Five short years later, in marked contrast to its enthusiastic endorsement of fashionable historical romances above, *Godey's* complained of literature that is "chiefly framed for amusement." Turning from the seeming innocence of romance to fiction demonstrating a higher social and intellectual utility, as well as a greater correspondence to reality, in 1853 both *Godey's* and *The North American Review* exhorted their readers to more serious purpose in their reading. As the writer for *Godey's* put it, "let the fervor of intellectual pursuits be encouraged; but it should be after knowledge, not excitement." Referring to the staples of polite American female reading, including Scott, Radcliffe, Burney, and Edgeworth, an essayist for *The North American Review* writes that "novels were not then supposed to express the spirit of the age. Their aim was to please the reader. . . The romance proper dealt only with an ideal" (105). He goes on to demand that readers strive toward a more elevated purpose in their reading, using Austen and Bulwer as examples of frivolous goods, emphasizing their lack of social and moral usefulness:

> We laugh at the foibles or frown at meanness; perhaps resolve to beware of the one and the other. So far, well enough. But what is our feeling of the social world thus exhibited? Is our love of kind increased? Are the Christian desire and duty of remedying the ills we see quickened by these pictures of prevalent heartlessness and folly? (108)

These critics, in attempting to outline appropriate reading for women in an age steeped in Christian evangelical reform and an explosion of print that often did not suit the period's moralistic impulses, are addressing the period's popular fiction and in doing so are almost exclusively discussing British

reprints. In this context *Vanity Fair* was seen as a useful form of social satire with an ultimately moral purpose in keeping with emergent American values emphasizing simplicity, honesty, and the absence of pretense.

19. The perceived moral purpose of novels was central to shaping the emerging hierarchies defining various fictional genres. And yet, as Reynolds argues, "the gap between doctrinal social texts and entertaining imaginative texts" narrowed during this period, with the result that fluidity between genres was markedly increased as the social purpose infiltrating many novels became harder to distinguish from sermons or religious tracts. Thus, what Reynolds refers to as "sacrosanct themes" became a crucial element in fiction, while at the same time, those themes were invoked in a newly stylized version that called on "the mimetic, earthly world of literary realism" (16). Thus the emergent ideals of a more literary style combined, in the American context, with the demand for a more sophisticated morality underwritten by a "more serious purpose." That is, expectations for both the purpose or function of fiction as well as the style and devices used to accomplish that aim changed, becoming at once more "literary" and more didactic.

20. *Vanity Fair* was widely understood in the Anglo-American press to be both a moral and literary accomplishment, with reviewers referring to Thackeray's "entire freedom from mannerism and affectation both in style and sentiment. . . His effects are uniformly the effects of sound wholesome, legitimate art; and we hardly need add that we are never harrowed up with the physical horrors of the Eugene Sue school in his writings, or that there are no melodramatic villains to be found in them" ("Thackeray's Writings" 272). This admiration of the "art" of Thackeray's work and what might be termed its genteel simplicity was repeated in many of the reviews. Often compared to Dickens and his level of "pathos," appraisals of both authors were continually caught up in addressing the morality of the authors' stories, their views on human nature, and the ultimate effect of these tendencies on the reader—that is, the "lesson" their texts offer. The judgment of the moral value of a text was taken quite seriously, with a complex understanding of readers as serious consumers of narrative not taken in by, or more importantly, not affected by, artificiality either in prose, plot or character. As a reviewer writes in October 1856 in *The North American Review*:

    > Because the moral of a book is not written out in a few pithy words on the last page, it does not follow that the book has no moral. No faithful transcript of human life and human passion can be clearly and powerfully exhibited, without, of necessity, containing a deep and searching moral, all the more forcible to the thinking man because it is subtle and beneath the surface. Is not Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* a sermon of the most stringent application? Its author holds a mirror to our hearts, which reveals to each of us many a spring of action that we blush for, many a littleness and weakness, with much of worldliness and vanity, which we have never before been forced fairly to acknowledge, even to ourselves. We lay down the book, confessing, in spite of ourselves, that it is a faithful likeness of a large part of our human nature and this confession is followed by a pang that is not always useless. . . . Much self-knowledge may be attained, much healthful humility promoted, by having, as it were, the picture of our own hearts set forth before our astonished eyes, touched by the hand of a skillful and fearless master. ("Chapter" 349)

    Vanity Fair is admired not only for the moral lesson it offers, but also for the subtlety with which that lesson is imparted, and for the forcefulness of it, the result of the "faithful likeness" or the realism with which the "skillful and fearless master" sets the lessons forth. This suggests that the emerging divide between old and new was not parsed so much in terms of sentimentality and realism; rather, the divide is expressed on the one hand as a division between texts that followed dated narrative formulas and those that were able to move into a more sophisticated and character-driven expression of the novel's purpose; on the other hand, it is a divide between pure "amusement" and the purposeful, yet

sophisticated, moral didacticism of the 1850s. As the same reviewer writes in *The North American Review*:

> The modern novel differs from the old-fashioned one in so many points, that hardly any similarity remains, save that which is implied and necessitated by the realm to which they appertain, and the allegiance which both owe to the imaginative faculty of their creators. They differ, not only in choice and arrangement of materials and agencies, but their motive powers are totally unlike. The successful novel of the present day is strictly a work of art, amenable to all the laws of art. . . Artistic beauty of style must accompany the creation, development, and completion of the plot. Harmonious and dignified expression must follow powerful conception in the romance that would win and retain a strong hold upon the public taste. ("Chapter" 348)

Comparing these works to the "days when Richardson, Mrs. Radcliffe, and Miss Burney wrote romances which set the literary coteries of England in a blaze," the writer notes the "conventional ingredients" these novelists relied upon for their fiction but which have been supplanted by "the element of conversation. . . to allow the characters to unfold their individuality through the medium of their own expression." This aesthetic of the literary (identified as a less conventional telling of a story and by the absence of stock incidents, "startling events," "accidents and surprises," and "secrets and discoveries") is an essential element in "good" fiction, and yet fiction of all kinds is still positioned very much as an instrument of moral and intellectual improvement. He goes on to argue that, "The high requirements which criticism has lately made, have placed the novel on an elevated grade, not only as a composition, but as an assistant in mental and moral culture" ("Chapter" 342).

21. A lengthy essay on *Vanity Fair* in *The American Whig Review* (October 1848) addresses realism and morality in a way that brings us, perhaps surprisingly, to the connection between women, books, morality and maternity, a set of terms crucial to both domesticity and sentimentality, and one around which my argument will frequently circulate. The reviewer, having discussed Balzac's characters, writes that "this mention of Balzac brings to mind a more serious charge. . . more than once heard" against Thackeray: "namely, that his sketches contain too many disagreeable characters." The reviewer then acknowledges: "a queer charge this to come from a reading generation which swallows copious illustrated editions of *Les Mystères* and *Le Juif*, and is lenient to the loathsome vulgarities of *Wuthering Heights* and *Wildfell Hall* [*sic*]." The critic then goes on to defend Thackeray's use of such "scamps, profligates, and hypocrites;" these characters, the reviewer claims, are introduced "to show them up and put us on our guard against them. . . we hate them, and he hates them too. And if he ever does bestow attractive traits on his rogues, it is to expose the worthlessness and emptiness of some things which are to the world attractive—to show that the good things of *Vanity Fair* are not good per se, but may be coincident with much depravity" (*American Whig Review* 422-3). In other words, the complexity of Thackeray's text works to subtly and more effectively convey the novel's moral content. The assumption is that readers, particularly female readers, will identify with the text. This is the mode of reading I have identified with Dickens and which is linked to domesticity and its ideological shaping of gender insofar as women were assumed to have greater capacity for empathy and thus tended to be more influenced by their reading. The very qualities that made women maternal by nature also made them, by nature, more vulnerable and deeply invested consumers of fiction.

22. As Kate Flint argues, in the Victorian era "maternity was no longer regarded, in relation to women's reading, simply as a function which ensured close social guiding of one's offspring." Rather, she argues, it was "the ability to venture with sympathetic identification into the lives of others" that guaranteed "women's susceptibility to identifactory modes of reading" (31). This, of course, was constructed as a "natural" result of the female physiological makeup, including the reproductive capacity and the female brain. In turn, the deep identification with the text necessary to its "influence"

is dependent upon a certain degree of realism to be effective. Thus one of the most influential books of the decade, *The Wide, Wide World*, was admired for its realism, a fact that may surprise many readers of the novel insofar as realism is generally posed in opposition to sentimentality. Warner's novel was viewed by many critics as both artful (with well-developed characters, scenes and plot) and at the same time true to its moral and religious purpose, neither of which were seen to be in conflict. The novel's status as the sentimental novel *par excellence* in the literary history of the period is a categorical position imposed on the novel *later* and not one that the novel occupied during the 1850s.

23. To position Warner's and Thackeray's novels in a literary market together, and to see them as sharing readers, we need not recast these texts nor create unbridgeable divides between them; rather, we must grant the readers of the period a measure of sophistication in terms of their literary tastes. We must also give credit to these readers' ability to attain some distance and perspective on the tears and sentiment they consumed, based again on their consumption of a satirical novel like *Vanity Fair*. Beyond the superabundance of tears, there is very little in common between Thackeray's Amelia Sedley and Warner's Ellen Montgomery, much less between his Becky and her Ellen; the books, however, have a serious didactic purpose (although not the same purpose) and each carries out its mission with prose that is attentive to the representation of the "real" in the interests of social and moral improvement. And while Thackeray's parody engages the perfect heroines of old, including those idols of perfection so popularized in England and America by Scott and Cooper, Warner's certainly owes a great deal to their sisters, the searching paragons of moral and social perfection exemplified in the novels of Burney and Edgeworth.

24. The overwhelming popularity of *Vanity Fair*, *The Wide, Wide World*, *David Copperfield*, *Jane Eyre*, and *The Lamplighter* all provide opportunities to perceive the way the taste for popular literature moved toward a mode of purposeful reform (an exhortation applied to both writers and readers) in the 1850s, while at the same time becoming more sophisticated and less formulaic in style, plot, and character. To pursue this point further, Becky Sharp and her relation to domesticity and self-improvement provides some insight into the values underlying the shift that the reviewers above identify. I will situate *Vanity Fair*, with its ambiguous "heroine," as a text that throws into relief many of the cultural and social imperatives exemplified by female protagonists as represented by Warner in *The Wide, Wide World* and by Maria Cummins in her 1854 novel *The Lamplighter*—two novels that, aside from Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, were the most popular novels of the decade.

25. *Vanity Fair* is a moral book because it is a successful satire; indeed, it could scarcely be read any other way given how often the novel's narrator tips his hand and laughs at the pretensions and conventions of the "sentimental" and "ever so stupid" novels he parodies. As the reviewer for *The United States Democratic Review* writes in October 1848: "*Vanity Fair* is the world, and through its booths and busy places of pleasure and sorrow, the author leads the reader with Sentiment on one arm and Satire on the other." As this comment suggests, the American press had no trouble joining Thackeray's reverie, since the kinds of novels he mocks had long been staples of American reading and are included in a long list of British fiction read in the United States. Included in these perennial Anglo-American favorites are in fact many of the novels that polite society and genteel lady's magazines had long recommended women and girls read, including Edgeworth's *Belinda*, Fanny Burney's *Evelina*, Jane Austen's novels, and the works of Susan Ferrier. American domestic fiction, of course, also owes a great deal to these novels insofar as they established the "sentimental" genre as the female coming-of-age tale, a legacy that shaped both writers' and readers' expectations of the novel as a form meant, at least in part, for amusement. While the American works distinguish themselves in many ways in their treatment of race and class, they share a preoccupation with the British model in their treatment of emotion and intellect (or sense and sensibility) that is expressed through the representation of the female protagonists as sensitive, highly passionate and in need of training in the arts of self-control and reason. This is, of

course, the novel's British inheritance dating back at least to Richardson's *Pamela*, the history of which is discussed fully by Nancy Armstrong and Kate Flint in their respective histories of the novel and of reading in Britain.

26. Thackeray is not immune to the legacy of this formula, and yet he cunningly situates his text in such a way that it fits neatly into, while retaining some distance from, its narrative demands. From Amelia's sweetness, tears, and generosity (however mocked) to Becky's status as a penniless orphan, from the narrative structure that ultimately leads to its logical end (the marriage of Amelia and Major Dobbin, and Becky's second marriage) to the novel's perverse preoccupation with Becky's natural instincts, Thackeray retains many of the shared conventions of the sentimental novel while at the same time explicitly undermining them through the narrative voice. Most notably, Becky is not improved, nor does she wish to be. She openly engages in behavior that would make her repugnant according to any measure of idealized femininity of the period, which valued purity, benevolence and emotional self-control above all. Thackeray does not shy away from making a mockery of these traits in Becky, just as he does not hesitate to represent Amelia as a bald caricature of the insipid sentimental heroine. As an 1848 reviewer in *The Living Age* writes, one of Thackeray's women "is without a heart, the other is without a head" (413). Another critic, writing the same year for *The Democratic Review*, sees this tension between sentiment and satire in "these two women of opposite disposition" as the "woof and web of the story; all the rest is only nap, but nap of a most excellent quality" (378).

27. Because Thackeray deploys the staples of sentimentality so self-consciously, *Vanity Fair* is useful in reframing American domestic fiction and its complex situation in a mixed and chaotic print culture. In turn, the text provides insight into the preoccupation with purposeful and not merely frivolous novel reading by revealing how knowledge and sentimentality are entwined in the popular fiction of the period. By placing *Vanity Fair* in the body of American domestic fiction, we disrupt the isolation many critics have depended on in viewing American fiction as a self-enclosed universe, one that was either reflective of, or posed in opposition to, the real lives, work, and thoughts of American female readers. As Jane Tompkins famously argues, "the tears and prayers of sentimental heroines" were compelling to readers "not because they didn't know what good fiction was, nor because their notions about human life were naive and superficial, but because the 'order of things' to which both readers and fictions belonged was itself structured by such narratives." While Tompkins is certainly correct in postulating a mid-century culture permeated by the reform movement and religious piety, I think it is a mistake to view the fiction itself or its readers as existing in such a vacuum. The popularity of *Vanity Fair* undermines the kind of naiveté Tompkins's claim depends on; it suggests that the need to understand the readers of domestic fiction as sophisticated consumers of a diverse array of narrative styles with varying didactic purposes.

28. As Reynolds and others have demonstrated, the reform impulse was expressed not only as sentimentality, but also as sensation. *Vanity Fair* bridges these two seemingly opposed modes of expression, or genres. By exploiting the period's sentimental novels in a way that suggests a far more complex "order of things" than Tompkins would have, *Vanity Fair* may be seen as at once sentimental and sensational. And while *The Wide, Wide World* certainly fits the conventional notion of reform writing insofar as it shows the path to goodness through examples of the heroine's internal mastery of self and soul, not all so-called sentimental writing did so. *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and the writing of E.D.E.N. Southworth and Charles Dickens, to name just three examples, frequently fall into the sentimental and the subversive genres, showing the consequences of various vices in graphic and sensational language, while at the same time enacting maudlin scenes replete with tears. This implicates the reader in scenes of sympathy in a particularly intimate manner. Tompkins states that she does not view these readers as being "naive"—that the "order of things" was structured by "real" and fictional narratives that reinforced a sentimental world-view. I want to argue that by reading into the period's domestic fiction the satirical narrative *Vanity Fair* offers, the solidity of this order and the

narratives that comprised it are both compromised and revealed to be working in unison with an assumption central to readers of *Vanity Fair*: cynicism. American popular novels (many of them "sentimental") must be viewed through a far more knowing, self-conscious lens than has been assumed as the cynicism of *Vanity Fair*'s narrator exposes some of the more vulnerable lines beneath the seemingly enclosed body of American domestic fiction. Becky's character inverts many of the most essential qualities of the female protagonist, while reinforcing the centrality of class and market relations as determining factors in the protagonist's destiny. A deeply invested mode of reading is elicited by these texts, but the depth and emotion involved in this mode does not make it unknowing or innocent.

29. I want to focus now on Becky's temper and her mis/management of it as something that forcefully distinguishes *Vanity Fair* from its British and American competitors including *David Copperfield*, *The Wide, Wide World*, *The Lamplighter*, *Jane Eyre*, and other British and American popular novels. These are all novels preoccupied with learning and, most centrally, with learning to control the passions through the use of books—or through the practices of writing, and reading. Becky's rejection of this model of self-improvement helps to reframe the narrative boundaries defining Anglo-American popular novels of the period. Through her refusal to tame either her passionate nature or her own self-interest Becky remains, throughout the novel, un-domesticated. As Amy Kaplan notes, we should think of "domesticity not as a static condition but as the process of domestication, which entails conquering and taming the wild, the natural, and the alien." *Vanity Fair* suggests that domestication fails Becky, that she is irrevocably "wild, natural, and alien"—"this rebel, this monster, this serpent, this firebrand" is never tame (52). Unlike *David Copperfield*, she cannot put aside the self-interest born of her early poverty. *Vanity Fair* not only takes place outside of the domestic in the sense that the novel does not locate its emotional center in or around a particular house, but its main character explicitly rejects the self-improvement necessary to domestication, a resistance that places Becky, as a white woman in genteel society, in a somewhat ambiguous relation to her gender.

30. Becky's resistance to domestication begins in the novel's opening scene, when we see how very mistaken "honest," "good natured" Jemima is when she slips a copy of the revered *Johnson's Dictionary* to Becky upon her departure from Miss Pinkerton's School, certain that Miss Becky "will be miserable if she don't get one" (41). Not only does Becky not value the book, she is repelled by it, and in fine comic fashion, "just as the coach drove off, Miss Sharp put her face out of the window, and actually flung the book back into the garden" (45). It is not only her rejection of *a* book, but of *this* book in particular, which in 1830s and 1840s England was a proud testament to the power of words and to the knowledge necessary to their proper use. Becky doesn't want that knowledge, and she violently rejects the civilizing strictures—pomp, pity, and education—it represents. As Becky states bluntly to Amelia, "Revenge may be wicked, but it's natural"—and natural is precisely what Becky is and remains throughout the text (47). In sticking her face out the window, she exposes herself, barefaced as it were, not only to expose her act and its result, but to place her naked face there alongside the book as it flies through the air in a sort of open declaration of her brazen and unfeminine character. What is crucial about this scene is not that Becky would so rudely fling the book (she does much worse), nor that she is unrepentant about it. Becky's behavior is outrageous because the credo she announces never changes—she is content to be *natural*. She has no interest in or use for education nor, as I will argue, for moral or intellectual reform of any kind. She is to be taken as is, and no bonnet or head-scarf is called for to cover or to shield (herself or others) from her actions.

31. Becky's refusal of *Johnson's Dictionary* is a refusal that reverberates as she demonstrates that her natural instincts serve her self-interest very nicely. Having made use of Miss Pinkerton's school where she was "bound over as an articled pupil" because she could be "useful," and not to gain an education there, she is moved along when she becomes unmanageable and put to work as a governess, again, selling her skills in exchange for access to genteel society and, of course, money (49). Unlike the

eminently improvable Amelia, or the anxious and ambitious type that includes Ellen of *The Wide, Wide World* and Gerty of *The Lamplighter*, Becky neither accepts nor needs instruction, except perhaps in the finer points of upper-class etiquette and speech—skills she gathers effortlessly: "that in a fortnight, and after three dinners in general society, this young woman had got up the genteel jargon so well, that a native could not speak it better; and it was only from her French being so good, that you could know she was not a born woman of fashion" (342). While Thackeray notes condescendingly that Becky "went through the little course of study which was considered necessary for ladies in those days," beyond this obligatory bit virtually all of what she knows is innately hers (51). The American heroines Ellen and Gerty, on the other hand, are desperate to learn and go to great lengths and make significant sacrifices of time and energy to learn, with French being just one example of the staple accomplishments the American novels take up, the same Thackeray mocks. As Ellen in *The Wide, Wide World* confesses, "I determined I would try to study myself. . . . French I can do nothing at all with, and that is what I wanted to learn most of all." Gerty, too, "conceived a strong desire to learn French," and proceeds to demonstrate "a wonderful determination for doing so." In contrast to the American heroines's commanding self-discipline and dutiful drive to learn French (not by accident a necessary accomplishment for a "lady" in genteel society), it is simply Becky's "mother-tongue." And while Becky does practice her music "incessantly" at Miss Pinkerton's, it is a labor which says more about the expression of her passionate nature than it does about her desire to improve her skills.

32. The representation of this proper feminine model, and its relevance to understanding how Becky's shocking "natural" behavior plays into this tradition, can best be viewed through one of the central conventions of the period's fiction—that of the motherless child. As the critic Carolyn Dever convincingly argues in *Death of the Mother*, the absence of the mother in Victorian fiction is a prerequisite for re/forming the *ideal* mother. In each of the novels I discuss, the protagonist is (at least initially) an orphan, a formulation which enables the ambiguity necessary to sustaining the ideal of a classless society (the orphans' origins are never fully known, or are revealed at the end of the novel). With the notable exception of *Vanity Fair*, the void this absence creates is filled in each case with two linked substitutes, reading/books and the idealized maternal figure. The surrogate maternal characters, Emily in *The Lamplighter* and Alice in *The Wide, Wide World*, are themselves motherless, in effect doubling the effective absence and its representational possibilities. No better way could be contrived of representing the possibilities inherent in the threatened sacred feminine than through following the moral, intellectual and religious development of these lost children and their doubles. And while poverty and injustice are heaped upon the orphans, they are represented as spirited and capable in their struggle to master their passions. As Ellen confesses tearfully to Alice in one of their first meetings: " The worst is,—oh the worst is—that I meant—I meant to be a good child, and I have been I have been worse than ever I was in my life before. I have been passionate and cross, and bad feelings keep coming, and I know it's wrong, and it makes me miserable" (151). In turn, Gerty, of *The Lamplighter* confesses to her blind guide Emily on their first meeting (in a church, no less), "But I an't good...I'm real bad!" (66). For, like Ellen, her passions "once excited...were always extreme" (148), although she badly wants to be "good." Through the representation of the good mother/orphan and her unfailing guidance of the passionate child/orphan (Emily and Gerty in *The Lamplighter*, Alice and Ellen in *The Wide, Wide World*) these novels repeat and reinforce the necessity and possibility of *learning* to be (domesticated) women. Of Becky we are told, "she never had been a girl; she had been a woman since she was eight years old," which means not just that she is knowledgeable about the world, but more importantly, that she is sexually compromised. Thackeray indicates as much with his shadowy description of her history with Mr. Crisp in Chapter Two, when he writes knowingly of her outlook in leaving school and embarking on a visit with Amelia's family that "in all events, if Rebecca was not beginning the world, she was beginning it over again" (49, 53).

33. For Gerty and Ellen the process of becoming their guiding maternal ideal (Emily or Alice) is a great portion of the story the novel tells. As each learns to discipline her body and mind by decoding the

necessary lessons for performing genteel womanly behavior, the reading these girls do and that their surrogate mothers give them access to is what fully transforms them. The paradox generated by the values circulating around sincere behavior and the learning of authenticity in antebellum American culture provides insight into the American novels's preoccupation with learning and reform as exemplified by these characters. The partial resolution of this paradox by mid-century enables us to better understand the central place the idealized heroine of *The Wide, Wide World* holds in American domestic fiction, and how her sentimentality can be understood without creating an inapproachable divide between Warner's novel (and others like it, including Cummins's) and other British reprints, including *Jane Eyre* and *Vanity Fair*.

34. The standard version of this period's history is that the preoccupation with education that is characteristic of the age may in part be explained by social and economic change during the Jacksonian Era that eroded established means of identifying status, class and identity. As many historians have argued, in their absence a crisis of confidence arose, resulting in a flood of instructions for American men and women. "Conduct guides," whose purpose was to instruct Americans in how to behave—including how to dress, walk, mourn, worship, eat, and speak—flooded the market beginning in the 1830s and continued to appear in great numbers through the 1850s. I quibble with this analysis only insofar as conduct guides did not spring out of nowhere, nor did they disappear after 1860. They were published in great numbers throughout the nineteenth century and beyond and, as Nancy Armstrong has argued convincingly in her study of the British novel, *Desire and Domestic Fiction*, their origins may be traced to Richardson's *Pamela* (1740). Virtually every period in American history may be characterized as containing great economic and social upheaval. The 1850s are no exception, and perhaps even merit some special consideration on the grounds that the nation did in fact go through fairly radical social, political and economic upheaval on the eve of the Civil War as well as during the crash of 1857. Thus, while Americans experienced great economic and social change during this period, it is the way these anxieties were manifested—how they were expressed within the writing of the period—that concerns me.

35. What is compelling about the proliferation of conduct guides during this period is how, somewhat paradoxically, they were aimed at instructing readers in the art of being sincere. As Karen Haltunnen argues in *Confidence Men and Painted Women*, the anxiety over social and economic anomie was resolving itself by mid-century as Americans became more comfortable with the manners and rituals that marked genteel, middle-class conduct; that is, they became more secure in the idea that proper manners, dress and conduct *represented* their sincerity (rather than hiding it), and guarded them against what continued to be their greatest fear, the hypocrite or the masked upstart (197). Warner's representation of the ideal feminine emphasize how Ellen's piety is manifested *internally*, a formula for politeness echoed by an advice manual of the period which advised that "true politeness has its foundation in benevolence. . . It is not confined to mere exterior behavior . . . it proceeds from the heart" (*Manual of Politeness* 7). This internal sense, however, is repeatedly linked to a morality that performs itself through deeds and actions while at the same time arising out of that performance. As Kathryn Sklar argues, a shift toward an emphasis on outward manifestations of piety and morality took place during this period that "was congruent with an increasingly democratic and individualized ethos." As behavior was valued over the psychological state of a "joyous love to God," conduct became crucially important. This shift changed, Sklar argues, "what had theoretically been merely superficial behavioral modes into rigid moral determinants. . . . Sexually differentiated definitions of morality were thereby heightened, since so-called *natural* and unnatural behavior could now be equated with the moral and immoral" (83). We can then explain how natural characteristics or the "undomesticated," including blacks and non-assimilated immigrants, were linked to immorality by examining more closely some of the origins of domesticity.

36. As Kathleen McHugh asks in her *American Domesticity*: "What have slavery, suffrage, and citizenship

to do with domesticity? In the period between 1787 and 1840, the rise of the cult of domesticity coincided almost exactly with the fight for universal white manhood suffrage." Over the course of this fight, she argues, "the criterion for the franchise shifted from exclusions based on unequal distribution of property to exclusions that legally constituted identity itself as the premise for inequality" (39). One of the consequences of this shift toward a politics of identity-based citizenship (rather than class- or property-based) was "the transformation of domestic property relations." As McHugh argues, this transformation affirmed the private sphere as "domestic discourses formulated and celebrated the value of private property or the domicile as precisely dematerialized and idealized" (40). Connecting these discourses back to the natural and consequently back to Becky Sharp, we can see how McHugh's argument helps to explain the connections between feminine identity and property and in turn how Becky's need for property and the subjectivity that is underwritten by that property. As Becky herself famously acknowledges, in a tone reminiscent of Austen: "It isn't difficult to be a country gentleman's wife. . . I think I could be a good woman if I had five thousand a year" (495). Thackeray's narrator is unapologetic about the link between being a "good woman" and possessing property, with Becky's quest for riches, social stature and sexual purity underwritten by the narrator's comment that "who knows but Rebecca was right in her speculations—and that it was only a question of money and fortune that made the difference between her and an honest woman" (496).

37. External manifestations of piety and morality gained in importance during this period in part because Americans were able to consolidate their construction of "natural" behavior through the articulation of, paradoxically, unpretentious manners while distinguishing those "natural" manners from "unnatural" behavior. In turn, the more rigid requirements for feminine gender performance was linked to the evolving importance of the private sphere and the construct of domesticity. And while England was not undergoing an identical crisis, the antecedents for and the intellectual foundation of the crisis are shared. What, I think, distinguishes the two at this point is the American drive toward nationalism and its explicit identification of simplicity as "American." This meant that in food, dress, and manners Americans began to desire to express and distinguish themselves—as Americans. This is not to say that the slightly conflicted Anglophilia that I would argue is a characteristic of the period did not exist. It is to say that Americans were beginning, for a variety of reasons, not the least of which was the impending fight over a united nation, to see themselves as separate, and as embodiments of new and simpler values. When Thackeray has a bit of fun with the construct of the "artless" woman, it is a construct that perhaps resonated even more strongly on the American side of the Atlantic. The feared interloper, according to *Vanity Fair*'s narrator, is not far removed from what the revered figure represented in the American domestic novel. As Thackeray's narrator somewhat wickedly warns:

> The best of women (I have heard my grandmother say) are hypocrites. We don't know how much they hide from us: how watchful they are when they seem most artless and confidential: how often those frank smiles they wear so easily, are traps to elude or disarm —I don't mean in your mere coquettes, but your domestic models, paragons of female virtue. (210-1)

The cynicism of this view of the polished woman contrasts starkly with the American novel's unerring faith in the true woman's use of manners as a means of expressing authentic feeling. Indeed, it might be read as a scathing indictment of America's polite but deeply hypocritical white women's culture on the eve of war. Americans, I want to suggest, clung to the idea that actions (manners) expressed feelings (the source of truth). As Gerty in *The Lamplighter* demonstrates, perfect manners could not be separated from genuine emotion. The young and impressionable Fanny, when forced to tell Gerty's rule for learning politeness, responds that her advice "was the same my music-master gave me last winter" when she asked him how she should "learn to play with expression." The answer he gave and which Gerty's recommends was "You must cultivate your *heart*, Miss Bruce; you must cultivate your *heart*" (240-1). Thus while Cummins represents good manners as the result of genuine feeling, Thackeray

represents them as pure artifice—as a part of the theater of society. Which is not to say that Becky's manners were lacking—in fact, Becky's "manners were fine, and her air *distingué*" (342). Clearly, however, Becky's manners are precisely that, a means (access and acceptance) to an end (money, a husband) in genteel society—their honesty more closely matches England's treatment of race, whereas the American model seems to cling to a justification that manners might cover for hypocrisy.

38. Warner repeatedly engages the question of manners in *The Wide, Wide World*, with Ellen's and others' manners discussed throughout the novel as markers of class, nation and racial identification. The following discussion gives some indication of this:

> "She is a fascinating child," said Mrs. Gillespsie. "I cannot comprehend where she gets the manner she has. I never saw such a perfectly polite child; and there she has been for months with nobody to speak to her but two gentlemen and the servants. It is natural to her, I suppose; she can have nobody to teach her." (475)

Warner's emphasis on Ellen's innate goodness is something of a paradox. While she shows that Ellen is passionate, and that those passions must be tamed and controlled through submission to God, she is also careful to demonstrate that Ellen is inherently "good" or unusually pious by nature. What Thackeray represents in Amelia as so much foolish falsehood—including the maudlin scenes that characterize sentimentality—are, paradoxically, in the American novels, represented as a manifestation of *authentic feeling*.

39. Contextualizing this split between the Thackeray's cynicism and the American novelists' more naive values requires delving deeper into the logic of sentimentality, and how it works within all three novels to subsume social and racial difference behind the already racialized and gendered enclave of the private middle-class home—the sanctuary of the white, middle-class woman. Indeed, as Shirley Samuels has argued, by resolving public difficulty within the private sphere, domestic sentimentalism in the American novels at once erased unresolvable differences and ignored them. In these texts, a specifically racialized class status is ostensibly secured by the knowledge of a set of rules that could be learned by anyone, and yet which are in effect a set of codes that enable the means of identification necessary to exclusion. At the center of this code, or deeply embedded within the logic of sentimentality, is the work it does in building and maintaining the boundaries defining of gender. Becky Sharp, because she is represented as the antithesis of the sentimental heroine, provides a striking example of the contours of gender. Because she is anti-sentimental, the result is the representation of an ambiguously gendered character.

40. In fact I'd like to go further and suggest that Becky is coded masculine, identified as she is with the marketplace and with men throughout *Vanity Fair*. "She had never mingled in the society of women," Thackeray writes early in his description of her, a situation that might in part explain what he describes as "her hostility to her kind" (50, 48). Extending her quasi-masculinity and its consequences further, into the marketplace, I see her performing as a commodity in the text as she is repeatedly exchanged by (exchanges herself with) men and women, gathering use-value without engaging in the labor of self-improvement, becoming more and more expensive as she moves up the marriage market until she finally oversteps the line of propriety in her quest for greater riches and status, thus ultimately devaluing herself. Most importantly, Becky's value (as a subject, as a woman) is naturalized as an exchange value since one might argue that the most feminine behavior in the marriage market—being a commodity—is precisely what women are expected to do. The difference is that Becky understands herself and her relation to the world in commodity terms (she is for sale to Miss Pinkerton and then to the right husband, for the right price), and her efforts at self-promotion amount to a fairly successful marketing of her own assets.

41. I see Becky's status as a commodity, combined with Thackeray's representation of her as natural and his repeated emphasis on her as anti-domestic, as a set of conditions that by coding her masculine invert many of the key assumptions sustaining the sentimental novel. The text, through Becky, subverts domesticity and its basic values by representing them as so much falsehood, so much pretense; and yet, the text's effort to undermine the tired genre goes much further, exposing the artificiality of white femininity itself. Thackeray, by coding Becky as masculine and yet representing her as a woman, enables her to enact, in an extreme form, the basic preoccupation with natural passions so evident in the period's popular fiction. In other words, Becky is an expression of what Reynolds identifies as the subversive impulse that floods the sensation fiction of the period—that is, she embodies the shocking human passions and their untrained expression that is at the core of this crude mode of reform writing, an expression that embodies masculinity.

42. Thackeray's novel thus may be seen to work in concert with American domestic fiction, but the novel does so in a way that draws its readers' attention to sentimentality's central pretensions. For it is not ultimately learning and diligence, it is not spiritual and moral reform that makes womanly virtue possible; rather, these are revealed as the pretensions hiding the essential difference between classes—and it is ultimately the very American obsession with race that is underscored as the real difference between women. To be "natural," then, had a dual and somewhat contradictory meaning since it simultaneously signaled effortless, authentic performance of the "self" while also indicating an undesirable absence of cultivation and domestication most damningly and shockingly linked to female sexual passion which is in turn coded black.

43. In this formulation we can see that Thackeray's representation of Becky and her passionate, fiery and indeed often uncontrollable nature plays on the divide in American popular fiction between the sentimental and sensational modes. For while impulsiveness is represented in both genres as a great evil to be conquered (although it is often not conquered in the sensation novels), it is the play of race and gender that complicates the divide. For white female protagonists, the necessity of concealing and ultimately ridding the self of all uncontrolled desires and impulses is at the center of the drive toward achieving the virtue necessary to becoming a genteel wife—the end that is in store for virtually all heroines in all coming-of-age novels. This end, and its links to controlling the passions, cannot be overemphasized as the failure to achieve this control is represented not only as a moral failure but also as a failure to *become*, or to prove one's orphan-self to be, of solid (white) blood.

44. *Vanity Fair* provides a tame antidote that plays upon the pretensions of the sentimental novel while outing many of its most insipid conventions. And yet it fleshes out the space between genres, providing some of the gray area between genteel women's writing and the cruder yet extremely popular sensation novels of the period. That these novels existed in a divided universe of male and female is, I think, an untenable proposition, one that becomes more strained as we begin to understand the role of British reprints in this market and how their often less dogmatic narratives and more complex characters provide one more of the missing pieces of this period's literary history. By so explicitly engaging the formula followed by conventional sentimental fiction, *Vanity Fair* complicates our understanding of readers, texts, and the relations between them in 1850s America.

Works Cited

American Publishers Circular. 10 Jan. 1857.

Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. New York: Oxford UP, 1987.

Baym, Nina. *Novels, Reviewers and Readers: Responses to Fiction in Antebellum America*. Ithaca: Cornell

UP, 1984.

Berkovitch, Sacvan, ed. *Cambridge History of American Literature*. vol. 2. NY: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Blanck, Jacob. "Problems with the Bibliographical Description of Nineteenth Century Books," the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*. Vol. 36. (1942).

Berkovitch, Sacvan, ed. *Cambridge History of American Literature*, vol. 2. NY: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Blanck, Jacob. "Problems with the Bibliographical Description of Nineteenth Century Books." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*. 36. (1942): 124-36.

Brown, Gillian. *Domestic Individualism: Imagining Self in Nineteenth-Century America*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1990.

Campbell, M.J. Hotel St. George, Brooklyn Heights from Harper & Brothers, New York, NY. 29 May 1911. Letter stapled inside New York Public Library copy of W.M. Thackeray, *Vanity Fair*. New York: Harper & Brothers, n.d.

"A Chapter on Novels." *North American Review*. Vol. 83, no.173. Oct. 1856.

Cozzens, Frederick William. *Prismatics*. NY: D. Appleton, 1853.

Cummins, Maria S. *The Lamplighter*. 1853. New York: American Publishers Corp., n.d.

Curtis, George William. *The Potiphar Papers*. New York: G.P. Putnam, 1853.

Denning, Michael. *Mechanic Accents: Dime Novels and Working Class Culture in America*. New York: Verso, 1987.

Dever, Carolyn. *The Death of the Mother from Dickens to Freud: Victorian Fiction and the Anxiety of Origins*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Dzwonkoski, Peter, ed. *American Literary Publishing Houses, 1638-1899*. Detroit: Gale Research Co., 1986.

"Editor's Table." *Godey's Lady's Book*. Oct 1847.

"Easy Chair." *Harpers New Monthly Magazine*. Vol. 8, no. 48. May 1854.

Exnan, Eugene. *The Brothers Harper: A Unique Publishing Partnership and its Impact upon the Cultural Life of New York from 1817 to 1853*. New York: Harper, 1965.

Flint, Kate. *The Woman Reader: 1837-1914*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

Haltunnen, Karen. *Confidence Men and Painted Women: A Study of Middle-Class Culture in America*. New York: Yale UP, 1982.

Kaplan, Amy. *The Social Construction of American Realism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.

Knickerbocker. Vol. 32, no. 3. Sept. 1848.

Levine, Lawrence. *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1988.

Living Age. Vol. 18, no. 124. 26 Aug. 1848.

McHugh, Kathleen. *American Domesticity: From How to Manual to Hollywood Melodrama*. NY: Oxford UP, 1999.

National Union Catalog of Pre-1856 Imprints. Vol. 588. London: Mansell, 1968-81.

North American Review. Vol. 76. Jan. 1853. .

Petigru, Sue. *Gerald Grays Wife*. Augusta, GA: Stockton, 1864. .

Reynolds, David. *Beneath the American Renaissance: The Subversive Imagination in the Age of Emerson and Melville*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1989.

Roorbach, A.O. *Bibliotheca Americana: Catalogue of American Publications, Including Reprints and Original Works from 1820-1852 Inclusive*. New York: Orville A. Roorbach, 1852.

Samuels, Shireley. *The Culture of Sentiment: Race, Gender and Sentimentality in 19th Century America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1996.

Tanselle, Thomas G. *Guide to the Study of United States Imprints*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1971.

Tebbel, John W. *A History of Book Publishing in the United States*. vol. I. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1972.

Thackeray, W.M. *Vanity Fair*: *A Novel Without a Hero*. New York: Penguin Books, 1968.

Tidball, William Linn. *Olinda, or the Mexicans Daughter*. Cincinatti: H.B. Pearson, 1854..

United States Democratic Review. Oct. 1848.

Tompkins, Jane. *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860*. NY: Oxford UP, 1985.

Warner, Susan. *The Wide, Wide World*. 1850. New York: The Feminist Press, 1987.

Wilson, James Grant. *Thackeray in the United States*. 2 vols. London: Smith & Elder, 1901, 1902.

Winship, Michael. *Ticknor & Fields: The Business of Literary Publishing in the United States of the Nineteenth Century*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1992.

Wright, Lyle. "A Few Observations on American Fiction, 1851-1875." Worcester: American Antiquarian Society, 1955.

Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism

Money, Matrimony and Memory: Secondary Heroines in Radcliffe, Austen and Cooper

Jen Camden, University of Indianapolis

1. James Fenimore Cooper's *The Pioneers* (1823) almost ends with the marriage of the hero and heroine, Edward Oliver Effingham[1] and Bess Temple--almost ends, but doesn't. Instead, the last chapter begins with Bess and Oliver walking towards the graveyard, discussing their future. When Oliver fails to guess Bess's plans, she replies: "Do you forget Louisa, and her father?" (448). In the exchange that follows, their badinage over Louisa's future frequently repeats that phrase: "you forget Louisa." As Oliver and Bess debate, readers are reminded that they have forgotten Louisa. Indeed, Cooper appears to have forgotten Louisa — she has not appeared since she refused to return to the mountain with Bess. Although Louisa attracts readers' attention early in the novel, by the end she has faded from view, her heroic status replaced by Bess, the consummate "American girl." In this respect, Louisa functions as what I term a secondary heroine.

2. In this essay, I locate the erasure and then the return of Louisa as part of a larger narrative pattern of forgetting in the nineteenth-century novel. Specifically, I examine Ann Radcliffe's *A Sicilian Romance* (1790), Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* (1811), and *The Pioneers* to argue that each novel "forgets" a heroine, only to have her return at the end in a puzzling and uncanny "return of the repressed." Rather than understanding this return in psychoanalytic terms, however, I examine these heroines in terms of competing ideals of national identity and femininity. Specifically, I show that the primary heroines in these novels represent a socially-visible "sensibility" that represses the more invisible "sense" represented by the secondary heroines. In turn, these novels evoke readers' sensibilities, either to enforce or, in the case of Austen, to question the role of sensibility in shaping the national identities of England and America through literary heroines. In this way, I demonstrate that the transatlantic transmission of the figure of the forgotten heroine [2] is illustrative of the cultural work performed by the novel as a genre in both England and America.

3. Several literary and historical narratives link the novels that I examine, most importantly, the cult of sensibility, the Gothic, and the marriage plot. The secondary heroine provides a way to locate these organizing narratives intertextually. While the primary heroines of Radcliffe, Austen and Cooper's novels each possess sensibility, brave a form of the Gothic, and end happily married, the secondary heroine in each of these novels illuminates the work of sensibility, the Gothic and the marriage plot in stabilizing constructions of femininity and national identity and suggests, quite literally, the cost of sensibility. These secondary heroines suffer because of their lack of independent financial resources; they make visible the structure of wealth girding the nation, but masked by the sensibility of primary heroines. These secondary heroines respond to the overwhelming ideological power of sensibility by insisting that we remember the ordinary.

4. It has been common in recent years to study both British and American early novels in terms of the impact of the cult of sensibility on the history of the novel. Robert Jones opens his review of five recent books on this subject by remarking: "Earlier conceptions of sensibility as a particular literary, artistic or social mode--most often described as the 'cult' of sensibility — have given way to a history of the late eighteenth century that regards sensibility as the animating force for the whole period" (395). Recent considerations of sympathy,[3] such as Audrey Jaffe's *Scenes of Sympathy: Identity and Representation in Victorian Fiction* (2000) or Kristin Boudreau's *Sympathy in American Literature: American*

Sentiments from Jefferson to the Jameses (2002), extend the influence of sensibility well into the nineteenth-century. These scholars and others have uncovered the ways authors narrate the spectacle of suffering to provoke sympathy in characters and readers alike, and then use that sympathetic response to cement national identity or reshape social policies.[4] However, attention to this spectacle, this scene of sympathy, has obscured the role of the secondary heroine. In both British and American Romantic novels, the heroine of sensibility embodies national ideals that the ideal reader internalizes via sympathy. This narrative strategy connects the British and American literary traditions through the cult of sensibility. In contrast, the secondary heroine's lack of sensibility limits readers' sympathy for her character and thus, at least initially, for the alternative possibilities of nationhood and womanhood she represents.

5. Before turning to the secondary heroine, I want briefly to follow the trajectory of the primary heroine in the three novels (and three genres) I consider in this essay. In the Gothic novel, the reader watches the heroine of sensibility appreciate the beauty of a piece of music or a picturesque scene and, through sympathy with her, learns to value that aesthetic. The Gothic plot disrupts these scenes of sensibility, but we return to them once the Gothic mystery has been resolved. The Gothic plot, therefore, serves as both interruption and test for the heroine of sensibility, and she is rewarded by the restoration of order, implicit in the return to the pastoral, and by the resolution of the marriage plot in favor of the hero of sensibility who shares her aesthetic tastes.

6. In the nineteenth-century novel, we see British and American authors incorporating heroines of sensibility to very different nationalist ends. In England, as we see in *Sense and Sensibility*, the narrator's ironic distance from the marriage plots illuminates the excessive sensibility of the protagonists and calls into question the possibility of true sympathy. By setting her novel in a very familiar English landscape, Austen offers a sort of test case that asks how the sensibility endorsed by the eighteenth-century novel fares in quotidian England. In *The Pioneers*, Cooper's heroine, Bess, is the heroine of sensibility who rightly appreciates the beauty of the American landscape and is able to respond appropriately to scenes of distress. However, Bess also establishes American domesticity through her management of Judge Temple's house and his wayward subordinates and in her marriage to Oliver Edwards. In this way, Cooper establishes a new American sensibility able to face both the wilderness and the management of the hearth.

7. By writing a historical romance, Cooper is also clearly indebted to Sir Walter Scott, whose Waverly novels first appeared in 1814, three years after the publication of *Sense and Sensibility* and nine years prior to *The Pioneers*. In this essay, I focus on Cooper's less-studied debt to Austen to understand the significance of the cult of sensibility to the development of the novel and the nation. In Radcliffe and Austen, the heroines are sisters, ensuring a common biological background; the difference between each heroine is one of sensibility.[5] While Cooper insists that Louisa and Bess are different — both emotionally and biologically — Louisa's social status is the key marker of difference. Cooper's focus on the class identity of his heroines connects his version of the historical romance to Austen.[6]

8. The secondary heroines I examine in this article — Emilia, Elinor and Louisa — receive little sympathy from their sister heroines of sensibility. Radcliffe and Cooper intentionally limit readers' sympathy for these figures in order to consolidate national identity under the auspices of the heroine of sensibility, but in doing so reveal the ways that sensibility masks the link between money and matrimony.[7] While Radcliffe and Cooper deploy very similar strategies of "forgetting" in the undomesticated landscapes of the Gothic and the American frontier, Austen reveals the limits of sensibility by giving narrative weight to pragmatic Elinor as well as to the more effusive Marianne. In Austen's novel, the reader is encouraged to have sympathy for Elinor at least in part because Marianne and the other figures of sensibility do not. In reimagining the British domestic within the borders of home, Austen refigures the marriage plot to value the quotidian. Austen occupies a pivotal point in my

argument: a point where British and American traditions divide. Austen's valorization of the domestic is often located as a point of origin for the British realist novel.[8] In the American tradition, Cooper responds to Austen by deliberately forgetting the secondary heroine in order to shore up the nationalist project of the historical romance. By forgetting the secondary heroine, Cooper attempts to create a new point of origin for the American novel.

Domestic Sense and Italian Sensibility in A Sicilian Romance

9. Whether with respect or derision, the nineteenth century looked back to "Mrs. Radcliffe," or "Mother Radcliffe," as Keats called her, as the exemplary author of the Gothic novel. It has become a critical commonplace to name Radcliffe the founder of a form of "female Gothic," though the scope of definitions of this term is as dizzying as the landscapes of her novels. E. J. Clery traces the origin of the phrase back to Ellen Moers in *Literary Women*, suggesting that Moers coined the term "in order to reveal a tradition of women's writing, an alternative canon; by it, she meant simply 'the work that women have done in the literary mode that, since the eighteenth century, we have called the Gothic'" (qtd. in Clery, "Ann Radcliffe," 203). Clery rightly continues to question the accumulated connotations now surrounding Moer's coinage in order to raise the central question of her argument: "Why a heroine?" (203). The question raised by *A Sicilian Romance*, however, is why *two*?

10. Traditionally these sisters, Emilia and Julia, have been read as representations of sense and sensibility, [9] with Emilia's "sense" quickly dismissed to focus on the education of Julia's sensibility. Though Julia certainly takes on the status of primary heroine, Emilia is not neatly killed off, imprisoned or exiled. Instead, her story surfaces at several points to punctuate Julia's Gothic adventures with an alternative narrative of domestic confinement and bereavement. In the conventional Gothic novel, the heroine survives her adventure to be married to the hero; Emilia has no adventure and survives the novel unmarried and with apparently no inclination to be married.[10] Radcliffe's insistence on Emilia's return suggests that the restoration of order is not complete once the Gothic is explained and the hero and heroine reunited. While the Gothic now has an explanation, Emilia's confinement in the Castle Mazzini does not. By encouraging readers to draw comparisons between their own domestic confinement and Emilia's while suggesting the Gothic nature of that confinement, Radcliffe raises the possibility that the Gothic is not only in Sicily, but also at home.

11. By constantly providing a rational explanation for her supernatural events, it has been argued, Radcliffe educates her heroine and her readers' sensibilities, teaching them to rely on their reason instead.[11] However, Radcliffe not only "disappoints" us by revealing the rational behind the supernatural, she disappoints almost all of our readerly expectations, in effect refuting the rational reader's attempt to relegate the plot of the novel to expected conventions. If the novel teaches Julia, and through Julia, us, that the mysterious light has a perfectly rational explanation,[12] what the novel teaches us, but not Julia, is that we should not expect this novel to fall into conventional patterns so easily. By returning periodically to Emilia's confinement, Radcliffe violates her own narrative pattern and raises the possibility that, for readers, Emilia, and not her mother, is the Gothic mystery that must be discovered at the heart of the Castle Mazzini.

12. The novel concludes by falling into the greatest of all possible literary conventions, the marriage plot, but I would argue that by establishing a pattern of narrative violation throughout the course of her novel, Radcliffe teaches readers to be disappointed in the tidy ending by revealing its constructedness. In turn, our dissatisfaction with the conclusion of the novel, our awareness that something is not quite right here, encourages readers to look for the rational explanation, the making-right, that Radcliffe has always offered. As Claire Kahane has convincingly argued:

> This disjunction between the Gothic experience and the novel's conclusion illustrates a

> pervasive ambivalence for the female reader in the Gothic paradigm. . . . Thus as in *Udolpho* and *Jane Eyre*, while the heroine ultimately moves into a space that she seemingly controls, that control is illusory, based as it is on social withdrawal and psychological repression, on an ultimate submission to patriarchal constructs of the feminine.[...] Both conclusions excise the Gothic terrors, idealizing the mother and the heroines as well. Yet beneath the pedestal lies an abyss; at the Gothic center of the novels, a fearsome figure in the mirror still remains, waiting to be acknowledged. (340)

Kahane sees the heroine's confrontation with the mother as the dark center of the Gothic novel from which the heroine (and the reader) is "saved" by repression and a return to the pastoral/patriarchy at the conclusion of the novel. In the case of Julia in particular, her many attempts at escape lead her back to her true point of origin — her mother. Julia appears to be doomed to a fate similar to her mother's, thus perpetuating the repetitious cycle of doubles and traps characteristic of this novel. In keeping with Kahane's argument, it is possible to read Julia's inability to escape from Sicily as a narrative device forcing her further inward towards the confrontation with her mother. However, despite appearances, *A Sicilian Romance* does *not* end by repressing the Gothic danger Julia had faced and ushering the hero and heroine into a comfortable pastoral landscape. Instead, the novel insists on the return of the repressed through both landscape and the secondary heroine.

13. We leave Julia at the close of chapter fourteen, hiding from the Marquis with no sign of escape. Her eventual escape with her mother, aided by Hippolitus, is destined to fail in precisely the same manner as her first attempt with Ferdinand. Julia's encounter with her mother has not made it possible for her to escape Sicily. However, the discovery of Julia's mother does change the narrative practices of the novel: the story of their escape and attempt to flee to Italy is told in the past tense, as all of the characters are seated around a happy villa fireside. Secure in the outcome for Julia—a happy reunion—the Gothic events of the story are made harmless and almost inconsequential. Indeed, our narrator does not indulge in the descriptions that have heretofore characterized the novel. In contrast to the lengthy description of Julia's discovery of her mother, their reunion with Hippolitus is described as follows: "No color of language can paint the scene which followed; it is sufficient to say that the whole party agreed to quit the cell at the return of night" (195). Readers have followed Julia through all of the picturesque scenery of Sicily; now their journey to Palermo is condensed: "Having escaped from thence they proceeded to a neighboring village, where horses were procured to carry them towards Palermo. Here, after a tedious journey, they arrived, in the design of embarking for Italy" (197). The storm which (inevitably!) strikes their small vessel is contained in one sentence: "They soon had reason to repent their temerity; for the vessel had not been long at sea when the storm arose, which threw them back upon the shores of Sicily, and brought them to the lighthouse, where they were discovered by Ferdinand" (198). Compared to the tempest described earlier in the novel, the transformation in Radcliffe's narrative tone is amazing. And although the narrator's tone and manner of description appears to indicate that the narrative is headed towards resolution, the tempest, operating as a sort of deus ex machina, returns the characters to the shores of Sicily to fetch Emilia from the Castle Mazzini and reminds readers that they have forgotten Emilia for the majority of this tale.

14. Once the family has "settled their future plans," Ferdinand "hastened to the castle of Mazzini to fetch Emilia, and to give orders for the removal of his household to his palace at Naples, where he designed to fix his future residence. The distress of Emilia, whom he found recovered from her indisposition, yielded to joy and wonder, when she heard of the existence of her mother, and the safety of her sister" (198). The "distress of Emilia" is interrupted by the clause "whom he found recovered from her indisposition." Some might claim this is simply Radcliffe tying up loose ends; indeed, it might appear that Radcliffe has suddenly remembered that Emilia was left "confined to her bed by a dangerous illness" (193) after the deaths of the Marquis and Maria, but this is consistent with Radcliffe's treatment of Emilia throughout the novel.

15. Emilia is gradually left out of the plot from the moment Julia sees Hippolitus. The morning after the ball, the narrator tells us "Julia found it impossible to support a conversation with Emilia, whose observations interrupting the course of her thoughts, became uninteresting and tiresome" (21). The introduction of "the Gothic" to the novel, in the form of the mysterious lights and sounds from the uninhabited portion of the castle, serves as much to throw Julia and Emilia back together, at least initially, as it does to ultimately unite Julia and Hippolitus. It is not the mysterious chambers of the castle, but rather the marquis's decision that Julia should marry the Duke de Luovo that once again separates Julia and Emilia. Whether the suitor is the appealing Hippolitus or the vile Duke de Luovo, the effect of the marriage plot on Emilia and Julia is the same: separation.[13]

16. Emilia does not return to the narrative until the end of the first volume, when Madame de Menon's accidental discovery of the marchioness's intrigue forces her to leave the castle. Unlike Julia, who abandons friend and family without a word, Emilia's distress at Madame de Menon's departure is markedly vocal: "In madame she lost her only friend; and she too well understood the value of that friend, to see her depart without feeling and expressing the deepest distress" (102). This vocal distress is valorized by our narrator, who commends madame's and Emilia's grief at parting: "They left each other with a mutual sorrow, which did honor to their hearts" (103). By valorizing "mutual sorrow" and the expression of feeling, Radcliffe quietly rebukes Julia's selfish sentimentality that prioritizes her own marital happiness over female friendships. Emilia's narrative, when it surfaces, prevents readers from fully identifying with Julia's narrative by making visible what Julia represses: the toll sensibility takes on other characters.

17. At the close of the novel, our narrator recounts the fate of each of the characters, beginning with the marchioness, followed by Hippolitus and Julia, Ferdinand, Madame de Menon, and lastly Emilia, whose future is elided with that of the marchioness: "Emilia, wholly attached to her family, continued to reside with the marchioness, who saw her race renewed in the children of Hippolitus and Julia. Thus surrounded by her children and friends, and engaged in forming the minds of the infant generation, she seemed to forget that she had ever been otherwise than happy" (199). The text only definitively states that Emilia is "wholly attached to her family," but the pairing of Emilia and the marchioness is suggestive. Although this pairing might appear to conflate Emilia's imprisonment with that of the marchioness, there is a crucial difference: the marchioness married the marquis; Emilia has never been married. By having Emilia choose to remain with her family, unmarried, Radcliffe authors and authorizes an alternative to marriage, but perhaps more importantly, reveals the perilous position of women. Choosing a bad husband, such as the Marquis, or choosing no husband, as Emilia does, has the same effect: imprisonment.

18. Though Emilia, like her mother, may have "seemed to forget that she had ever been otherwise than happy" (199), by concluding the manuscript annals with this line Radcliffe reminds us that Emilia had indeed been "otherwise than happy" and points us back into the text. But where is the record of Emilia's unhappiness? Where has she been for the last hundred pages? Emilia thus becomes a Gothic mystery and in the untold tale of her imprisonment within the Castle Mazzini the reader might infer instead a domestic double of Madame de Menon and Julia's adventures. All we are told is that "the castle Mazzini, which had been the theatre of a dreadful catastrophe; and whose scenes would have revived in the minds of the chief personages connected with it, painful and shocking reflections—was abandoned"(198). Emilia is the chief personage connected with the castle Mazzini, having spent the bulk of the novel within its ramparts. If Julia is perpetually cast back "upon the shores of Sicily," Emilia is kept within the confines of the castle, without the hope of rescue from a suitor, and subject to Ferdinand's "fetching" her to rejoin their friends.

19. The barely-narrated story of Emilia's imprisonment is compelling if we remember that Emilia had never been impatient to leave the confines of the Castle Mazzini, as is made evident by her and Julia's

strikingly different reactions to the approaching festival:

> Julia, who, in the distance, had considered the splendid gaieties of life with tranquility, now lingered with impatient hope through the moments which withheld her from their enjoyments. Emilia, whose feelings were less lively, and whose imagination was less powerful, beheld the approaching festival with calm consideration, and almost regretted the interruption of those tranquil pleasures, which she knew to be more congenial with her powers and disposition. (15)

Emilia's contentment with her tranquil retirement is only troubled by the disappearance of those female friends and relatives whose company she enjoys. Julia's entry into the world through her attachment to Hippolitus exiles her from Emilia, and, at least for the first volume of the novel, from Madame de Menon. This exile begins long before Julia's escape, when her preoccupation with Hippolitus renders Emilia's conversation "uninteresting and tiresome" (21).

20. By entering the world through heterosexual desire, Julia subjects herself to competing authorities: Hippolitus and her brother, Padre Abate, as well as the Marquis and Duke. In contrast, Emilia remains subject to her father's authority, but suffers because of the preoccupation of the household with the impending threat of Julia's marriage, whether to Hippolitus or to the Duke. In the novel, Radcliffe describes two scenes as "known only to those who have experienced a similar situation": the first is Emilia's "anguish" (103), at the departure of Julia and then Madame de Menon; the second is "the strangely mingled emotions of joy and terror that agitated Hippolitus" (164) upon the rediscovery of Julia in the caverns of the banditti. Clearly the gothic excess of the latter makes it unlikely that any reader would identify with Hippolitus; moreover, that Radcliffe's readers were predominately middle-class women makes their identification with a young Neapolitan aristocrat even more suspect. Emilia's domestic confinement, on the other hand, would echo their own, and they would certainly be sensible to her pain at the loss of her female friends.

21. Thus Julia's Gothic adventures illustrate the perils and the inescapability of not only the Sicilian landscape but the tandem impossibility of escape from the competing patriarchal authorities of the father, whether embodied in the aristocratic Duke, the Catholic Church (certainly already suspicious to a Protestant like Ann Radcliffe), or the literal paternal figure.[14] However, Emilia's untold story, her confinement in the Castle Mazzini, which despite its Gothic secrets must also be described as her home, allowed the readers of Radcliffe's novels a space in which to realize their own English identity within the novel, both in their complicity with the Gothic structures that nearly killed the Marchioness, whom Emilia is said to be so much like, but also in the difficulty of completely abandoning those structures. For readers of *A Sicilian Romance*, the forgotten heroine's return, like the return to Naples, is a return of the repressed. While readers may wish to forget Emilia, as Julia does, to do so requires that they repress the narrative of her confinement. Emilia's return reminds readers that the dangers apparently surmounted in Sicily are not so safely distant from their own shores.

A New British Domestic: Sense and Sensibility

22. In *Sense and Sensibility*, the frequent cases of mistaken identity that drive the plot, the incorporation of the picturesque and the sublime, and, of course, the silences and secrets that estrange our characters from each other are all reminiscent of the Gothic. Most readings of Austen limit her response to the Gothic to a discussion of her early novel, *Northanger Abbey*.[15] The Gothic elements of *Northanger* are contained by Henry Tilney: it is Henry who first suggests to Catherine the Gothic possibilities of the Abbey, and Henry who undoes the Gothic spell by asking: "Remember that we are English, that we are Christians. Consult your own understanding, your own sense of the probable, your own observation of what is passing around you. . . . Dearest Miss Morland, what ideas have you been admitting?" (270).

[16] By using Henry to contain the Gothic possibilities Catherine imagines, Austen ensures that their marriage provides the kind of rational explanation Radcliffe offered to her readers.

23. *Sense and Sensibility* opens with the exile of the women from their home, Norland, by the conditions of their father's will. In effect a social-realist parody of the conventional Gothic cruel father who drives his daughter beyond the pale, the unintentional cruelty of Mr. Dashwood sends his daughters and wife outside of the domestic. The world they encounter is not filled with banditti or inescapable caverns, but it is equally challenging, as they attempt to negotiate the British economic system. Austen juxtaposes the heroine of sense, Elinor, with the heroine of sensibility, Marianne, to discipline readers into emotional and fiscal management. Critics have long argued over the respective status of these two heroines;[17] I argue that Marianne is the primary heroine, and Elinor is the secondary heroine. In doing so, however, I do not mean to suggest that Elinor is less significant than Marianne. Instead, I argue that Elinor lines up with the category of the "forgotten heroine," but that Austen's project is to insist that we remember her.

24. In the eighteenth century, the manifestation of proper sensibility was a marker of class status. However, the later appropriation of the discourse of sensibility by the middle class devalued the performance of sensibility. Although Marianne's spectacle of sensibility gets readers' attention and often our sympathy, [18] it is Elinor's more difficult and often less interesting attempt to negotiate the English class system in search of financial security that Austen trains her readers to appreciate. In this respect, Austen builds on Emilia's domestic confinement in *A Sicilian Romance*. Emilia values female friendship, but is financially dependent on her father. By choosing not to marry, she necessarily chooses domestic isolation until the family is reconfigured in Naples. The death of the father at the start of *Sense and Sensibility* leaves the Dashwood women without any financial resources: they cannot remain at home. By devaluing Marianne's encomiums on the English landscape in favor of Elinor's pragmatic approach to economics, Austen establishes a new British domestic. This new domestic recognizes that the sensibility of the Dashwood girls does not ensure happiness, as it might in one of Marianne's novels; instead, the Dashwoods are dependent on the sympathy of their relations, their own ability to economize and, lastly, on the possibility of marrying well. In short, the Dashwood women need money, and the juxtaposition of Elinor and Marianne is in some ways a competition to determine the best way to get it. This competition reveals the correlation between economic and emotional management.

25. The Dashwood women are in financial need, but support from their relations is highly unlikely. John's discussion with Fanny concerning the interpretation of his father's last wish that he would "assist his widow and daughters" (6) reveals their want of true sympathy.[19] Their overmanagement of financial resources — in short, their greed — makes them unsympathetic to the Dashwoods. John and Fanny are more attentive to their own comfort, and imagine how they would feel if they were in place of the Dashwoods quite literally, by moving into Norland and lamenting the loss of the original linen and china. In their limited understanding of the economic plight of Mrs. Dashwood and her daughters, they imagine them either well-married, or able to shift on the inheritance they already have. In contrast, Austen places the Middletons, whose excessive hospitality also discomfits the Dashwoods. It is notable that their hospitality not only consists of financial support through the low rent at Barton cottage, the frequent invitations to dinner, and the journey to town, but also extends to the preoccupation of Sir John and Mrs. Jennings with the intimate details of the social lives of the Dashwood sisters. Thus even financial generosity is not necessarily equivalent with true sympathy, a requisite for proper sensibility. Their overexuberance to see the girls married results in a great many awkward misunderstandings concerning the three primary suitors: Willoughby, Colonel Brandon, and Edward Ferrars.

26. The three suitors, in turn, offer different representations of wealth and economy as they operate in England; the financial practices of Austen's men are an echo of their true sensibilities. Willoughby's excessive spending and want of management not only results in debt but also in his dishonorable

relationship with Eliza. Willoughby is, we discover, not what he seems, and thus true sympathy with Marianne is impossible. Colonel Brandon's history is determined by both wealth and sensibility: his love for Eliza was obstructed by his parents' determination to wed her to his older brother for the sake of uniting their family fortunes. Brandon's careful management of his own wealth and his generosity to Edward are reflections of his appropriate sympathy for others and management of his own emotions. Although Brandon styles himself a "poor narrator," he knows when it is appropriate to divulge information, and when it is best to conceal what one feels. In contrast, Edward's financial security as a gentleman, unallied to any sort of profession, leaves him adrift and susceptible to the superficial charms of Lucy Steele.[20] Only after Edward is tethered to Lucy by their engagement does he begin to understand his failure of sensibility. His subsequent disinheritance requires that Edward find a profession; his new responsibilities as pastor render him fit for the anti-Gothic new world of sense that Austen constructs as the English ideal. Austen does not imagine a world of independent women possessing rooms of their own, but instead suggests that economic and emotional management on the part of men *and* women will secure domestic England.

27. The Dashwood women will achieve financial security through marriage, but they must first learn to economize for themselves. It is only after they have successfully negotiated domestic economy and sensibility that these heroines can identify and thus sympathize with the management of sensibility and wealth by their suitors. While the Gothic novel opposed the greed of the father to the sensibility of the daughter, Austen's domestic novel requires that her heroines manage their money and their marriages (and understand the relationship between the two).

28. Even before Elinor learns of Edward's engagement to Lucy Steele, she does not openly display her feelings: "Without shutting herself up from her family, or leaving the house in determined solitude to avoid them, or lying awake the whole night to indulge meditation, Elinor found every day afforded her leisure enough to think of Edward" (90). The negative construction of this sentence invites comparison with Marianne, who would, of course, shut herself up, leave the house, or lie awake the whole night to think of Willoughby. By illustrating the negative consequences of Marianne's excessive sensibility, Austen trains her reader away from the narrative of sensibility epitomized in the story of the two Elizas, and into an understanding of the British domestic, in which the real tragedy occurs, as George Eliot would later remark, in "the roar on the other side of silence." Marianne's disdain for the Colonel and preference for Willoughby and his sonnets mark her as a descendant of the Gothic heroine of sensibility. However, as we have seen in the embedded narrative of the Elizas, such heroines no longer end happily. Elinor's silence (although probably initially as disappointing to Austen's readers as it is to Marianne) grants her desire, whereas Marianne's multiple letters to Willoughby produce little effect. Marianne's letters are manifestations of her sensibility, but Austen reveals that if an excess of wealth does not support that excess of emotion, it has no effect. In Austen's new domestic England, happiness is preserved, at least fictionally, for those capable of emotional management.

29. By reforming her expectations from Gothic to domestic, Marianne is able to find some sort of contentment. Brandon's connection to Willoughby through the two Elizas makes Marianne sympathetic to *him*, and out of that sympathy their attachment is formed. This sympathy is in contrast to Marianne's pride in her "sensibility." Whereas Marianne's sensibility values her individual response to Norland or to Cowper, and finds sympathy with those who share her exact response, as Willoughby appears to, Marianne's discovery of sympathy is not linked to appearance (Brandon is, after all, twice her age and fond of flannel waistcoats), but rather to Adam Smith's understanding of sympathy: "As we have no immediate experience of what other men feel, we can form no idea of the manner in which they are affected, but by conceiving what we ourselves should feel in the like situation" (10-11). Marianne imagines herself in the place of each Eliza and realizes that her sensibility is not individual and individuating, but dangerously common. Through the first Eliza, Marianne becomes aware of the possibility of parental prejudice to her lack of wealth; through the second, Marianne furthers the

correlation between wealth and sympathy: if one's wealth is contingent on another, one's sympathy must follow. However, by imagining herself in the place of Eliza, Marianne is able to imagine herself in Brandon's care.

30. Marianne's first moment of sympathetic identification is not with either Eliza, but with Elinor. Marianne has sympathy for Elinor because Elinor is experiencing something that Marianne has also experienced: the marriage of a former suitor. When their man-servant informs the Dashwoods that Mr. Ferrars is married, Marianne's reaction illustrates that she has literally imagined herself in Elinor's place, but in doing so prevents others from sympathizing with Elinor:

> Marianne gave a violent start, fixed her eyes upon Elinor, saw her turning pale, and fell back in her chair in hysterics. Mrs. Dashwood, whose eyes, as she answered the servants inquiry, had intuitively taken the same direction, was shocked to perceive by Elinor's countenance how much she really suffered, and in a moment afterwards, alike distressed by Marianne's situation, knew not on which child to bestow her principal attention. (310)

Although Marianne's "violent start" is solely occasioned by her concern for Elinor's feelings, it produces much the same effect as her previous effusions of sensibility — it gets everyone's attention. By the time Marianne has been attended to by her mother and the maid, Elinor "had so far recovered the use of her reason and voice as to be just beginning an inquiry of Thomas, as to the source of his intelligence" (310). Elinor's suffering is barely noticed by the characters within the narrative, as is made evident by Mrs. Dashwood's shock at Elinor's countenance. In maintaining this distance from her own suffering, and seeking always the benefit of others, Elinor resembles Austen's narrator, whose ironic distance from narrative events disallows sympathy, or at the very least, reveals the ways in which sympathy functions within its own economy, whereby one must construct a narrative which will engage the sympathy of the listener.[21] Marianne is never fully aware of the way a story is told, she instead responds to stories that appeal to her. Elinor initially uses silence to manage her emotional response to narratives (such as Lucy Steele's account of her engagement to Edward), but eventually learns to tell her own story in order to manage Marianne's emotions.

31. Elinor tells Marianne about Edward's engagement twice. The first time, the narrator suppresses her account and tells us instead: "Her narration was clear and simple; and though it could not be given without emotion it was not accompanied by violent agitation, nor impetuous grief.—*That* belonged rather to the hearer, for Marianne listened with horror, and cried excessively. Elinor was to be the comforter of others in her own distresses, no less than in theirs" (227). Elinor's narrative, intended to "suggest a hint of what was practicable to Marianne" (227) in the management of one's sensibilities, only provokes Marianne's sensibilities. Elinor must reconstruct her narrative to appeal to Marianne's sensibilities.[22] Her second narration, full of dashes and emotional confessions, finally moves Marianne to realize how selfish she has been in her own distresses. But perhaps Marianne goes too far in embracing "sense"—as the narrator tells us, she embarks on a rather excessive course of study, and in the end, marries Colonel Brandon out of pure sense: "With such a confederacy against her—with a knowledge so intimate of his goodness—with a conviction of his fond attachment to herself, which at last, though long after it was observable to everybody else—burst on her—what could she do?" (333). Marianne's new responsibilities, however, are still those of pre-industrial England. She and the Colonel have no profession except for the management of their estate and the village.[23] It is significant that the narrator focuses not on Marianne's happiness, but rather on the Colonel's — describing Marianne as his "reward" that "consoled for every past affliction" (334) and thus coding their life together as outdated.

32. It is instead Elinor, who tempers sensibility with sense and who persists in her first very reasonable attachment to Edward, whom the narrative quietly endorses. Elinor and Edward's residence in the

parsonage at Delaford marks them as resolutely middle-class. Their very real concerns with household economy result from their similar economic situations. Each is unexpectedly disinherited: Elinor, by her father's early death and the entailment of Norland; Edward, by his misstep with Lucy and the resultant forfeiture of his "right of eldest son." However, the novel discourages reliance on these antiquated legal mechanisms of acquiring property and wealth, and instead rewards Edward's and Elinor's characters, which earn them the living at Delaford and the grant of ten thousand pounds from Mrs. Ferrars. In doing so, Austen not only revises literary tastes from Gothic to domestic, but also envisions a new British domestic that is not bound by the artificial economies of sympathy and primogeniture. Marianne's marriage to the man in the flannel waistcoat is dissatisfying because it undoes the reader's nostalgia for uncomplicated sentimental resolution. In this new domestic, for Marianne to find her sentimental equal she will have to look to an older man, an older generation. Elinor's rather uninteresting marriage to Edward is in fact progressive. The seamy economic underbelly of the national romance is thus made explicit and renounced in favor of a sort of national realism. Austen directly confronts the vestiges of British aristocracy that the Gothic had located in the past and on the Continent and devalues the means by which they sustain power.

Remembering the Rival: Louisa Grant

33. Austen's gentry and middle class represent a very narrow swath of the British class structure. In James Fenimore Cooper's *The Pioneers*, the construction of American identity in the wake of revolution assembles a more socially diverse group of characters, but Cooper ultimately reimposes aristocracy as the best means of ordering the previously "composite order" of Templeton. The marriage of Elizabeth and Oliver at the close of *The Pioneers* does, as many critics have argued,[24] establish the ideological stakes of the new nation, while attempting to reconcile or erase alternative possibilities: Indian John dies, Natty heads west, and Edwards/Effingham's complex ancestry seems to satisfy all of the quibbles over land ownership and law that have plagued Templeton.[25] However, one alternative remains: Louisa Grant.

34. Critics have long dismissed Louisa Grant as a bland foil who renders Elizabeth, or Bess, more brilliant, [26] but to dismiss Louisa requires that we ignore Cooper's insistence on her presence in the text. Louisa's exile at the close of the novel removes the last impediment to Oliver and Bess's marriage—Bess's rival [27]—and reveals that Bess does, as she claims, "manage more deeply than you imagine, sir" (449). By resigning the future of Templeton, and by extension, America, to Bess's management, Cooper writes Louisa out of the novel and with her the alternative subjectivity she represents. In doing so, Cooper chooses the stable narratives of aristocratic primogeniture to consolidate the new nation even as he raises, if only to dismiss, the possibility of a meritocracy.[28]

35. The first appearance of each heroine is significant in determining the relationship between the heroine and the possible direction of the nation: Louisa and Bess are each initially obscured from the reader's gaze, but both become visible and audible when they resolve an awkward situation. When Bess and Judge Temple approach Templeton, Bess is buried beneath layers of garments. However, she casts aside her cloak and her silence to tend to the young hunter, Oliver. As Janet Dean has already noted, something of Bess's character is revealed in this action: her sensibility to the young hunter's dangerous wound overcomes her prudence in sheltering herself from the cold air. Throughout the novel, Bess braves the elements of the American frontier—scaling the Vision, paddling in the canoe, walking unattended in the woods—as she says, "My father's daughter fears nothing, sir" (188). Her temerity—attached to her status as heiress—is requisite for the frontier, where she must be willing and able to meet the challenges of the wilderness. Her self-identification—"my father's daughter"—underscores the literal genealogy of this temerity. By deploying her status as heiress, Bess establishes her authority over the American landscape.

36. In contrast, the reader is introduced to Louisa at the first formal service held at the new church. Louisa is the only member of the congregation familiar with the correct responses and willing to speak them out loud. Bess and Oliver, we later discover, have been raised in the city and are familiar with the service, but Bess does not speak until she hears Oliver join Louisa. Certainly her motivations are not as pure as Louisa's piety: it is only once Oliver tacitly rebukes her silence that she joins the prayer to maintain his good opinion. Richard Jones's attempt to impose one permanent church in Templeton is unsuccessful because the only attendees familiar with the proper responses are those who have spent time in the city, as opposed to the frontier.

37. The parishioners, accustomed to a rotating minister, do not know what the appropriate responses are in the Episcopalian service; they may, in fact, be somewhat suspicious of the service because of its ties to England. The narrator informs us that after the American Revolution, the Episcopalian church "languished" until American ministers could be ordained in England: "Pious and suitable divines were at length selected, and sent to the mother country, to receive that authority, which, it is understood, can only be transmitted directly from one to the other, and thus obtain, in order to preserve, that unity in their churches, which properly belonged to a people of the same nation" (102). The Episcopalian church, therefore, appears to function as a transatlantic bridge between England and America and suggests an alternative to nationalism, one that incorporates the English, the Americans, and the Native Americans under the umbrella of Christianity. Cooper makes clear that the authority of the Episcopal divines is more tenuous than the authority of law, embodied in Judge Temple. While Judge Temple's questionable legal practices are always effective, Cooper's history of the Episcopal Church in America, his depiction of the first Episcopal service in Templeton, and Reverend Grant's unsuccessful attempt to perform the last rites for Indian John all depict the church as ineffective. Although the church appears as an ordering structure in the new colonies, alongside government and the law, it does not carry the authority of these other structures of order:[29] while Reverend Grant attempts to convert Native Americans, and Louisa lives in fear of them, Bess's marriage to Oliver at the conclusion erases the threat of the many claims to Templeton through primogeniture, and exiles Louisa and her father to Boston. The ideological impact of the conclusion of the novel is so forceful that it is easy, perhaps, to forget that Louisa's attachment to Oliver is not entirely unfounded; in the early chapters of the novel, Oliver's attentions seem devoted to her: "Drawing her arm through his own, he lifted his cap from his head, allowing the dark locks to flow in rich curls over his open brow, and walked by her side, with an air of conscious pride, as if inviting an examination of his inmost thoughts" (140). Solicitous of her comfort, Oliver saves Louisa from a falling branch: "the figure of Louisa, slowly yielding in her saddle; and but for his arm, she would have sunken to the earth" (240). By constantly placing Louisa in situations where she is dependent on Oliver, Cooper seems to forward a romance plot between them.

38. In contrast, Bess repeatedly refuses Oliver's aid. Until she can ascertain his real identity, she will not be dependent on him in any way. Bess's status as heiress makes it particularly important for her to keep her distance from this unknown quantity. Louisa, on the other hand, finds the various potential identities for Oliver — Native American, for example — troubling, but not troubling enough to prevent her attachment to him. Louisa's insistence on seeing the good in Oliver overwhelms these other considerations, and highlight's Bess's distancing strategies. Bess sees the transformation of the American landscape; Louisa notices the transformation in Oliver. Bess sees a subject to sketch; Louisa sees how superior Oliver is to his companions. Bess may see the American landscape in its totality, but she does so because her class status requires her to see herself apart from the landscape and its inhabitants.

39. As the novel progresses, sympathy develops between Oliver and Bess, but Oliver is consistent in his attentions to both young women. Bess and Oliver's shared sensibilities are evident despite their attempts at secrecy: for example, Oliver's hand rests naturally on the piano, despite his hunting garb. Bess reads Oliver's sensibilities as evidence of his true identity, and only waits for more tangible

confirmation of his worthiness. Cooper foregrounds these scenes of sensibility to prepare readers for the revelation of Oliver's identity, but distances us from Louisa by limiting our perception of her to the perspectives of the other characters. This narrative distance echoes Austen's use of Mrs. Jennings to relate Elinor's marriage, and to similar effect. Louisa is made auxiliary to the other characters, and particularly to Bess.

40. However, Cooper complicates the novel's endorsement of Bess through depictions of Bess's jealousy. Bess's jealousy reveals the merit of Louisa, and the extent of her own management. When Oliver expresses surprise at her desire to send Louisa away, Bess questions his motivations: "fixing her eyes with a searching look on his countenance, where they met only the unsuspecting expression of manly regret" (449). Oliver passes her test, but Bess's jealousy forces readers to question her motivations for exiling Louisa at the end of the novel. Bess is right to be jealous, for Louisa is the only other woman in the Patent who is her equal; indeed Remarkable Pettibone, admittedly for selfish reasons, prefers Louisa to Bess: "Now, to my reckoning, Lowizy Grant is much more pritty behaved than Betsy Temple" (176). Bess herself acknowledges Louisa's superiority, although her sincerity is questionable: "'Nay, Louisa, humility carries you too far. The daughter of a minister of the church can have no superiors. Neither I nor Mr. Edwards is quite your equal, unless, 'she added, again smiling, 'he is in secret a king'" (279). Rather than locating superiority in social status, Remarkable and Bess each assign an alternative form of value. Remarkable suggests that Louisa's "pritty" behavior surpasses Bess's temerity; Bess suggests that Louisa's place in the Christian hierarchy, as the daughter of a minister, gives her a higher station than herself or Oliver, unless Oliver is "in secret a king." Bess quickly changes the compliment to Louisa into a prying barb at Oliver's secrecy, one that reveals her own anxieties about Oliver's social status and national identity. Louisa's social status can be located, but Oliver's is a contradiction: his sensibilities suggest that he is from the same social class as Bess, but his attire and association with Natty and Indian John complicate Bess's reading of his sensibilities. Oliver is also Young Eagle: both his Native American and English names prevent Bess from reading his social status because neither name provides a genealogy. Oliver is an assumed name, and Young Eagle is a name given to him by Indian John to mark his adoption.

41. In contrast, Louisa's legible social status obscures her merit, especially in conversations between Oliver and Bess. It is easy to lose perspective of the "real" Louisa in the complex motivations behind all of these speeches, until Louisa speaks for herself: "It is sometimes dangerous to be rich, Miss Temple; but you cannot know how hard it is to be very, very poor. . . . Ah! Miss Temple, you little understand the troubles of this life, I believe. My father has spent many years as a missionary, in the new countries, where his people were poor, and frequently we have been without bread; unable to buy, and ashamed to beg, because we would not disgrace his sacred calling" (305). This almost untold story of Louisa's past opens a gap in the history of Louisa narrated in the text. While the Louisa visible to Bess and Oliver lacks the polish of Bess's education, wears garments inappropriate to the season, and is in general "timid" and "maidenly," Louisa has known "the sick and the hungry" (305), the death of her siblings and the horrors of poverty. Louisa's class position as minister's daughter has not granted her the respect and superiority that Bess and Oliver imagine, but instead has insured nothing but suffering and hunger, as the Grants conscientiously attempt to maintain the same level of subsistence as their parishioners. Bess's status as "the heiress" may make her the more obvious choice for Oliver, but it has also preserved her from the suffering Louisa has endured. Bess deploys her status to justify a sort of exceptionalism: as "my father's daughter" she may board a canoe or witness a turkey shoot without impinging on her maidenly delicacy. She assumes her position as mistress over Remarkable Pettibone by adopting the title Miss Temple and exiles Oliver from her walk with Louisa because she does not want to entertain "particular attentions" from someone whose family history is unknown. Bess's apparent fearless independence is tempered by a rather Old World sense of social propriety and class distinctions. Louisa's experiences of poverty and suffering complicate the novel's attempt to dismiss her as unfit for the frontier: instead, it becomes clear that Louisa's merit is overshadowed by her class

identity. Cooper introduces the possibility of an alternative system of value, but forecloses it in favor of a conclusion that establishes the legal right of white Americans to the land through the very same strictures of primogeniture that Austen had called into question.

42. After her indirect rescue of Bess and Oliver, Louisa never reappears in the novel. However, she is discussed by Oliver and Bess, and narrated once by Cooper, during the strange comedy of Monsieur LeQuoi's proposal. Janet Dean has read these proposals as "the connection between marriage and nationhood," arguing that Elizabeth, should she accept Monsieur LeQuoi, would become French, and relinquish her property in Templeton and, by implication, "the promise of the American future" (1-2). Dean ignores Monsieur LeQuoi's subsequent proposal to Louisa, which is also rejected. Monsieur LeQuoi's proposals are offered "as a duty which a well-bred man owed to a lady in such a retired place" (444), and remind us that Louisa is as qualified as Bess to receive them. Louisa's refusal, however, is significant in that through it, Louisa exiles herself from the marriage plot. There are no other young men in Templeton, as Oliver observes, "I really don't know any one hereabouts good enough for her" (448); and by refusing Monsieur LeQuoi, Louisa, in effect, refuses marriage.[30] Aside from Cooper's account of her refusal, Louisa is removed from the novel. Bess's plans for Louisa's future are, as Oliver notes, evidence of how deeply she manages, but seem unlikely to agree with Louisa's own desires or tastes. It is almost impossible to imagine Louisa in a situation where she "may meet with such society, and form such a connexion, as may be proper for one of her years and character" (449): society has never been Louisa's forte. Thus Cooper requires the reader to imagine Louisa's future as one outside the marriage plot Bess and Oliver imagine, and allows for another possibility. In this respect, Louisa's exile might be compared to Natty's — although it is difficult to think of the timid Louisa as "the foremost in that band of Pioneers" (456). The conclusion of *The Pioneers* opens the possibility of an ever-receding frontier, but the subsequent Leatherstocking tales look back instead to narrate Natty's past. While Cooper asks the reader to imagine Natty's journey west, he sends Louisa back east to settled Boston.[31]

43. Louisa, therefore, has a double function within *The Pioneers*: she represents, on one hand, a possible alternative to the marriage plot by choosing independence rather than a marriage of convenience with Monsieur LeQuoi.[32] On the other hand, Louisa also stands in as representation of what is lost through the solidification of American identity emblematized in the marriage between Bess and Oliver. For while their marriage can be read as reconciling competing nationalisms — British, American and Native American — in favor of a new, legitimate order, the exile of Indian John, Natty, and Louisa from that new order points to what is lost in the consolidation of American identity. Natty and Indian John live on in the rest of the Leatherstocking tales, but Louisa's prehistory and subsequent fate are left unnarrated, pointing to the erasure of women by history unless they are allied to the dominant hierarchies of power. But the forgetting of Louisa also suggests the significance of women in consolidating national identity: the possibility of Oliver and Louisa's marriage must be eliminated, and is, in fact, so frequently raised and discarded that it persists even after the marriage of Bess and Oliver. The narrative's inability to forget Louisa underscores Bess's methodical elimination of any other claim to the American landscape she and Oliver inhabit. Louisa's suffering, allied to her status as a minister's daughter, poses an alternative hierarchy of value that reveals the economic underpinnings of the legal unification of Templeton, and thus America. Bess's sensibilities surmount the American wilderness, just as Marianne's effusions over dead leaves and Julia's ever-ready lute surmounted the British and Sicilian islands, respectively, but each of these heroines indulged their sensibilities at the expense of a secondary heroine who remained at home. Emilia, Elinor and Louisa each suffer, and attention to their suffering reveals the cost of sensibility.

Conclusion: Who Can Afford Sensibility?

44. For Radcliffe, the forgotten heroine serves as a site of readerly identification, in which the barely-told narrative of Emilia's loss of her friends to the Gothic plot, set in play by Julia's desire for Hippolitus, is similar to the less Gothic experience of so many young women as they reached marriageable age. Julia's adventures in Sicily point to the dangers of wealth and aristocracy: the Marquis's desire to profit by marrying Julia to the Duke de Luovo, the banditti rampant in the Sicilian caverns, the greedy Padre Abate's attempt to coerce Julia into becoming a nun. The restoration of the Marchioness, the marriage of Julia and Hippolitus, and the return to Naples under the direction of Ferdinand resolve these issues by instituting a stable domestic family. However, Emilia's narrative clearly does not belong in the crags and caverns of the Sicilian landscape in the manner that Julia's does. Rather, through Emilia, Radcliffe offers readers a way back from Italy to England, and suggests that the stability of the domestic is always available there, but also always compromised.

45. Austen's novel is set in the domestic England Emilia emblematizes. In Austen, both heroines marry at the end, and so we must instead understand why Elinor seems "forgotten" throughout much of the text while we are preoccupied with Marianne. Elinor's silences, her ability to manage her emotions rather than indulge in them, mark her as already having successfully exchanged the discourse of sensibility for that of sense. Marianne's reeducation teaches her the dangers of a hero like Willoughby, and her marriage to Brandon, who shares a similarly Gothic past, is coded as traditional and even antiquated. Elinor and Edward's residence in the parsonage at Delaford makes them dependent on the Brandons, but they are also depicted as progressive: the parsonage has been remodeled, and their prosaic wish for "rather better pasturage for their cows" is indicative of their mutual proficiency in financial, as well as sentimental management.

46. In writing a novel clearly preoccupied with a romantic reconciliation of history, Cooper selects an outspoken and wealthy heroine to create a new and uniquely American aristocracy that resolves, however superficially, America's tenuous position as former colonial subject and nascent colonial power. However, Louisa's experiences of poverty and hardship, when contrasted with the luxuriant excess of Judge Temple's house, suggests a correlation between financial security and sensibility. Bess's bravery is, quite literally, a luxury she can afford. In contrast, as the sole surviving child of Reverend Grant, Louisa has witnessed the price of temerity, and her father cannot afford to lose her assistance. Bess's plans for Louisa, in tandem with the exile of Natty and the death of Indian John, attempt to remove the threat that suffering poses to the national romance.

47. The relationship between these novels and the cult of sensibility is complex, and is explicitly tied to concerns of national identity. At the height of the cult of sensibility Radcliffe's novel introduces two sisters, not for the purposes of a contrast novel that exalts one sister and deprecates the other, but rather to provide an alternative narrative to the Gothic plot that anticipates Austen. While Radcliffe's Emilia still inhabits Sicily, she rarely ventures outside the confines of home. In turn, Austen's critique of sensibility is also a critique of the fantastic displacement common to the Gothic novel. Readers who identified with a victimized Italian noblewoman, according to Austen, have more important, and perhaps more terrifying challenges to face in domestic England. Austen's heroines ask readers to choose between two versions of English identity: the familiar heroine of sensibility, who is comically out of place in quotidian England, or a pragmatic heroine of sense, who is capable of navigating the changing class structure of early nineteenth-century England. In turn, Cooper's romance adopts Gothic strategies to displace and resolve competing national origins. Although the landscape of *The Pioneers* is explicitly American, it is clearly not the America familiar to Cooper's readers. By reintroducing the heroine of sensibility as the emblematic American girl, Cooper exploits her ideological power to exile competing national identities, including that of the secondary heroine.

Notes

[1] Oliver's name and heritage is a source of confusion in the novel, and the revelation of his heritage is key to Cooper's reconciliation of the competing Native American, British and American claims to Templeton. In this essay, I refer to Edward Oliver Effingham as Oliver, and to Elizabeth Temple as Bess.

[2] In this essay, I use "secondary" and "forgotten" heroine interchangeably.

[3] I do not wish to conflate sympathy and sensibility; for the purposes of this essay, I consider sympathy to be one of the qualities necessary to possess sensibility. To possess sensibility, as Margaret Anne Doody has defined it, is "to possess the capacity of human sympathy, as well as the capacity for aesthetic responsiveness" ("Introduction," xiv). The power of sympathy, according to Adam Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759), is to bridge this divide between individual minds: "As we have no immediate experience of what other men feel, we can form no idea of the manner in which they are affected, but by conceiving what we ourselves should feel in the like situation" (10-11). Smith suggested that observing a fictional sentimental hero or heroine's response to an occasion for sympathy, such as suffering or beauty, and the narrative reward of that appropriate behavior, or punishment of inappropriate behavior, enabled the reader to internalize sentimental ideals. In turn, the reader's appropriate response to the representation of a scene of sympathy allows the reader to claim to possess sensibility. Thus, despite the decline of the "cult of sensibility," theories of sympathy continued to impact the novel.

[4] Thus, sympathy is inherently tied to questions of class identity and nationalism, issues also central to the resolution of the marriage plot in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century novel.

[5] Elizabeth Barnes's *States of Sympathy* is particularly useful here. In *States of Sympathy*, Barnes suggests that early sentimental seduction novels and the domestic fiction of the 1850s are connected by a common preoccupation with sympathetic identification: "Whereas seduction fiction depicts the middle-class family as a closed system—a nuclear and potentially incestuous unit based on the affiliation of blood ties—the domestic story represents the family as a collection of shared values and emotional experiences" (15). Cooper rewrites Radcliffe and Austen's sisters into friends to ensure that Louisa is, in effect, always already forgotten—exterior to the family unit of Templeton.

[6] Race is, of course, also a central issue in *The Pioneers*. Cooper locates the threat of miscegenation in his male characters, especially Oliver. Oliver's manifestations of an appropriate sensibility — his hand resting naturally on the piano, for example — assure Bess and the reader that the apparent markers of racial identity (his name and knowledge of their language, his time with Natty and Indian John) must be misleading. Cooper's conclusion not only erases the threat of miscegenation, but it reveals that Oliver is the rightful heir of Templeton, reinstating the importance of primogeniture in legitimating the new nation's claim to the American landscape.

[7] This is, as I will illustrate in the next section, complicated by the location of Radcliffe's novel in Sicily.

[8] See, for example, George Levine, who suggests in *The Realistic Imagination*: "Realism got its second full start in the English novel (after Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding) in the work of Jane Austen" (35).

[9] Literally, in Elizabeth Nollen's essay, which claims that Julia and Emilia served as a model for the Dashwood sisters of Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*. Valdine Clemens and Brigitta Berglund also claim that Emilia contrasts Julia's sensibility.

[10] Even Kate Ellis's otherwise quite excellent reading of *A Sicilian Romance* in *The Contested Castle* ignores Emilia's role in the novel (103-107).

[11] This has become such a critical commonplace it seems almost unnecessary to offer sources, but, for the sake of illustration: see, for example: Kate Ellis, "Ann Radcliffe and the Perils of Catholicism" where she distinguishes between Catholic superstition opposed to pious sensibility: E.J. Clery reads this pedagogy in Marxist terms as enabling the reader to indulge in a consuming "passion that is economically desirable but morally problematic; happily...sublimated by the same means, in sympathetic identification with the virtuous and most immaterial heroine" ("Ann Radcliffe," 212). More straightforwardly, see Fred Botting, "*Dracula*, Romance and Radcliffean Gothic"; Scott Mackenzie, "Ann Radcliffe's Gothic Narrative and the Readers at Home," John Stoler "Having her Cake and Eating it Too," James Watt's *Contesting the Gothic* and Michael Gamer's *Romanticism and the Gothic*.

[12] If you can call the discovery of your presumed-dead, long-imprisoned mother a "rational" explanation.

[13] See also Elinor in *Sense and Sensibility*, who must keep Edward and Lucy's engagement secret from Marianne; also Elizabeth and Louisa — Elizabeth's jealousy separates her and Louisa.

[14] Although Julia does escape from the church and from her father, Ferdinand assumes the head of the household. Additionally, as Toni Weir has argued, Ferdinand's adoption of military dress consolidates his virility as the hero. Tellingly, Weir does not read Hippolitus as the hero of *A Sicilian Romance*, although Weir does make arguments concerning feminized heroes at other points in the book.

[15] See, for example, Judith Wilt's *Ghost of the Gothic: Austen, Eliot, Lawrence*. Wilt focuses on *Northanger* and *Emma*, but barely addresses *Sense and Sensibility*.

[16] Although Captain Tilney's subsequent actions suggest that he is not much better than a Gothic villain, Henry once again intervenes by proposing to Catherine anyway, locating the Gothic in the past.

[17] There are two major critical camps: pro-Elinor and pro-Marianne. (However, within these critical camps is a strong tendency to insist that Austen troubles a simple division between sense and sensibility, or between Elinor and Marianne.) For pro-Elinor readings, see: James Thompson, Marilyn Butler, Stuart Tave, and Barbara Seeber. See also Alistair Duckworth and Mary Poovey. For pro-Marianne readings, see: Angela Leighton, Julie Shaffer, and Karl Kroeber. Laura Goodlad explicitly connects Austen to both the French Revolution and English nationalism: "Austen's early novel contrasts Elinor's ideal Englishness, a synthesis of "sense" and "sensibility" with Marianne's immoderate *Frenchness*" (60). Other readings of the novel, including Poovey, Kroeber, Butler, and Leighton, have argued that Elinor's reserve is Augustan, Classical, or in other ways outdated and is contrasted with Marianne's more modern Romantic sensibility. I argue, instead, that Marianne's sensibility is depicted as outdated, whereas Elinor's "sense" is progressive and tied to economics, rather than aesthetics.

[18] Scholars of this novel have addressed, rather extensively, the strange paradox that readers are sympathetic to Marianne, even though Austen appears to punish her excessive sensibility in the novel's conclusion. As Tony Tanner has noted: "As in behavior, so in language, Marianne gives an added dimension of warmth and vitality to the world of the book and Jane Austen was well aware of it" (96). Where Tanner and others struggle is in reconciling Marianne's sympathetic character with Austen's treatment of Marianne in the conclusion. I argue that this struggle comes from a critical forgetting of Elinor, who is alternately dismissed as an "overpowerful ideology that has limited value and that therefore deserves deauthorization" (Shaffer, 143), or as "the bearer of a more or less fully developed historical and national consciousness" (Goodlad, 65).

[19] See Tara Ghoshal Wallace's article, "*Sense and Sensibility* and the Problem of Feminine Authority," for an interesting reading of Fanny, and other monstrous women in Austen. Wallace suggests that Elinor is actually

aligned with authoritative figures like Fanny and Mrs. Ferrars and is emblematic of Austen's own authorial anxieties.

[20] Lauren Goodlad argues: "Nevertheless, the greatest irony, as we shall see, is that Austen's resort to the logic of Spivak's 'soul making' project is less a defense against Marianne's emancipatory politics, than against the increasing sway of Lucy's bourgeois epistemology" (76). Although Lucy's desire to know how much everything costs is clearly a dark echo of Elinor's attempts to economize, it is Lucy's corresponding over-management of her own sentimental economy that the novel condemns.

[21] Marilyn Butler has argued that Austen's use of "free indirect speech" gives readers access to Elinor's point of view, rather than Marianne's (190). Similarly, Stuart Tave has claimed: "*Sense and Sensibility* is the story of Elinor Dashwood. The action of the novel is hers; it is not Marianne's and it is not equally divided between the sister's; it is Elinor's. The whole of Marianne's story is included within Elinor's: Marianne's begins later and it ends earlier"(96). However, both of these readings overlook the ways in which Elinor's narrative is packaged (so to speak) for Marianne's consumption.

[22] Strangely, despite consistent critical attention to and praise of Austen's use of language, critics have ignored this exchange between Elinor and Marianne. For discussions of Austen's use of language, see Thompson, Tanner and Kroeber.

[23] Laura Goodlad has interpreted Marianne's status as "mistress" as revealing "the potential complicities between domestic and imperial dominions"(76). But in 1811, the year of *Sense and Sensibility*'s publication, the British Empire had just lost a colony (America), had mistakenly supported the French Revolution, and was about to enter the War of 1812. Rather than reading Marianne as emblematic of an ascendent imperialism, therefore, I argue that she is allied with an outdated feudal agrarian culture.

[24] See also Janet Dean's excellent article, "The Marriage Plot and National Myth in *The Pioneers*," for a reading of Elizabeth as contested property.

[25] Additionally, Natty has trained Oliver to be both a good shot and a conservationist. Elizabeth's affection for and debt to Natty ensures that they both will abandon the "wasty ways" that had threatened the natural resources of Templeton.

[26] See, for example, Joy Kasson: "Elizabeth Temple's education shines more brightly when she is contrasted with simple Louisa Grant" (57); John Sheckter: "In *The Pioneers*, references to 'the delicacy of her sex' and 'natural feminine timidity' almost always occur in connection with the thoroughly conventional Louisa Grant, to contrast her lack of imagination and her cowardice with the energy and courage of Elizabeth" (41); or Abby Werlock, for a similar reading.

[27] Critics have been too quick to dismiss Louisa's potential as Bess's rival, as I will argue later.

[28] I use this term advisedly. I do not mean to suggest that Louisa is "better" than Bess — Louisa's racism and timidity are very unappealing qualities. Rather, I argue that Bess's class status is what enables her lack of fear (for Louisa's racism is really a sort of fear, rather than a belief in the inferiority of the other). By writing Louisa out of the novel, Cooper affirms class hierarchies at the expense of any alternative system of order, including both the religious hierarchy suggested at times by Bess herself, Richard Jones, and Reverend Grant, but also a similar secular hierarchy that would privilege Louisa's suffering as a mark of merit, rather than Bess's wealth.

[29] That Richard Jones is the chief advocate for the Episcopalian faith illustrates that the church itself has little power on its own.

[30] Although popular with the ladies, Monsieur Le Quoi is, admittedly, no prize. However, Louisa is here presented with the choice to be married; with Oliver she had no choice or opportunity.

[31] Natty's journey westward may be thought of as "progress," in opposition to Louisa's return east, which suggests a sort of regress towards England. However, Natty's age, his departure from the gravesite of Mohegan John and Effingham, and the narrator's claim that "He had gone far towards the setting sun" all point to a strange contradiction in Natty's journey westward: is he really "opening the way for the march of the nation across the continent" (456)? Or do all of these images of age and death gesture instead to a conclusion? Cooper seems to suggest both simultaneously; as Natty himself remarks, "Tis like the dead there, who thought, when the breath was in them, that one went east and one went west, to find their heavens; but they'll meet at last; and so shall we, children. --- Yes, end as you've begun, and we shall meet in the land of the just, at last" (454). But it is impossible for Bess and Oliver to "end" as they have "begun," just as it is impossible for Natty to remain ahead of the "march of the nation" in his journey west. Instead, Natty and Louisa are each subsumed by the culture from which they attempt to differentiate themselves.

[32] We see this same pattern rehearsed in Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie*, in which Esther declines any future offers of marriage once her engagement to Everell is broken off.

Works Cited

Austen, Jane. *Sense and Sensibility*. Ed. Margaret Anne Doody. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

Barnes, Elizabeth. *States of Sympathy: Seduction and Democracy in the American Novel*. New York: Columbia UP, 1997.

Berglund, Birgitta. *Woman's Whole Existence: The House as an Image in the Novels of Ann Radcliffe, Mary Wollstonecraft and Jane Austen*. Lund: Lund U.P., 1993.

Botting, Fred. "*Dracula*, Romance and Radcliffean Gothic." *Women's Writing* 1.2 (1994): 181-201.

Boudreau, Kristin. *Sympathy in American Literature: American Sentiments from Jefferson to the Jameses*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2002.

Buell, Lawrence. "American Literary Emergence as a Postcolonial Phenomenon." *American Literary History* 4.3 (1992): 411-42.

Butler, Marilyn. "The Woman at the Window: Ann Radcliffe in the Novels of Mary Wollstonecraft and Jane Austen." *Women and Literature* (1980): 128-48.

---. *Jane Austen and the War of Ideas*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Clemens, Valdine. *The Return of the Repressed: Gothic Horror from* The Castle of Otranto *to* Alien. Albany: SUNY P, 1999.

Clery, E.J. "Ann Radcliffe and D.A.F. de Sade: Thoughts on Heroinism." *Women's Writing* 1.2 (1994): 203-213.

---. *Women's Gothic: From Clara Reeve to Mary Shelley*. Plymouth: Northcote House Publisher's Ltd., 2000.

Cooper, James Fenimore. *The Pioneers*. Ed. Donald Ringe. New York: Penguin, 1988.

Dean, Janet E. "The Marriage Plot and National Myth in *The Pioneers*." *Arizona Quarterly* 52.4 (Winter 1996): 1-29.

Duckworth, Alastair. "Improving on Sensibility" *Sense and Sensibility* and *Pride and Prejudice — Jane Austen*. Ed. Robert Clark. New York: St. Martin's, 1994. 27-53.

Ellis, Kate Ferguson. *The Contested Castle: Gothic Novels and the Subversion of Domestic Ideology*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1989.

---. "Ann Radcliffe and the Perils of Catholicism." *Women's Writing* 1.2 (1994): 161-169.

Gamer, Michael. *Romanticism and the Gothic: Genre, Reception and Canon Formation*. Cambridge Studies in Romanticism. 40. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Giobbi, Giuliana. "Sisters beware of sisters: sisterhood as a literary motif in Jane Austen, A.S. Byatt, and I. Bossi Fedrigotti." *Journal of European Studies* 22 (1992): 241-58.

Gladsky, Thomas S. "The Beau Ideal and Cooper's *The Pioneers*." *Studies in the Novel* 20.1 (1998): 43-54.

Goodlad, Lauren M.E. "England's 'Glorious "Middle Way"': Self-Disciplinary Self-Making and Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*." Genre 33.1 (Spring 2000): 51-82.

Jaffe, Audrey. *Scenes of Sympathy: Identity and Representation in Victorian Fiction*. Ithaca: Cornell, U.P, 2000.

Jones, Robert. "Ruled Passions: Re-Reading the Culture of Sensibility." *Eighteenth Century Studies* 32.3 (1999): 395-402.

Kahane, Claire. "The Gothic Mirror." *The (M)other Tongue*. Ed. Shirley Nelson Garner et. al. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985. 334-351.

Kasson, Joy S. "Templeton Revisited: Social Criticism in *The Pioneers* and *Home as Found*." *Studies in the Novel* 9 (1979): 54-64.

Kelley, Mary. *Private Woman, Public Stage*. New York: Oxford U.P., 1984.

Knights, Elspeth. " 'The library, of course, afforded everything': Jane Austen's representation of women readers." *English* 50 (Spring 2001): 19-38.

Kroeber, Karl. "Jane Austen as an Historical Novelist: *Sense and Sensibility*." *Persuasions* 12 (1990): 10-18.

Levine, George. *The Realistic Imagination: English Fiction from Frankenstein to Lady Chatterly*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1981.

Leighton, Angela. "Sense and Silences." *Sense and Sensibility* and *Pride and Prejudice — Jane Austen*. Ed. Robert Clark. New York: St. Martin's, 1994. 54-66.

Mackenzie, Scott. "Ann Radcliffe's Gothic Narrative and the Readers at Home." *Studies in the Novel* 31.4 (1999): 409-31.

Miller, D.A. "Closure and Narrative Danger" Sense and Sensibility *and* Pride and Prejudice — *Jane Austen*.

Ed. Robert Clark. New York: St. Martin's, 1994. 67-82.

Nollen, Elizabeth. "Ann Radcliffe's *A Sicilian Romance*: a new source for Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*." *English Language Notes* (December 1984): 30-37.

Poovey, Mary. "Ideological Contradictions and the Consolations of Form (1)." Sense and Sensibility *and* Pride and Prejudice — *Jane Austen*. Ed. Robert Clark. New York: St. Martin's, 1994. 83-100.

Radcliffe, Ann. *A Sicilian Romance*. Ed. Alison Milbank. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.

Ray, Joan Klingel. "Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*." *Explicator* 60.1 (Fall 2001): 15-19

Rowe, John Carlos. "Nineteenth-Century United States Literary Culture and Transnationality." *PMLA* 118.1 (2003): 37-68.

Shaffer, Julie. "The Ideological Intervention of Ambiguities in the Marriage Plot: Who Fails Marianne in Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*." *A Dialogue of Voices: Feminist Literary Theory and Bakhtin*, Eds. Karen Hohne and Helen Wussow. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Scheckter, John. "History, Possibility and Romance in *The Pioneers*." *Essays in Literature* 8.1 (1981): 33-44.

Seeber, Barbara K. " 'I See Every Thing As You Desire Me to Do': The Scolding and Schooling of Marianne Dashwood." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 11.2 (1999): 223-233.

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Ed. Knud Haakonssen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Smith, Nelson C. "Sense, Sensibility, and Ann Radcliffe." *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 13.4 (1973): 577-90.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. "Privacy, Dissimulation, and Propriety: Frances Burney and Jane Austen." *Eighteenth Century Fiction* 12.4 (2000): 515-31.

Stoler, John. "Having Her Cake and Eating, Too: Ambivalence, Popularity and the Psychosocial Implications of Ann Radcliffe's Fiction." *Jane Austen and Mary Shelley and Their Sisters*. Ed. Laura Dabundo. Lanham, MD: UP of America, 2000. 19-29.

Tanner, Tony. *Jane Austen*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1986.

Tave, Stuart M. *Some Words of Jane Austen*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1973.

Thompson, James. *Between Self and World: The Novels of Jane Austen*. University Park: Penn State UP, 1988.

Wallace, Tara Ghoshal. "Sense and Sensibility and the Problem of Feminine Authority." *Eighteenth-Century Literature* 4.2 (1992): 149-63.

Watt, James. *Contesting the Gothic: Fiction, Genre and Cultural Conflict, 1764-1832*. Cambridge Studies in Romanticism. 33. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

Werlock, Abby H.P. "Courageous Young Women in Cooper's Leatherstocking Tales: Heroines and Victims." *James Fenimore Cooper, His Country, and His Art* (1986): 22-40.

Wilt, Judith. *Ghosts of the Gothic: Austen, Eliot and Lawrence*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980.

Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism

Love and Merit in the Maritime Historical Novel: Cooper and Scott

James Crane, Loyola University Chicago

1. Because two of the earliest Anglophone maritime historical novels feature seafaring characters whose manliness proves their suitability to command, they provide a useful field of inquiry for historians of gender and genre-making. In the 1820s, James Fenimore Cooper and Walter Scott invented manly heroes who exercise authority through a personal charisma that operates ineffably upon other men. Both Scott's *The Pirate* (1821) and Cooper's *The Pilot* (1823) cast socially isolated men in lead roles, but the various affectionate pairings of sailors in *The Pilot* contrast sharply with an emphasis on manly disinterestedness in *The Pirate*.[1] The American mariners in *The Pilot* are not anti-social like they are in *The Pirate*, because Cooper's concern with the republican possibilities of historical romance led him to represent the pleasurable camaraderie among American gentlemen as a social symptom of the representative government being constructed by hardy colonials.

2. Cooper portrays legitimate political authority by highlighting the manly characteristics of the Revolutionary-era naval officers, and contrasting their plucky heroics to the fruitless efforts of loyalists to preserve traditional notions of fealty. His tale promotes the view that a republican government creates social conditions that naturally engineer meritocracy, ensuring the cultivation of subjects who will form an elite governing class. For Cooper, meritocracy bridges the historical and social rupture between traditional and republican governments—a gap in which conservative thinkers from Hobbes to Cobbett envisioned destructive social leveling, violent anarchy, and the eventual dissolution of the protective authority of the state. In contrast, Scott's 1821 novel *The Pirate* celebrates paternal government, and conflates democracy with piracy. Cooper's strategic fictional response to the association of virtue with traditional monarchical authority attributes improved values to the exemplary democratic citizens that serve in the Revolutionary-era Navy. To dramatize the way these improved values develop, Cooper treats friendships between men as productive sites for collective social activity. The emotions produced in these relationships bring out the best in men, and ensure that the group selects the most able for positions of leadership.

3. By focusing on how men among men faithfully recognize the merit of one another because—as good citizens—they feel love, Cooper challenges disparaging views of early US culture and institutions. His depiction of meritocracy, manliness, and intimate friendship in *The Pilot* affirms a republic that did not become less civilized by breaking with the British Empire. The romantic story of naval adventure Cooper tells in his inaugural sea-novel stages the innate capability of exceptional individuals, who are recognized and rewarded by a well-organized republican society. According to this theory, meritocracy guarantees stable strata within the social hierarchy by ensuring the continued primacy of cultivated white males. Therefore love and merit take the place of traditionally exercised authority in Cooper's idealized democratic republic.[2]

4. This essay compares the patriots in *The Pilot* to the adventurers of *The Pirate*, examining in particular the ways that experiences of emotion do or do not enable the social construction of legitimate authority. For both writers, political authority inheres in the body of the genteel white male; however, in the process of transforming the American Revolution into the subject of romance, Cooper revises Scott's attitude toward the emotionally autonomous hero. In Cooper's response, caring friendships provide charismatic military heroes with emotionally charged, institutionally interpolated sites to socialize

subordinates, to make good collective decisions, and to romance women.

5. Scott sets *The Pirate* at "the end of the 17th century" in the environs of a remote, dilapidated "earl's mansion" situated on a "neck of land" in the archipelagos stretching northeast of Scotland (Scott 6). High-minded buccaneer captain Clement Cleveland wrecks near this mansion, the adopted residence of his estranged father. Of course, Cleveland does not find out that the wealthy recluse and reformed pirate is his father until the climactic final chapters. After he is rescued by his half-brother, the dashing but amoral seafarer takes up residence with local aristocrat Magnus Troil and his two beautiful daughters. Munificent Troil holds his land according to the pre-colonial traditions of the island's Scandinavian population. Though Troil and other ethnic Scandinavians resist outside influence, Scott makes it clear that by the end of the seventeenth century more than two centuries of occupation has nearly succeeded in securing the cultural ascendancy of nearby Scotland.

6. In the 1849 "Preface" to *The Pilot*, Cooper narrates how his dissatisfaction with the representation of technical knowledge, nautical language, and seafaring life in *The Pirate* by Walter Scott prompted a literary response that dramatizes the patriotic exploits of mariners led by John Paul Jones in a raid off the coast of Britain during the Revolutionary War. But in addition to nautical verisimilitude, the nature of legitimate political authority is at stake in both works, and so in *The Pilot* Cooper adapts a scene from *The Pirate* that enacts a central problem of democracy—in popular governments factions form, and sap a state's ability to function as a collective unit. Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century critics of democratic ideas often argued that without clear standards set by an exemplary aristocratic class, civil society must inevitably fracture into cliques motivated by regional prejudice and special interests. Factions, according to this line of reasoning, obviate the communal good that was the desideratum of much eighteenth- and nineteenth-century republican thought.[3]

7. To reckon with this critique of representative government, in *The Pilot* Cooper imagines that republican meritocracy can keep participative politics from degenerating into a chaotic, drunken brouhaha. Concentrating on representations of manhood, affect, and status, I show how the council scenes in these maritime romances comprise a transatlantic dialogue on issues of individual autonomy and political authority.[4] Different representations of manliness in these works demonstrate that the history of British and American republicanism is a history of efforts to manage ideas about manhood as well as race, class, nation, and commerce. In critiquing the reverence for a centralized political authority that Scott encourages, Cooper uses the manly sailor to legitimize his romantic version of republican meritocracy.

8. The Pirate council scene in *The Pirate* equates democracy with disorder. After the enigmatic buccaneer captain Clement Cleveland returns to his cronies after a long stay with Troil and his daughters, the leadership of this group of brigands is hashed out by two competing captains. The men's bodies narrate the difference between their characters and styles of command, and between the different sources of authority to which each can lay claim:

   > Black-haired, bull-necked, and beetle-browed, his [Goffe's] clumsy strength and ferocious countenance contrasted strongly with the manly figure and open countenance of Cleveland, in which even the practice of his atrocious profession had not been able to eradicate a natural grace of motion and generosity of expression. (403)

   As the contending commanders face off, the crew naturally divides into two factions according to partisan lines. In this drama of democratic feeling, the young men are attracted to the manly vigor exhibited by genteel Cleveland, while their more experienced peers favor the older Goffe's seniority. Operating outside the prescriptive procedures of an established civic order, the buccaneer crew cannot establish a clear order of merit; the captains therefore advance their respective claims of precedence

before the entire crew in a democratic fashion.[5]

9. The hallmark of socio-political chaos in *The Pirate* is this unsavory, unregulated contact among members of discrete social classes. Unlike commanders in the Royal Navy, buccaneers in *The Pirate* must exercise their authority without the protective veneer of esteem that legitimate state power affords to those with elevated status:

> When Cleveland . . . found himself once more on board the pirate vessel, his arrival was hailed with hearty cheers by a considerable part of the crew, who rushed to shake hands with him and offer their congratulations on his return; for the situation of a buccanier captain raised him very little above the level of the lowest of his crew, who, in all social intercourse, claimed the privilege of being his equal. (402)

Here Scott stages the vulgarizing effects of social leveling, for the disintegration of hierarchy wreaks havoc upon the orderly functioning of the collective. Instead of giving authority to the truly meritorious, an egalitarian society distributes a little ineffectual bit of power to every man, and as Cleveland takes the hand of each of "the lowest" men in his grasp republican social relations transgress the genteel boundaries that protect privileged bodies from the invidious touch of a "clumsy and ferocious" class of men—in other words, those without manly merit (402).

10. Eventually the boatswain motions for "a general council in the great cabin" to decide the contest of authority; meanwhile the drunken revels of the greater part of the crew demonstrate that the formal structures of majority rule elicit base behavior (405). During the proceedings that will determine the fate of the pirate vessel, most of the ordinary outlaws take advantage of the "unlimited quantity of liquor" ostensibly provided in order to facilitate free expression. Lacking both the education and character necessary for self-government, they soon grow too intoxicated to participate and the consultation of the interested players takes place without any real public discussion. The narrator describes how the election process degenerates into mayhem and oligarchy:

> But a few amongst the adventurers, who united some degree of judgement [sic] with the daring and profligate character of their profession, were wont, at such periods, to limit themselves within the bounds of comparative sobriety, and by these, under the apparent form of a vote of general council, all things of moment relating to the voyage and undertakings of the pirates were in fact determined. (405)

Despite the customary provisions for a general vote, on Scott's pirate vessel the actual decision-making is confined to the work of a select "senate" formed of the most interested or privileged individuals (405).

11. Meanwhile "inebriation in all its most brutal and disgraceful shapes" takes its moral toll upon the masses in the form of vile oaths, imprecations, naughty songs, and pervasive "ribaldry"; thus procedures that are intended to facilitate public participation actually create an "earthly hell" on the deck of the outlaw vessel (405). Since some few of the crew realize that only the appealing Cleveland can persuade local merchants into provisioning their ship, they make him acting captain. Later, gentlemanly generosity leads Cleveland to insist that the crew reinstate boorish Goffe as commander.

12. In *The Pirate*, the democratic form is merely nominal, because the individuals who comprise the public are unsuited to—and uninterested in—political participation. Because these men are not fit to govern themselves, on the buccaneer vessel power becomes concentrated in the hands of a few uncouth men who achieve positions of authority through brute force rather than true manly merit. The group subordinates the claims of cultivated individuals to partisan feeling and self-interest, while the

historical absence of statutory hierarchy leads inexorably to frighteningly chaotic political conditions. Scott's depiction of a rough pirate council confirms the social degeneration effected by majority rule, and empties political authority of meaning outside the structural mandates of the traditional monarchical state.

13. In contrast, in *The Pilot* the doctrine of charismatic manliness allows Cooper to locate political authority in deserving individuals, instead of attributing legitimacy solely to inherited institutions. The novel chronicles how youthful naval officers Ned Griffith and Dick Barnstable sail to the coasts of England during the Revolutionary War and discover their patriotic paramours housed in a crumbling Abbey with an aging uncle, a Carolina Tory, who represents an earlier age's devotion to England and to the defense of British imperial power. The adventure plot of *The Pilot* hinges upon the relationships these young naval officers—thoughtful Griffith and hotheaded Barnstable—form with the mysterious Pilot, John Paul Jones in disguise, who conducts a daring prisoner-taking expedition in order to bring the conflict in the North American colonies home to Britain's shores.

14. Cooper enacts the administrative logic of republican meritocracy most vividly in the council of war that follows the entrance of an enigmatic pilot into the shipboard community. Captain Munson gathers together the officers and warrant-officers of the frigate for a conference in the republican style; as suggested by the frontispiece to the chapter (drawn from Addison's Roman drama *Cato* "Sempronius, speak"), the council scene accentuates the policy-making procedures unique to republican hierarchy. Positing a hierarchy based upon individual merit at work on the frigate, Cooper intends to demonstrate how republican government cultivates personal worth, creating qualified leaders and a just social hierarchy to effectively manage the free exchange of ideas.[6] On the American frigate, the officers gather around the conference table in descending order of rank. Some legible personal quality accounts for the position each man holds in the scheme. Commencing with the pen-chewing, plebian sailing-master—aptly named Boltrope—the captain gives each officer an opportunity to speak in an institutionally prescribed order that indicates the seamless correspondence of manner and skill with rank in each participant. Beautiful young Ned Griffith is, by reason of his many virtues, near the top of the chain of command aboard the frigate, and eventually the officers acknowledge the tactical superiority of the plan he proposes.

15. Therefore the war-conference on board the American frigate models how republican political procedure engenders meritocracy, not anarchy; with careful attention to prominence the mariners and soldiers act out civic exchange of ideas, culminating in the selection of the best plan of action by those officers with the most expertise. Because of the irresistible draw of meritorious individuals with institutionally validated authority, republicanism regulates the social and occupational worlds on the ship so well that the palpably genteel character and measurable professional skills of each man are directly proportional to his social and economic status. Democratically, Captain Munson proposes that "by comparing opinions, we may decide on the most prudent course"; and, in fact, the thoughtful first lieutenant suggests a course of action somewhere between the two tactical extremes recommended by Barnstable and Manual (Cooper, 77).

16. After the lower-ranked warrant-officers offer their views, "The opinions of the others grew gradually more explicit and clear, as they ascended in the scale of rank" (75). Meritocracy and mutual respect make the correspondence of rank with ability entirely seamless. This council scene reveals the ways that republican ideals engineer the novel's fantasy of just statehood, of community formation, and of privileged male power by demonstrating how, in a republic, the system allows every man a voice. Moreover, in the institutional processes wherein constituents freely express their ideas, the group can readily single out for recognition those men with the best ideas. In *The Pilot*, Cooper imagines a system in which authority and merit coincide smoothly, so that society automatically recognizes and rewards manly merit.[7]

17. Manly affect holds the corporate group together securely, because each man perceives the worthiness of a leader like Griffith. As a result, charismatic leadership energizes the hierarchy engendered by the unique features of republicanism.[8] After the meeting, Griffith feels compelled to question Captain Munson's unwavering trust in the pilot—a stranger they have plucked from an isolated stretch of coast. The aging commander responds by recurring to his professional seniority, saying "I have not your pretensions, sir, by birth or education, and yet Congress have not seen proper to overlook my years and services" (82). At this point the pilot intervenes, acknowledging Griffith's doubts and then dramatically relieving them by producing "a parchment, decorated with ribbands and bearing a massive seal, which he opened, and laid on the table before the youth" (82). Once Griffith realizes that the seemingly innocuous stranger is in fact the infamous tactical genius John Paul Jones," a glow of fiery courage flitted across his countenance" and he instantly swears allegiance to the legendary warrior, pledging "Lead on! I'll follow you to death!" (82). The pilot and his protégé exit arm in arm, leaving "Old Moderate" to his private musings, the very picture of disinterested liberal authority.

18. The scenario whereby the pilot wins the allegiance of the young lieutenant is reproduced along the chain of hierarchy, linking superiors, peers, and subordinates in a series of institutionally proscribed partnerships validated by experiences of intensely personal emotion. The pilot's virtuoso technical knowledge signals one form of merit, but due to the programmatic niceties of institutional conduct Griffith may require additional credentials as proof of the worth and status of the mysterious interloper. The token the pilot produces—it seems to be the endorsement of the French crown—alleviates the anxieties about power, position, and hierarchy that prompt challenges from Griffith. Manly merit, therefore, is irreducible to professional talent. Meritocracy depends upon charismatic qualities and the resultant legitimacy afforded to those who exercise power. Charisma engenders sympathy; since affection makes authority more palatable, the most approved leaders are those whose charismatic leadership cements the community of individuals into one feeling whole.[10]

19. In *The Pilot* professional ability provides one obvious signifier of manly merit, but in addition to his technical skills, a bosun or coxswain in Cooper's revolutionary navy must possess those manly qualities that catalyze group affect within the unique conditions provided by maritime life, and according to genteel thinking the hard-working, moral, rustic characteristics of the regional type make such individuals well-suited to providing a unifying focus for social relations. The physical imagery Cooper employs in vivid descriptions of Long-Tom and David Boltrope, the sailing master, indicate that this charismatic capacity is another prerequisite for authority. Nevertheless, they lack an inherent quality of charismatic commanders—an ability to bodily convey an authority that other men will recognize and experience as legitimate.

20. In *The Pilot*, men learn to sympathize by emulating those they admire. When Long-Tom Coffin goes down with his ship, the entire crew mourns the loss of their beloved cockswain, but none with more feeling than his commander. As tears overcome poor Barnstable, Merry "sat respectfully watching the display of feeling that his officer, in vain, endeavored to suppress" (293). The lieutenant's tears elicit sympathy:

    > Merry felt his own form quiver with sympathy at the shuddering which passed through Barnstable's frame; and the relief experienced by the lieutenant himself, was not greater than that which the midshipman felt, as the latter beheld large tears forcing their way through the other's fingers, and falling on the sands at his feet. (293)

    Republican manliness is not at odds with such unguarded displays of affect, for the "loftiness" and "pride" of genteel manhood are linked to virtuous performance of emotion.[11]

21. Most importantly, the didactic exchange enacted through expressions of shared feeling cements the

already strong relationship the midshipman shares with his commander:

> Merry had often beheld the commanding severity of the lieutenant's manner, in moments of danger, with deep respect; he had been drawn towards him by kindness and affection, in time of gayety and recklessness; but he now sate [sic], for many minutes, profoundly silent, regarding his officer with sensations that were nearly allied to awe. The struggle with himself was long and severe in the bosom of Barnstable; but, at length, the calm of relieved passions succeeded to his emotion. (293)

The attraction Merry already feels toward Barnstable—who not coincidentally is engaged to Merry's cousin Katherine—increases to something near "awe" through the throbbing pulse of sympathy. Silently the midshipman gives himself up to the "sensations" provoked by a combination of his admiration for and desire to emulate his superior officer. In this fashion, *The Pilot* depicts how love among men shores up hierarchy. This scene enacts the principle whereby men learn to negotiate rank and status by managing their emotions in accordance with institutionally prescribed standards; needless to say, if an institution enforces standard practices for the experience and expression of feelings, it likewise manifests a code of manliness that uses emotional behaviors to index the social and institutional values of behavior associated with sex and gender.

22. In *The Pilot*, bodies stimulate recognition of merit, whereas intimate friendship verifies its presence. Griffith and Barnstable are fast friends from early childhood, and the twists and turns in their affectionate but occasionally competitive relationship provides the work with several of its characteristically melodramatic plot movements. Both men carry a mercantile culture's version of pedigree. Additionally, Griffith is "gifted with an experience beyond his years" (18) and endowed with a natural authority that operates "like a charm" (338); he also appears "haughty" and exults in a fervent "native pride" (72). Barnstable, likewise, radiates that "calm authority, that seamen find it most necessary to exert, in the moments of extremest danger" and readily exhibits "that collectedness of manner, and intonation of voice, that were best adapted to enforce a ready and animated obedience" on the part of a trusting crew (273). *The Pilot*, however, is the penultimate manly authority in the novel; combining consummate professional skill and a "muscular form" with commanding mien to which others respond "involuntarily" (338), Mr. Gray successfully asserts himself as "One who has a right to order, and who will be obeyed!" (345).

23. No single or central source of authority confers power and status in *The Pilot*. Instead, social relationships each produce unique conditions in which authority plays all kinds of constitutive roles. Like Mr. Gray or Griffith in *The Pilot*, Magnus Troil and Clement Cleveland in *The Pirate* are charismatic centers of authority; however, the brusque yet "honest Udaller" eschews most displays of emotion, while circumstances force the pirate captain to suppress his finer feelings and cultivate an appearance of ferocity. Despite very different political perspectives, manliness is the common ground for power and authority in both maritime romances. Cooper and Scott treat the charismatic male as the catalyst through which both collective identity and social hierarchy take form. And in both novels, affection may sustain hierarchy; intimate attachments to worthy representatives of power solidify allegiance to the abstract principles embodied in leaders. Yet for Scott, only avaricious self-interest provides incentive for *The Pirate* crew to follow their dashing, fearless commander. Troil holds the fealty of his tenants through tradition as well as force of personality; although his ample country feasts and paternalistic administration do secure the devoted adherence of his constituents, the power he exercises arises from the legal and cultural conventions that underpin his position in the local hierarchy.

24. But in *The Pilot*, representations of the complex network of relationships on board the frigate and the Ariel contradict the Hobbesian doctrine of natural competition among males in Scott's narrative. Because this view of manly charisma discounts intimate affiliations among men as binding social

forces, a character such as Cleveland cannot stand being indebted to Mordaunt Mertoun, the youth who has saved his life; "there is a natural dislike" between them, he avers, "a something like a principle of repugnance in our mutual nature, which makes us odious to each other" (Scott, 209). Of course, it turns out that the two men share a father, but they never achieve any kind of friendly relation or brotherly intimacy. For Cleveland, display of refined manly emotion proves troublesome and exerts no improving influence. While the picturesque work of the deep-sea fishermen occupies the residents of Burgh Westra, the elegant Cleveland reveals his history to his impressionable paramour, Minna Troil. Though drawn inexorably into the adventurous world of the unregulated West Indies, young Cleveland assures Minna that "my natural disposition has been controlled, but not altered, by the untoward circumstances in which I am placed" (217). While barely pubescent, undaunted Cleveland becomes commander of a privateering crew of "desperate fellows" bent on wreaking havoc on Spanish vessels. But his refined moral sense inconveniences his crew, so they maroon the principled buccaneer on an uncharted Caribbean islet.

25. In isolation Cleveland learns to adopt an "iron mask" of manly imperturbability as a "chief security against treason, or mutiny of my followers" (216). In order to safeguard the innocent and restrain his ignoble companions, he endeavors to appear even more terrible and inhumane than his subordinates by showing no emotion. Seclusion gives him time to acquire thoughtful insight into the character of the vulgar class of pirates:

> I thought over my former story, and saw that seeming more brave, skilful, and enterprizing than others, had gained me command and respect, and that seeming more gently nurtured, and more civilized than they, had made them envy and hate me as a being of another species. I agreed with myself, then, that since I could not lay aside my superiority of intellect and education, I would do my best to disguise, and to sink in the rude seaman, all appearance of better feeling and better accomplishment. (216)

This ruse permits Cleveland to more effectively enforce his will:

> I foresaw then what has since happened, that, under the appearance of daring obduracy, I should acquire such a habitual command over my followers, that I might use it for the ensurance of discipline, and for relieving the distresses of the wretches who fell under our power. (216)

Cleveland disguises his superior "mind, morals, and manners" because only the threat of savage reprisal can contain the depredations of his savage crew. In *The Pirate*, displaying "better feeling" will anger the mass of men rather than producing any refining influence.

26. In contrast, Barnstable and Griffith are sensitive to their crews. Exemplifying manly fortitude, they enforce discipline by winning the devoted admiration of their subordinates. No self-respecting seaman, hints *The Pilot*, could be anything but brave faced with the example of these worthy commanders; by this means republican institutions improve upon Hobbesian models of charismatic authority. In his writings on civil government, Thomas Hobbes claims that a society requires a single figurehead to organize individuals into a community. But in *The Pilot*, manly merit engenders intimate friendship, and affiliation among citizens becomes the cornerstone of authority in a republic. Therefore, Cooper treats the experience of being commanded as pleasurable; the powers of the US Navy to control and coerce are made legitimate by representing authority as the product of intimacy. Because it relies on love among good citizens, republican meritocracy readily provides ethical justification for democratic revolution. In the world of *The Pirate*, on the other hand, demonstrated worth might just get you stranded on a deserted island by jealous plebeians.

27. *The Pirate* portrays the provincial political structure of the seventeenth-century Orkney and Shetland islands nostalgically. It depicts the slow mainstreaming of the Norwegian ethnic majority, while *The Pilot* evokes the revolutionary transformation of a British colony into an independent state. In *The Pilot*, expressions of affect indicate the revisions to political subjectivity that accompany republican revolution because conditioned emotional response on the part of the citizen is a requirement for political participation. Sympathy and sentiment have political uses, not least because they allow men to explain the ties binding citizens to one another without exclusively locating those ties in the realm of economic expedience. For Cooper, the very reasons for communal identification and collective action reside in the affective drives and physical needs of politically empowered subjects.

28. The staging of sympathy in *The Pilot* may seem familiar to readers of Adam Smith.[12] Unlike earlier thinkers, such as Shaftesbury, Smith does not treat sympathy and sociality as innate human faculties; for him, "fellow-feeling" arises through "excited" "fancy" and is therefore a product of the imaginative mind of the civilized subject (Smith, 48). It is also social, because "sympathy" is shared experience not of feelings, but "of the situation which excites" feelings (51). Potentially, "mutual sympathy" confers both pleasure and the power to perform concerted action since a man who seeks the aid of others "rejoices when he observes that they adopt his own passions, because he is then assured of that assistance" (54). The virtuous man with "proper motives" for his actions automatically

> Is in friendship and harmony with all mankind, and looks upon his fellow-creatures with confidence, and benevolent satisfaction, secure that he has rendered himself worthy of their most favorable regards. In the combination of all these sentiments, consists the consciousness of merit, or of deserved reward. (165)

Merit, therefore, is present in the individual who inspires the regard of others. This is why Cooper ties merit to the love engendered by manly sympathy.

29. Smith sees recognition of individual worth arising in the social configurations that sympathetic situations create: "our sense of . . . merit arises from . . . an indirect sympathy with the gratitude of the person who is . . . acted upon" (148). Meritocracy, then, is about the emotions charismatic individuals elicit in other subjects. For this reason the "Grateful affection" of others is the best evidence of manly merit (148). Because mutual regard is the hallmark of fellow feeling, friendship both indexes personal merit and images the bonds that organize men into societies. In fact, according to Smith sympathy makes meritocracy possible: "Our whole sense, in short of the merit and good desert of such actions [those of Scipio, Camillus, Timoleon, and Aristides], of the propriety and fitness of recompensing them . . . arises from the sympathetic emotions of gratitude and love, with which, when we bring home to our own breast the situation of those principles concerned, we feel ourselves. . ." (149). Conversely, according to Smith patriotism originates from self-interest: "The state or sovereignty in which have been born and educated" naturally includes the self and also "comprehends" family, friends, and other attachments to loved ones (372).

30. Applying many of the same ideas, in *The Pilot* Cooper shows how republican meritocracy cultivates patriotism. The proof, the novel suggests, is in the heroes. Unlike the typical man Smith describes, the mariners of *The Pilot* revere "wisdom and virtue" and not "wealth and greatness"; therefore Cooper’s Americans bestow their "respectful attentions" according to merit and not display of affluence or status (Cooper, 126). Like friendship and other virtues, love of country proves merit by exemplifying the virtuous exercise of human capacities for emotional attachment. When authority figures exhibit affect in *The Pilot*, their subordinates learn virtuous practice of emotion. In a culture wherein "male" and "female" designate different regimes of feeling, these displays teach proper practices of gender because they also teach proper practices of emotion. As scholars of US literature have argued in the context of the American family, love turns out to be an especially effective mechanism for socialization and for

the reproduction of hierarchical power relations. Manly friendship in *The Pilot* illustrates how the disciplinary powers of love and affection can fashion subjects in institutional confines as well as in the domestic sphere.

31. Thus admiration becomes the means for reproducing the system of rule among Cooper's republican mariners, and the loyalty individuals feel for their leaders guarantees good discipline.[13] Through an admixture of love and submission that locates discipline and patriotism within personal experiences of emotion as well as in the institutional and cultural state apparatus, American men in *The Pilot* come to passionately follow authority figures. Genteel republican love for meritorious soldiers and seamen ensures the just administration of discipline on the part of the powerful, and secures for the elite the gratefully devoted service of their subordinates.

32. Throughout *The Pilot* Cooper is especially skillful at scripting the affective basis for authority. Intimate friendships demonstrate how a combination of attachments both to individuals and to principles solidifies and legitimates power in its patriarchal, institutional forms. Central to his view of the affect of authority is the charismatic male figure—physically arresting, knowledgeable in his field, and thereby in a position to secure the devoted admiration of others, Cooper's powerfully attractive hero can use his body as a focus for the emotions of a lot of people, whose attachments to one another are solidified by shared devotion to the hero and his principles. The mutual emotional attachments the charismatic man produces can thereby signal membership in a community of shared values and reciprocal affinities. From the isolated Pilot to the garrulous Barnstable, each hero exercises his authority largely because of the devoted love he engenders in the tenderly receptive bosoms of both comrades and subordinates.[14]

33. Because of the way that manliness grounds power for both Cooper and Scott, manly friendship provides a metaphor for US/British relations in *The Pilot*. The best example of Cooper's view of the relation of the US to Britain is the domestic pairing of an American and a British soldier who lead opposing armies during the period of border disputes with British-held Canada in the late eighteenth century. *The Pilot* ends with an epilogue describing the camaraderie of two characters, the marine captain Manual and British infantry commander Borroughcliffe, who eventually shack up together in a makeshift hut on an island in the St. Lawrence River. In England, the two men wound each other in a pointless duel that ends not with rancor, but with friendly feelings and vows of shared regard instead.

34. Years later, as their respective nations duke it out, the two men meet again and revive a military friendship based upon institutional values, affectionate respect, and a shared taste for Madeira wine. The comic parody of heterosexual domesticity represented by these two codgers implies the simultaneously contiguous and divergent nature of American and British institutions. The romance of maritime power in *The Pilot* works though the implicit suggestion that development of improved manly virtues among Americans signals the eventual doom of gendered principles of allegiance articulated according to inherited British models. However, while it stages the superiority of American manhood, *The Pilot* also points to the debt the young republic owed to metropolitan culture for acquired models of manliness. The politics of manliness in these maritime historical novels indicates that attitudes toward gender and sexuality permitted early architects of transatlantic white culture to represent the relations of the US with Britain dialectically. Ideas about gender and emotion that were widely shared allowed Anglophone writers paths into debates about more factious issues, like individual rights or the nature of political authority.

35. Recent studies of the interdependent concepts of race and nation in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century fiction illustrate how narratives of racial difference helped writers to invent a symbolic cultural and political heritage for the new nation. For instance, Jared Gardner has described how, in the *Leatherstocking* novels, Cooper reconciles the republic with the culture and institutions of Britain by

staging the disappearance of natives and African-Americans into an imagined past. However, in his maritime novels of the 1820s, Cooper uses manhood to depict the traditions and truisms of Old World politics succumbing to the irresistible force of republican pluck. Cooper's representation of the relationship between Old and New worlds hinges upon notions of masculinity as well as of race because enterprise and vigor are portrayed as key features of republican manliness. Cooper self-consciously presents a revised version of manhood and gender relations in order to justify the claims of his Revolutionary heroes not only to integrity, but to some degree of superior manliness over their British foes, who may be valiant but whose dedication to tradition prevents the public recognition of merit in enterprising individuals like John Paul Jones. In *The Pilot*, when men recognize worthiness in other men, the loving friendships that arise supposedly create a stronger, more stable state.

Notes

[1] *The Pirate* was published in Edinburgh and London November, 1821; authorized editions of *The Pilot* were published in New York and London in January, 1824.

[2] The variety of republican attitudes at work in the 1820s suggest that republicanism was a highly adaptable approach to theorizing the relationship of persons and communities to the state—one signaled by certain recurring themes rather than a system or set of beliefs. I use "republican" to refer to political ideas that both value representative government, elite or democratic, and emphasize a need for communal identity. In early nineteenth-century American culture, republican ideologues tended to understand political power as embodied in representative males who are endowed with authority by a constituency comprised of elite white property-owners, who in turn represent the aggregate body of society. For example, in no. 39 of *The Federalist* Madison sums up the "republican complexion" of government (242) as that endowed with authority "from the great body of the society" it governs (Rossiter, 241).

[3] In a recent study informed by the history of the book and by the history of ideas, Mark G. Spencer has described how Hume's ideas about factionalism influenced James Madison's *Federalist* No. 10.

[4] The careers of individual maritime workers in the ages of sail exemplify the contingent nature of "the Atlantic world," for many served or sought profit in both Pacific and Atlantic spheres, and many more employed their skills in smaller local communities. The narratives of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century seafarers suggest that Atlantic rim culture is as constructed as local and national geo-political terms for cultural contiguity. Since maritime workers were a historical locus of transatlantic cultural exchange, then narratives about sailors provide an especially useful archive for excavating embedded concerns with the shifting configurations of citizenship and international relations. For foundational research on seamen of African descent and the spread of political ideas, see Julius Scott, "The Common Wind: Currents of Afro-American Communication in the Era of the Haitian Revolution," diss., Duke U, 1986.

[5] By the nineteenth century, the British popular imagination had long associated piracy with democracy; both could be seen as unruly systems without any established moral foundation. Christopher Hill notes that in the seventeenth century pirate "Captains were often elected, and were answerable to their crews; decisions on policy and disciplinary punishments were democratically taken. This contrasted very sharply with the despotism of naval captains, the rule of the lash, the ultimate possibility of a death sentence for mutiny" (Hill, 117).

[6] Notably, Cooper's fantasy of revolutionary adventure imagines a maritime power the republic did not possess in the Revolutionary era or in the 1820s, although the US would achieve considerable sea power by the end of the century.

[7] Anthony Rotundo's *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* is a useful overview of changing ideas about manhood in the United States. Rotundo shows that in the later eighteenth century, intimate friendship between men was the norm in genteel circles. Recent studies of manhood and US print culture have applied the insights of Rotundo's work to more specific textual sites for the construction of masculinity. Most notably, in *American Sympathy*, Caleb Crain examines the relationship of sympathy to manhood in the early republic, and in the process shows how critics might productively view friendship among men as a site of possibility and complex negotiations of affect, rather than a reflection of the competitive relations of the market. My purpose here is to show how, for writers like Cooper, the dialectical emotional exchanges between friends also suggested one way to re-imagine the relationship of Britain to the US.

[8] Regarding the early republican fascination with charismatic males, Mark Kann writes that "Ultimately, the founders' faith in the Heroic Man completed their grammar of manhood by promoting a patriarchal discourse that lifted up a few great men over the democratic masses and played down women's political potential as citizens and leaders" (Kann, 130-1). In *A Republic of Men* political scientist Kann analyzes the ways in which cultural concepts of gender, and especially white manhood, were deployed in federalist print of the early national era. Positing a cultural "grammar of manhood"—comprised of "the hegemonic norms, language, and rules they employed to promote public quiescence and justify leadership" (3)—Kann assesses the effect of cultural notions of threatening (non-heterosexual) manly disorder, family stability, civic virtue and heroic individuality on the development of citizenship and doctrines of political authority.

[9] In this manner, my argument differs from Margaret Cohen's examination of "know-how" in *The Pilot*.

[10] My analysis of the feelings of the hero draws from the theory of charisma and institutional bureaucracy articulated by Max Weber. According to his sociology of the individual as political fetish, the modern state routinizes gender inequalities through a "workaday" bureaucracy located in the mundane structural demands of economic activity; in the civic arena created by official bureaucracy, patriarchal social patterns formalize commercial relations and enforce the domination of a perceived "natural leader" in the home, the marketplace, and the sphere of civic activity. Weber's description of patriarchal authority emphasizes the historical connections of patriarchal authority to economic forces and statutory bureaucracy. In the Western political scenarios that Weber describes, a social group recognizes the quality of "charisma" in a man; this act of ascription legitimizes the privileged positions of charismatic individuals within the prescribed hierarchy of the "social strata" (Weber, 39). Weber claims that under the conditions of modern capitalism, most social institutions in the West authorize these forms of individual—almost always a male individual—empowerment by managing the system of social status and access to capital.

[11] Showing how later eighteenth-century poets used the "imaginative domain" of the "Atlantic theater" to represent "the connection between emotion and history," Julie Ellison argues that "the Age of Sensibility can by defined by its focus on the moments when consciousness dilates to historical horizons and when history is compressed into consciousness" (Ellison; 124, 141, 142). In a similar manner, maritime historical novels such as *The Pirate* and *The Pilot* relate individual consciousness to grand historical narratives through shared experience. In the romantic worlds imagined by Cooper and Scott, each man's affective capacities engineer his position within social and political hierarchies, and his intimate attachments to peers, subalterns, and authority figures become the basic components of manly historical enterprise.

[12] It may also be recognizable to scholars of nineteenth century US sentimental fiction. For literary scholars like Elizabeth Barnes, Julia Stern, and Lori Merish, in the eighteenth century philosophies of sympathy set the precedent for sentimental forms and rhetoric—a nineteenth century middle class phenomena with a unique incarnation in the US. In her examination of the ways that familial love intersects with seduction plots, Elizabeth Barnes illustrates how doctrines of sympathy could collapse a variety of emotional relations

into the same forms in nineteenth-century novels. Stern uses her readings to describe the psychological underpinnings of connections between emotion, gender, and national violence in US writing, while Merish emphasizes attitudes toward the political and national subject status of middle-class women that make commodity consumption into a gendered practice. Following Nancy Armstrong, most feminists examining literary form in the early US emphasize the acculturation of British forms associated with the white middle class; for many of these scholars the literary relations of the US with Britain illustrate the relevance of British culture and especially print culture to gendered, political, and material practices in later nineteenth-century America.

[13] According to Enlightenment thinkers, this process of empowerment requires properly socialized national subjects, because the public must willingly recognize charisma in the men who exercise power.

[14] Interrogating the literary-critical tendency to idealize narratives of interracial male pairing, Robyn Wiegman has shown how these popular bonding narratives operate by "transmuting the narrative of racial difference into a scenario of the mutuality of gender" (Wiegman, 172). Despite the prevalence of this narrative convention in popular fiction and film, "critical discussions of the American [canonical] tradition have nonetheless debated, for almost half a century, the meaning, centrality, and utopian possibilities inherent in the image of closely bonded men" (172). Wiegman's thesis on the obsession of twentieth-century narrative with "symbolic marriage among men" is relevant to my study because her close readings highlight the ongoing relevance of theses about manliness, affinity, and sympathy in Enlightenment-era political thought. My point is that the cultural work assigned to same-sex friendship in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century historical fictions eventually produced the discourse of sexual correspondence that allowed twentieth-century critics like Leslie Fiedler to theorize "democracy" in US fiction by pointing to scenarios that displace women and heterosexuality, and that use same-sex bonds to dissolve the historical and political problem of racial difference (149).

Works Cited

Barnes, Elizabeth. *States of Sympathy: Seduction and Democracy in the American Novel*. New York: Columbia UP, 1997.

Burke, Edmund. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. New York: Penguin Classics, 1969.

Cohen, Margaret. "Traveling Genres," *New Literary History* 34.3 (2003): 481-99.

Crain, Caleb. *American Sympathy: Men, Friendship, and Literature in the New Nation*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2001.

Ellison, Julie. *Cato's Tears and The Making of Anglo-American Emotion*. University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Fiedler, Leslie. *Love and Death in the American Novel*. New York: Criterion Books, 1960.

Gardner, Jared. *Master Plots: Race and the Founding of an American Literature, 1787-1845*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Hill, Christopher. *Liberty Against the Law: Some Seventeenth-Century Controversies*. London: Penguin Press, 1996.

Hobbes, Thomas. *De Cive*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

Hutcheson, Francis. *A System of Moral Philosophy*, vol. 4 in *Collected Works*, ed. Bernhard Fabian.

Hildesheim, G.: Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1969.

Kann, Mark. *A Republic of Men: The American Founders, Gendered Language, and Patriarchal Politics*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.

Land, Isaac. "Domesticating the Maritime: Culture, Masculinity, and Empire in Britain, 1770-1820." Diss. U of Michigan, 1999.

Merish, Lori. *Sentimental Materialism: Gender, Commodity Culture, and Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2000.

Pocock, J. G. A. *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*. Princeton: The Princeton University Press, 1975.

Rossiter, Clinton, ed. *The Federalist Papers*. New York: Mentor Books, 1961.

Rotundo, Anthony. *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.

Sedgwick, Eve. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Scott, Julius. "The Common Wind: Currents of Afro-American Communication in the Era of the Haitian Revolution." Diss. Duke U, 1986.

Scott, Sir Walter. *The Pirate*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995.

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1976.

Spencer, Mark G. *David Hume and Eighteenth-Century America*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2005.

Stern, Julia. *Plights of Feeling: Sympathy and Dissent in the Early American Novel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Weber, Max. *On Charisma and Institution Building*, edited by S. N. Eisenstadt. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Wiegman, Robyn. *American Anatomies: Theorizing Race and Gender*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.

Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism

London-Kingston-Caracas: The Transatlantic Self-Fashioning of Simón Bolívar

Joselyn M. Almeida, Long Island University

> Whilst he was at Paris, Bolivar's favourite and principal occupation was the study of those branches of science which belong to the formation of the warrior and the statesman . . . Humboldt and Bompland were his intimate friends, and accompanied him in his travels in France: nor did he think he had learned enough until he had traversed England, Italy, and a part of Germany . . . He went back to America, where he arrived at the very moment when his fellow-countrymen, who were wearied with the oppression of the Spanish government, had determined to unfurl the standard of independence . . . but he disapproved of the system adopted by the Congress of Venezuela, and refused to join Don Lopez Mendez in his mission to England, which was connected with the interests of the new government. Bolívar even declined any connexion with it, though he continued a staunch friend of his country's liberties. ("Sketch" 5)

1. "Sketch of the Political Career of Simón Bolívar" is among the opening pieces of the January 1823 issue of the *New Monthly Magazine*, which, as Nanora Sweet has argued, served to foster Anglo-Hispanic ties (Sweet 143). Within the first paragraphs, the anonymous author endeavors to establish the image of Bolívar as a cosmopolitan gentleman who had completed his education with the European grand tour. The assertions that follow this initial description, however, are puzzling to anyone familiar with Bolívar's life. He in fact was with López Méndez "in his mission to England"; José Blanco White, who corrected the proofs for the *New Monthly* article, knew this not only because of his friendship with Andrés Bello, who had accompanied *el general* to London, but also because he met Bolívar there. André Pons notes that "Blanco White personally met Bolívar in the summer of 1810 when Bolívar was appointed by the Junta in Caracas to a diplomatic mission with Andrés Bello and López Méndez" (Pons 508).

2. Why did Blanco White not correct this historical error in the "Sketch"? If it was an oversight, he caught it in "Noticia biográfica de Dón Simón de Bolívar," his version of the *New Monthly* piece that opened the first issue of *Variedades*, and which was published in January 1823 as well. Blanco suppressed the erroneous passage for his Latin American readers, to whom Bolívar's London visit would have been familiar. That the author of the *Monthly* article would want to make British readers think that Bolívar had not accompanied López Méndez and that Blanco would go along with this impression point to the careful manipulation of Bolívar's image in the early 1820s: a victorious general and statesman who had liberated a continent from "the oppression of the Spanish government" through his own efforts. A public acknowledgement of how much British assistance he received would have been, as Blanco astutely added in the conclusion of the "Noticia biográfica," contrary to Britain's political interests. "Aunque los enlaces políticos de la Gran Bretaña . . . requerían la neutralidad que su gobierno ha guardado, los Republicanos de la América Española no cumplirían con los deberes de la gratitud si no mirasen a la Inglaterra como origen, en parte, de la libertad que empiezan a gozar" ["Though the political ties of Great Britain . . . required it to be neutral, the Republicans of Spanish America would not fulfill their debt of gratitude if they did not regard England as an origin, in part, of the liberty they begin to enjoy"] (Blanco 12).[1] Blanco also intuits that the idea that Simón Bolívar, who embodied

the gestas of independence and the liberation of South America, was ever in the position of a supplicant to a European power like Britain, would have been repellent to the new republics.

3. Notwithstanding Blanco's dexterous editorial diplomacy, his remarkable statement—that England be considered an origin of Latin American independence—posits a challenge to scholars interested in transatlantic Romanticism.[2] William Keach's "thinking transatlantically about romanticism" (33), which pervades current critical discourse, is caught in an impasse: the transatlantic journeys are assumed to be between Britain and its English speaking contacts in the American hemisphere. This monolingual notion of the transatlantic cannot explain Blanco White's assertion. Nor, in fact, do other models of British Atlantic culture that include the Caribbean in their formulations.[3] With the exception of Mary Louise Pratt and Eugenia Roldán Vera, the Spanish American nexus that connected London, Kingston, and even Dublin with Spain, the Caribbean, South America, and Africa has been largely overlooked. Pratt, whose work on Humboldt has reintroduced Latin America as a locus for Romanticism, devotes a chapter to Andrés Bello and Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, two major nineteenth century writers in Latin America, but it has not had the same critical impact as her work on Humboldt.[4] Eugenia Roldán Vera's work has shown the intricate connections between Rudolph Ackermann's bilingual press and the newly formed republics in the Americas; he published Blanco White's *Variedades* as well as 100 titles, including a translation of Scott's *Ivanhoe* and José Joaquín de Mora's *Meditaciones Poéticas*, a series of poems to accompany William Blake's engravings to Blair's *The Grave*.[5] This body of work, however, has not received the attention that it merits from transatlantic scholars.

4. To invoke the Americas, the Caribbean, and the Atlantic, and ignore the crucial presence of Hispano-Americans, whom Romantic authors themselves acknowledged, is an act of critical oversight that becomes less and less viable. Implicitly, this oversight condones what Kirsten Silva Gruesz calls the "imperial conflation of America with the United States . . . America [is] a name which [the U.S] has appropriated synechdocically unto itself" (10). However, the cultural history Gruesz maps for the United States, one in which intercultural exchanges cross linguistic borders, has earlier origins than those she claims for José María Heredia's "Niágara" (1824) and William Cullen Bryant's translation of Heredia in 1827. As Nigel Leask and more recently Robert Aguirre have shown, Humboldt's incursion into the Americas generated an avid interest in Mexican and Peruvian artifacts. Aguirre writes that "in the wake of Alexander von Humboldt's journeys, which made Latin America an object of intense scrutiny after 300 years of Spanish domination, the British quest for and representation of pre-Columbian antiquity became a crucial cultural arm of the larger political strategy historians call 'informal imperialism'" (xv). He focuses on William Bullock's *Residence and Travels in Mexico* (1824) and his collecting, which forms the basis of the British Museum's permanent collection of Mexican art (Aguirre 26-33).

5. As central as Humboldt's travels are when thinking about the European construction of Latin America, it must be remembered that two other pressing concerns made the Americas extremely real to the British public during the Romantic period—Napoleon and the slave trade. James Mill argued in "Emancipation of Spanish America" (1809) that South America was a "barrier . . . to resist the torrent whose pressure we must continue to dread" (230), a sentiment later echoed in other journals. "The Continent of America alone can save us from the gigantic power of Bonaparte" declares the November issue of *The Statesman* (Miranda 23:103).

6. Debbie Lee has most recently elaborated the connection between Britain and the slave trade, one that through commodities, maps, images, literature, discourse, and disease made itself felt in the metropolis and "shaped the Romantic imagination" (6). What has not been considered is how British discourse about the slave trade was linked in the British imagination with the independence of Latin America. A transatlantic reading of Simón Bolívar's "Carta de Jamaica" ("Jamaica Letter"), written during his exile

in Kingston in 1815, shows that he draws on the discursive connection between abolition and independence that Mill and others had made familiar to the British public in order to make his case for continued British support of the Latin American enterprise.[6] Like *El Español*, the *New Monthly Magazine*, and *Variedades*, the "Jamaica Letter" aims to create a textual alliance between Britain and Latin America. Though it has long been considered a foundational document of Latin American thought, the letter's intended audience is clearly the British public, metonymically represented by its addressee, Henry Cullen. Bolívar's language expresses anxiety about slave uprisings even as it uses the language of abolition as a critique of empire to gain sympathy for the Latin American cause, an anxiety with which British audiences, and especially British Creoles in Kingston, could clearly identify. This reading also reasserts the importance of Kingston as a locale that connects the Anglophone and Hispanophone transatlantic.[7]

7. The letter's publication history also supports the need to reconsider it within a transatlantic context, rather than the more nationalistic readings that it has hitherto received. As Pedro Grases, a renowned Bolívar scholar, has shown, the first known manuscript of the letter is in English. It was published in *The Jamaica Quarterly and Literary Gazette* in 1818 and again in 1825 under the title "General Bolivar's Letter to a Friend, on the Subject of South American Independence. (Translated from the Spanish.)" (706). The manuscript in Spanish was not published until 1833, after Bolívar's death in 1830. Like the "Sketch" in the *New Monthly* and the "Noticia Biográfica," the "Carta de Jamaica" has a double life. This article will briefly address the ways in which Bolívar's self-fashioning in the "Jamaica Letter" and other writings during his exile in Kingston in 1815 shapes the image of Bolívar for the British public. My reading suggests that Romanticism in the Caribbean and the Americas has a multilingual dimension, and invites readers to rethink the "movements of time, plot, and history" (Bakhtin 84) in the transatlantic that more traditional readings exclude.

II. Kingston Circa 1815

8. For British sailors, travelers, and planters like Olaudah Equiano, Lady Maria Nugent, and Monk Lewis experiencing the city of Kingston became *de rigeur* when in Jamaica. Lewis, who arrived during the John-Canoe celebrations at Christmas in 1816, gives a lively account of the city, declaring that he "never saw so many people [both black and white] who appeared to be so unaffectedly happy" (40). Equiano's experience, on the other hand, points to Kingston's role as a major slave-trading port. Having been denied his wages by a captain Baker, he goes from magistrate to magistrate seeking redress, "and there were nine, but they refused to do anything for me, and said my oath could not be admitted against a white man . . . Such oppressions as these made me seek for a vessel to get out of the island as fast as I could" (218). Trevord Burnard notes that during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Kingston "remained the principal port of entry of slaves until the abolition of the trade in 1808 . . . [from 1700] to 1808, 830,000 slaves were imported into Jamaica" (234). Merchants also supplied slaves to the Spanish American colonies—the illicit trade in goods and slaves provided needed bullion for traders, who in turn used it for loans to sugar planters (Burnard 237). Burnard continues "Having gone to the Caribbean to make their fortunes, some wealthy West Indians returned to Britain and made new careers as London merchants, continuing to deal with their brethren back in the tropics" (232)— dealings that Jane Austen dramatized in *Mansfield Park* through the figure of Sir Thomas Bertram. Kingston, as a city of empire, seemed distant and marginal, but as Edward Said has pointed out,"Far from being nothing much 'out there,' British colonial possessions in the Antilles [West Indies] and Leeward islands were during Jane Austen's time a crucial setting for Anglo-French colonial competition" (90).

9. Said, however, does not mention that Spain also was part of this contest and does not posit Kingston as a site of resistance. The Ashanti Queen Nanny, who defeated the British in the Jamaican Maroon Wars during the 1720s and 1730s, played on the imperial rivalry between Spain and Britain. The British feared a plan by slaves to "hand over the island [of Jamaica] to Spain when they had taken it over, on

the condition that the Spanish guarantee their freedom" (qtd. in Linebaugh and Rediker 195). Resistance was also expressed in the domestic sphere: Toussaint L'Ouverture's revolution encouraged enslaved Afro-Caribbeans in Kingston to "not do anything but listen" to the tabletalk of whites. Lady Nugent records in her journal: "The splendour of the black chiefs of St. Domingo, their superior strength, their firmness of character [. . .] are the common topics at dinner; and the blackies [sic] in attendance seem so much interested, that they hardly change a plate, or do anything but listen. How very imprudent, and what must it all lead to!" (198). The latent implications of a revolution in Jamaica —one that domestics could conceive around her own dinner table as they ignored the dishes that needed to be retrieved—do not escape Lady Nugent. As Lucille Mathurin Mair notes, "Domestic slaves in particular, many of whom were women. . . listened carefully to the discussions of their masters and mistresses: planters spoke quite frequently about slavery in their homes, at the dinner tables . . . confident that blacks were too unintelligent to understand the conversation of whites" (991).

10. If the slave trade connected the Anglo-Hispanic world in Kingston, the city also served as a strategic location for the wars of Spanish American Independence because of its geographical proximity to Venezuela, and its financial, political, and military connections to London. In 1806, when Francisco de Miranda had tried to invade Venezuela while the British attempted to take Buenos Aires, Kingston was a purveyor of supplies, and perhaps more importantly, the communications hub for news about Miranda's operations. London papers relied on their Kingston counterparts to report what was happening in South America and the Caribbean. A report from *The Times* is typical: "The Jamaican papers state, that Miranda's squadron touched at Jacmel of the 10th of April and sailed again on the 6th for Caraccas, joined by the Echo Schooner at Jamaica. The avowed object of the expedition (says the royal Gazett) is to revolutionize the south american Colonyes [sic]" (Miranda 23: 157).[8] When Bolívar arrived in Kingston after the disastrous loss of Cartagena to the Spanish at the end of 1814, the Latin America-Kingston-London news circuit was thus well established.

11. From Kingston Bolívar launched a public relations campaign to raise British support for more money and troops, directing his efforts towards individuals and the press. On May 1815, Bolívar wrote to Sir Richard Wellesley, who had been an Ambassador to the Central Junta in Spain in 1809 and Secretary of Foreign Affairs until 1812: "Me he salido a dar la alarma al mundo, a implorar auxilios, a anunciar a la Gran Bretaña y a la humanidad toda, que una parte de su especie va a fenecer, y que la más bella mitad de la tierra será desolada" ["I have come to sound the alarm, to ask for assistance, to tell Great Britain and the world that part of its species will die, and that the most beautiful half of the earth will be desolate"] ("A Sir Ricardo"). He also wrote to the Duke of Manchester, who was then Governor of Jamaica. Besides those in governmental positions, Bolívar had contacts among the merchant class in Jamaica, which is not surprising given the fact that Kingston and South America carried on trade in defiance of prohibitions from the Spanish Crown. Maxwell Hyslop, who acted as an agent for plantation proprietors, is one of the persons to whom Bolívar wrote for money.[9] "Suplico a Ud. que se sirva suministrar el dinero que Ud pueda . . . en la inteligencia de que, en llegando a Cartagena, le pagaré a Ud. la suma total" ["I humbly ask that you provide whatever money you can . . . with the knowledge that I will pay you the total sum upon my arrival in Cartagena"] ("Al Señor Don Maxwell").

12. Besides contacting government figures and merchants, Bolívar also wrote pieces for the *Jamaica Gazette*, which were reprinted in the Times; these were calculated to appease and appeal to a British audience. He had a difficult task ahead. On the one hand, the British were elated and exhausted after Wellington's triumph over Napoleon at Waterloo; the benefits of British intervention in South America would not seem as urgent to Britain after the Napoleonic menace had been removed. In a letter to the *Royal Gazette*'s Editor published on September 23, 1815, Bolívar explains his view of "internal differences" between Royalists and those in the Independence army. The letter's temporal proximity to the better known Jamaica Letter shows Bolívar's struggle to rewrite the rationale for British participation and intervention in Latin America. He places Latin America in a historical continuum,

beginning with Athens and concluding with "the United States of North America": "What free nation, ancient or modern, is there, which has not suffered by disunion? Can there be a history more turbulent than that of Athens? . . . Civil wars, more violent than those of England? Dissensions, more dangerous than those in North America?" ("To the Editor"). Bolívar sees the internecine struggles in Latin America as a "thermometer of liberty," and not as a symptom of an instability that threatens to give victory to the Spanish, which is the concern of his detractors. He also notes that the United States had "a foreign Power" support its bid for independence, whereas "we were abandoned by the whole world" ("To The Editor"). His disappointment after months of lobbying is palpable: "We have no other weapons to resist our enemies but our arms, our breasts, our horses, and our pikes. The weak require to struggle long, in order to conquer. The strong give, as at Waterloo, one battle, and an Empire disappears!" (Bolivar "To the Editor"). Yet Bolívar ends with a brave front despite these reverses, acknowledging the desperate situation in which "The South-Americans" find themselves, "a despair which has almost always led to victory" ("To the Editor").

III. The "Jamaica Letter"

13. If the "Letter to the Editor of the *Royal Gazette*" presents a defiant Bolívar struggling to write Latin America into the narrative of world and British history, the "Jamaica Letter," written around the same time (September 6, 1815), shows a Bolívar who confidently draws upon authors such as Alexander Von Humboldt, William Robertson, Abbé Raynal, Montesquieu, and Blanco White to seek the "auspicios de una nación liberal que nos preste su protección" ["auspices of a liberal nation that would lend us its protection"] ("Carta" 84). While other scholars have focused on the letter's relationship to Enlightenment thought, I focus on Bolívar's doubling strategies within the letter given his consciousness of a transatlantic audience, and that the perception of his persona in London was crucial to the success of the Wars of Independence. [10] The letter's double life in Spanish and English creates a mirroring effect between Latin America and Britain in order to cement a textual alliance. Bolívar also uses the discourses of slavery and empire to deflect another "doubling" that he is at pains to conceal from his British audience: the actions of Afro-Venezuelans who, like the Independence army, fight against their criollo masters to get the freedom the latter are demanding from Spain. This was a special concern to the British, who were in the midst of abolitionist campaigns, and for Bolívar's financiers in Kingston and London, whose profits from slavery would be jeopardized if enslaved Afro-Jamaicans took up arms like their Venezuelan counterparts.[11]

14. The letter's composition in two languages is extraordinary—its historical equivalent would be a 1776 translation of the Declaration of Independence into Spanish for circulation in Florida, New Orleans, and Latin America. After Bolívar wrote the letter in Spanish, General John Robertson, an Anglo-Canadian officer in the British Army who had served as secretary of the governor of Curazao, drafted the English translation, and Bolívar then corrected it, marking his corrections on the English manuscript in French (Grases 706).[12] Yet the Declaration, as an official, public, statement carries with it the weight of the letter of the law. By contrast, a letter is dialogical in nature and depends on the addressee to complete its signification. As Lacan concludes with regards to Poe's purloined letter: "the sender . . . receives from the receiver his own message in reverse form" (52-3). The letter's signification points to several reversals. First there is the reversal of language in Bolívar's answer. Bolívar assumes the rhetorical stance of answering questions that he receives from Henry Cullen, and although Cullen's letter is presumably in English, Bolívar answers in Spanish. The second reversal is the Jamaica Letter's translation from Spanish to English; Bolívar reverses his own text by authorizing Robertson's translation into English.

15. The mirroring of English and Spanish in the letter stands for a complex rewriting of Anglo-Hispanic historiography, in which Spanish Americans emerge as accomplices of Britain, rather than as their traditional antagonists. In his *Days of Obligation: An Argument With My Mexican Father*, Richard

Rodríguez, the renowned Latino essayist, suggests that the emblematic episode of Anglo-Hispanic history is the sinking of the Spanish Armada. He summons this cultural icon as paradigmatic of Latino-Anglo American relations:

> According to the *Dallas Morning News*, a gang of "Anglos" and a gang of Hispanics shed real blood in a nonfictional cafeteria, in imitation of a sixteenth century sea battle the students have never heard of. Who could have guessed that a European rivalry would play itself out several hundred years after Philip's Armada was sunk by Elizabeth's navie? And here? Yet Americans comically (because unknowingly) assume proxy roles within a centuries-old quarrel of tongues. (110)

16. While Rodríguez is right to point out that the narrative of imperial Spain and its rival England frames the Latino and Anglo students fighting in a cafeteria à la West Side Story, he overlooks how translation —mirroring rather than confrontation—was one of the strategies Latin Americans used to resist Spain's imperial narrative and author their own. Like other translations that invert colonial relations—for example, Richard Madden's translation of the autobiography of Cuban slave Juan Manzano—the "Jamaica Letter" problematizes the assumption that European rivalries replay themselves obsessively in the theatre of the Americas.

17. Rather than recapitulating the bitter history of England and Spain, Bolívar presents himself as Cullen's ally by quoting and answering Cullen's questions on the character of the "New World." Indeed, Cullen's letter serves to organize Bolívar's exposition. Bolívar assumes the role of the addressee returning the sender's message in "reverse form"; the message that Bolívar returns is a narrative of empire and oppression. Prompted by Cullen, who writes, "For the last three centuries, the Spanish have been committing barbarities in Columbus' hemisphere" (56), Bolívar invokes Las Casas, who "denunció ante su gobierno y contemporáneos los actos más horrorosos de un frenesí sanguinario" ["denounced before his government and contemporaries the most horrendous acts of a bloodthirsty frenzy"] (56). The bloodthirstiness of the Spanish is "insaciable" (58), and the implied cannibalism and/or vampirism of the Spanish transposes the valuation of the European as "civilized" and the Native as "savage." As Tzvetan Tódorov has observed, Las Casas is the first European to make this transvaluation. Las Casas "show[s] the relativity of the notion of 'barbarism' . . . each of us is the other's barbarian" (190).

18. Las Casas's denunciation of abuse and torture against Native Americans becomes the basis of the case against Spain, and this seems to be the accepted reason as to why Bolívar chooses him to open his case to the British. [13] Antonio Benítez Rojo has noted that "las ideas de Las Casas cobraron particular importancia en las primeras décadas del siglo XIX, cuando la gran mayoría de las colonias españolas de América se rebelaba para conseguir la independencia" ["Las Casas's ideas became particularly important during the first decades of the nineteenth century, when the great majority of American colonies rebelled to obtain their independence"] (112). When read in a transatlantic context, however, Bolívar's billing of himself as a second Las Casas raises important questions about the contradictions regarding slavery at the heart of the independence movement, and the way in which Bolívar wants to control how the British public read reports of his revolution, one that, for all its rhetoric against slavery, will not result in the actual liberation of slaves, and in fact conceals actual slave uprisings against Bolívar and the Independence army. While Bolívar writes from Kingston, slaves in Venezuela and Latin America have not been liberated, and Britain—still profiting from slavery—is providing financing for the Wars of Independence. Invoking the comparison to Las Casas allows Bolívar to communicate to his British audience that he vehemently opposes Spain without having to declare a position on slavery.

19. This double signification is possible because of Las Casas's contested status in Britain as an icon for abolitionists. Thomas Clarkson opens his Essay on the Slavery and Commerce of the Human Species

narrating Las Casas's activities against slavery; Clarkson places his work in relation to that of "the pious Bishop of Chiapa" (Preface). In the midst of the brutal scene of the conquest, he is the man to "make a publick remonstrance before the celebrated emperor Charles the fifth, declaring, that heaven would one day call him to an account of those cruelties which he then had it in his power to prevent" (Preface). The abolitionists' identification with him partially explains Las Casas's deus ex machina role in Williams's Peru, where he appears as "the pitying angel" who opposes the priest Valverde's cruelty and brutality (3.97). In *The West Indies*, which James Montgomery wrote to commemorate the abolition of the slave trade in 1808, he calls Wilberforce "The new Las Casas of a ruin'd race" (4.136); Las Casas "raised his voice against a sea of blood / Whose chilling waves recoiled while he foretold / His country's ruin by avenging gold" (1.120-2). At the same time, abolitionists fiercely defend him against the charge that William Robertson imputes in his *History of America*: "While [Las Casas] contended earnestly for the liberty of the people born in one quarter of the globe, he laboured to enslave the inhabitants of another region; and in the warmth of his zeal to save the Americans from the yoke, pronounced it to be lawful and expedient to impose one heavier still upon the Africans" (Robertson 1:319).

20. Robertson is not being entirely fair to Las Casas, though. In the early period of the conquest Las Casas did recommend that "if necessary, white and black slaves can be brought from Castille to keep herds and build sugar mills, and wash gold" and suggested that each Spanish migrant should be allowed to take 20 black slaves (qtd. in Traboulay 50). Todorov points out that "Las Casas did not have the same attitude towards Indians and Blacks: he consents that the latter, and not the former, be reduced to slavery. We must remember that the enslavement of blacks is an acknowledged phenomenon at the time, whereas that of the Indians is beginning before his eyes" (170). Las Casas's attitude changes from 1516 to 1546, for as Traboulay puts it, "The matter of providing Black slaves took a different turn than Las Casas had intended. The contract to provide 4,000 slaves was given to one of King Charles' friends, Governor Bresa, who then sold the license to Genoese merchants" (52). In other words, the Las Casas of 1514 sees the ramifications of Native American slavery but cannot foresee the enslaving of Africans becoming as systematized, inhumane, and genocidal as what he is witnessing in the New World. By 1546, the trade and exploitation of enslaved Africans leads him to write, "He [Las Casas] always considered the Blacks as unjustly and tyranically reduced to slavery, for the same reasons applied to them and to the Indians" (qtd. in Todorov 170).

21. Peter Blanchard has attributed "the origins of the language of the independence era" to the Enlightenment and notes that the "particular analogy [of] slavery" creeps into the language of "those fighting for freedom" (500). Yet slavery as a metaphor for the condition of Latin Americans in the Jamaica Letter is a result of Bolívar's unstated but analogous relationship to Las Casas, and his knowledge of the British abolitionist debate. While Bolívar has to gain support for his cause, he cannot afford to alienate those of his supporters who are profiting from slavery, which included the Baring family and banking house (Williams 171). Bolívar describes the colonial relationship between Spain and the Americas as a relationship between an abusive master and his slave. Speaking to Cullen of Spain's attempt to suppress the Independence army, he writes "Ya hemos sido libres y nuestros enemigos pretenden de nuevo esclavizarnos" ["We have been free, and our enemies pretend to enslave us again"] ("Carta" 63). Under Spanish rule, Latin Americans have lived "en un grado más bajo de la servidumbre, y por lo mismo con más dificultad para elevarnos al goce de la libertad" ["in a state lower than servitude, and because of this, with greater difficulty to lift ourselves to the enjoyment of liberty"] ("Carta" 70). Following Montesquieu, he speculates that it is harder for "naciones esclavas" ["enslaved nations"] to become free than it is to "subyugar un[a] libre" ["to subdue a free one"] ("Carta" 76). The metaphor is calculated to engender pathos: the degradation that accompanies slavery highlights the righteousness of the patriots' cause, since no free man would ever want to be enslaved. Resistance against the Spanish is fierce because men "han perecido por no ser esclavos" ["have died so as not to be slaves"] (Carta 58). But the metaphor also points to Bolívar's attitudes towards slavery. To

Bolívar and his audience, enslavement is the most degraded state of being, and renders it "difficult to enjoy liberty." One can see how this argument could be used by both abolitionists and planters.

22. When Bolívar actually refers to slavery, he imagines slaves as incapable of becoming free in the sense that would be acceptable to a European audience, "la [libertad] que se alcanza infaliblemente, en la sociedades civiles, cuando ellas están fundadas sobre las bases de la justicia, la libertad y la igualdad" ["the [freedom] reached infallibly in civil societies, when they are founded on the basis of justice, liberty, and equality"] ("Carta" 76). Surveying the likelihood of success for the independence army, Bolívar paints the geography of the continent from Mexico to Peru. The only country where he doubts independence can be achieved is Peru because it "encierra dos enemigos de todo régimen justo y liberal: oro y esclavos. El primero lo corrompe todo; el segundo está corrompido por si mismo" ["[Peru] encloses two enemies of any just and liberal government: gold and slaves. The first corrupts everything; the second corrupts himself"] ("Carta" 80). The self-corrupting slave "rara vez alcanza a apreciar la sana libertad: se enfurece en los tumultos o se enfurece en las cadenas" ["rarely appreciates healthy liberty: he rages in revolt or rages in chains"] ("Carta" 81). Bolívar's claim that slaves are incapable of "appreciat[ing] healthy liberty" echoes Coleridge's pronouncement that slaves were "unprepared for freedom" (Richardson 11). It also anticipates the resistance of planters just before the abolition of slavery in 1834, captured in Mrs. Carmichael's *Domestic Manners and Social Condition of the White, Coloured, and Negro Population of the West Indies*. Intended as evidence for Parliament and an apologia for planters, she writes from her experience as a planter's wife: "I could enumerate numerous facts, all tending to prove that many negroes are utterly unfit for rights of civilized men" (2: 198).

23. Bolivar's insistence on the inability of enslaved persons to translate their "rage" into action culminates in a portrait of the contented slave, which Bolívar offers in another letter he writes to the *Royal Gazette* of Jamaica:

> El esclavo en la América española vegeta abandonado en las haciendas, gozando, por decirlo así, de su inacción, de la hacienda de su señor, y de una gran parte de los bienes de la libertad; y como la religión le ha persuadido que es un deber sagrado servir, ha nacido y existido en esta dependencia doméstica, se considera en su estado natural, como un miembro de la familia de su amo, a quien ama y respeta.
>
> [The slave in Spanish America loafs abandoned in the plantations, enjoying, as it were, his inaction, his master's grounds, and a greater part of the fruits of liberty; and because religion has persuaded him that service is a sacred duty, because he is born and raised in this domestic dependence, he considers himself, in his natural state, as a member of the family of his master, whom he loves and respects.] ("Carta al Editor" 87)

24. The rhetoric of Kingston's planters has found its way into Bolívar's prose here, for after all, British slaves, like those in Spanish America, were also treated as "members of the family of his master." The idleness of slaves in the midst of abundance is a favorite theme of Mrs. Carmichael's, who informs her readers that "The slave may be perfectly idle, and yet he is supported. The British labourer strains every nerve to live. The slave is provided for without anxiety on his part" (1:180) and that "Indeed one had only to walk about the states in the vicinity of Kingstown . . . and see how cheerful the slaves were, to be convinced that the idea of slavery as bondage, was the last thought that ever entered their minds" (1: 244). But Bolívar knew this portrait did not correspond to reality any more than those painted by the Kingston planters. Manuel Piar, one of his generals, was a mulatto who "proclaimed to the inhabitants of Margarita Island in 1814 that to him 'death was more worthy than slavery'" (qtd. in Blanchard 501).[14] While Piar fought for the Independence army, there were enslaved Venezuelans who chose to throw in their lot with the Royalists, a far cry from the filial fantasy the Bolívar depicted

in the pages of the *Royal Gazette*. [15]

IV. Puy and Pío

25. Puy and Pío are two Afro-Venezuelans whose opposition to Bolívar and the independence army have earned them the excoriation of Bolivarian scholars for almost two hundred years; yet what has not been sufficiently considered in Bolivarian historiography is the fact that they were enslaved men siding with the Royalists in the hope of earning their freedom, and, given the uprisings throughout the Caribbean, freedom for slaves at large. As Blanchard records, the Spanish crown offered slaves their freedom if they sided with the Royalist army, an action which is reminiscent of British strategy in the American Revolution; the Independence army had to make accommodations if it was not to lose the large number of men to the Crown: "Needing soldiers for their armies and trying to prevent slaves from supporting the royalist cause, revolutionary leaders in all parts of the continent granted slaves the freedom that they wanted" (Blanchard 501). But the delay in granting slaves their freedom cost the revolutionaries troops. Bolívar did not grant freedom to slaves serving in his army until 1816; prior to that, Miranda had done so in 1812, and the war had been going on for two years by then. José Ramos Guédez notes that Miranda's "measure did not consolidate the Independence army's efforts to destroy the Spanish forces that in a short time frustrated the republican cause. Furthermore, many slaves obtained their liberty by fighting for both sides, or by fleeing their place of work to maroon communities, where they obtained protection and food" (125).[16]

26. The *New Monthly* "Sketch" features Puy, a recruiter and commander for the Spanish, though it is silent on Pío, who in fact tried to kill Bolívar while they were in Kingston in 1815: "The execrable Puy, who was far more bloodthirsty than any of his comrades" goes to "organize their [the slaves'] irregular bands" accompanied by "Palomo, a negro, who was a notorious thief and a murderer" ("Sketch" 8). After Puy assumed command of this "irregular band" and they entered Barinas, he had five hundred inhabitants executed "fearing that its inhabitants would rise en masse against him" (8). The "Sketch" continues: "Exasperated by the infamous conduct of his adversaries, Bolivar assumed a character totally foreign to his generous principles and habits, and ordered eight hundred Royalists to be shot" (8). The organized slaves are presented as "irregular" in contrast with a well-organized army, and of course "bloodthirsty"—as "bloodthirsty" as the Spanish whom Las Casas denounced. In writing about Haiti, Bryan Edwards, as Alan Richardson indicates, "depicts massacres of white colonists in racist and blood-curdling terms: 'Upwards of one hundred thousand savage people, habituated to the barbarities of Africa, avail themselves of the silence and obscurity of the night, and fall upon the peaceful and unsuspecting planters, like so many famished tygers thirsting for human blood'" (11). The *New Monthly* writer clearly evokes "the Spectre of Domingo" and Toussaint's revolt in his description of Puy, a connection clarified in José Blanco White's version of the "Sketch." We learn in the Spanish version that Puy is "uno de los gefes negros" ["one of the Black chiefs"]; Blanco also suspects the Spanish of starting "la violencia de una guerra civil" ["the violence of a civil war"] by arming slaves (5). Bolívar's extreme response was not only a lesson to Spain, but sent a clear message to Puy and his men, and any slave who would join the Royalists or try to rise up against the independence cause. As late as 1828 "Bolívar was indifferent to the fate of those enslaved . . . it must have stemmed from his fear of a 'race' or 'color' war, which had developed in Haiti and other Caribbean islands" (Ramos Guédez 14). That the English article does not contain Puy's status as a "Black chief" again shows to what lengths Bolívar's image, and by extension, Latin America's, is being manipulated across the Atlantic.

27. Pío, the Afro-Venezuelan who tried to kill Bolívar, is absent from the *New Monthly* and *Variedades* biographies of Bolívar altogether, even though the trial had been reported in the *Royal Gazette* during December 1815. Pío was Bolívar's slave and traveled with him to Jamaica. Not surprisingly, there are two versions of the story as to why Pío tried to kill his master, but instead killed Felix Amestoy, a friend of the general's whom he mistook for Bolívar. The first story is the one the *Royal Gazette*

reports. The coroner's inquest determined "That the deceased came to his death of a wound, supposed to be received from a negro man named Peo, the property of General S. Bolivar, with a sharp pointed knife, which entered his left side . . . and which wound was a cause of his death" ("A Coroner's"). The statement taken says that "The negro was offered two thousand dollars by some Spaniards" and "agreeably to his murderous contract" accepted the money ("A Coroner's"). Pío was sent to Kingston's Slave-Court, where he was identified again as "the property of Simon Bolívar, Esq." According to witnesses Felix Amestoy had arrived the night Bolívar was to be murdered, and was lying in the General's hammock when a black man came in and stabbed him. Antonio Paez, Bolívar's aide de camp, heard Amestoy exclaim "Paez, Paez, this negro is murdering me" ("A Special"). Bernardo Castillo, another witness who heard Amestoy, tried to get out "but could not, as his servant had locked his room" ("A Special"). This detail shows that Pio could not have been acting on his own; however, he alone was convicted for the murder: "The Court then pronounced the sentence of death" and called for "his head to be afterwards severed from his body, stuck on a pole, and Placed in Spring-Path" ("A Special").

28. Daniel O'Leary, who became Bolívar's aide de camp after 1817, gives a very different account, which he presumably heard from Bolívar himself:

> In Kingston, Jamaica, an Italian Jew corrupted the fidelity of Pito [Pío], the servant of Paez, his ADC, and who had formerly been his own slave and received his freedom from him (B). This boy had for some time meditated his infernal design. His first intention was to execute it by means of poison. In this he was providentially frustrated every time he made the attempt by some unforeseen accident. Finally he resolved at the instigation of his employer to stab the general. (38)

In this later version of the story, Bolívar denies his ownership of Pío, a denial that is in line with Bolívar's public familial vision of slaves' lives. A contented slave would not have reason to try to murder his or her master; and Bolívar clearly wants it known that he was a good master, one who his slaves would not want to murder. The second notable alteration is the person who pays Pío for the murder: from two Spaniards to "an Italian Jew." Why would an Italian Jew have any reason to have Bolívar killed? The outrageousness of the suggestion signals, as Stephen Greenblat argues, "power, whose quintessential sign is the ability to impose one's fictions on the world: the more outrageous the fiction, the more impressive the manifestation of power" (13). The effect is to isolate Pío from the historical context of slaves who like Puy and himself, thought that the Spanish offered better chances of liberty than Bolívar. He adds a touch of the gothic through the detail of the poison, which was a terror of whites wherever they had slaves. Monk Lewis gives a detailed account on "the deadliest poisons used by the negroes" (207), and whites connected Obeah with poisoning. Robert Dunbar, a British Creole poet in Kingston, records "I myself was present at the trial of three Negroes for Obeah. An Obeah-man and two accomplices were clearly convicted of a design to administer poisonous drugs to a lady of the island" (129). Fears of Obeah and poisoning were connected to the larger fear of a slave revolution (Richardson 10-9), which I would suggest explains the alteration of the story to incorporate poison. As late 1828, Afro-Venezuelans were taking up arms against their masters; though it was a "free" republic, slavery was not abolished until 1830 (Ramos Guédez 14).

29. The two versions of Pío and Puy's stories betray the anxiety of Europeans and white Creoles following Bolívar's career. If freedom is the ultimate goal of Latin Americans, what is to stop the fire of revolution from spreading to Jamaica and the other British possessions in the Caribbean? What is to stop the reversal of master and slave? Bolívar employs rhetorical, affective, and political comparisons between enslaved Spanish Americans and actual slaves in Kingston and throughout the American hemisphere to give his argument urgency. Yet his transatlantic doublings as a new Las Casas, as a general who never crossed swords with a "Black chief," and as the victim of the perfidy of an ungrateful former slave allow him to separate any connection between rising against this metaphorical

enslavement and Afrocaribbeans taking up arms, and to emerge as the Bolívar that a British audience could embrace. His crossings of the Atlantic and then the South American continent—from Venezuela to Perú, Bolivia and back over the Andes on horseback— were truly Napoleonic in scope, and earned him an admirer in Byron, who immortalized Bolívar in what has to be one of the most remarkable rhymes of the English language. In the "Age of Bronze," Byron links his sympathies with the Greek struggle to the American one: "On Andes' and on Athos' peaks unfurled, / The self-same standard streams o'er either world: / The Spartan knows himself once more a Greek, / Young Freedom plumes the crest of each cacique" ("Age of Bronze" l. 275-279).[17] The transatlantic imaginary that connects Latin America, Kingston, and London reveals that on the path to those peaks of freedom, one might find displayed on a pike the head of a slave who also wanted to climb them.

Notes

[1] Translations in English are mine.

[2] The intense involvement of the British in Latin American independence is reflected in George Canning's statement regarding the event: "The deed is done, the nail is driven, Spanish America is free; and if we do not mismanage our affairs sadly, she is *English*" (Galeano 173).

[3] The available critical concepts illuminate different aspects of the Americas-Africa-Europe triad, but are mostly predicated on an Anglo-American outlook. Concepts like Paul Gilroy's "Black Atlantic," focuses on the Anglophone African diaspora; Joseph Roach's circum-atlantic gestures towards Latin America, but does not engage it; the "transatlantic" implies the U.S. and Britain or Europe; Srinivas Aravamudan's "tropicopolitan" gestures to the Francophone world, but conflates Asia and the Americas; Mary Louise Pratt's "transculturation" is a more inclusive term, but one that neglects the AfroCaribbean or Afroamerican experience in relation to the Hispanophone world. Most recently, Kaplan and Gerassi-Navarro note that "the Spanish empire and early Spanish American republics have not figured as centrally into these new transnational figurations" (2).

[4] For a more recent assessment of Humboldt and Romanticism, see Leask 243-97.

[5] For a complete catalogue of Ackermann's publications in Latin America, see Roldán Vera 239-59; for commentary on Mora's *Meditaciones Poéticas*, see Essick and Pailey 38-9.

[6] Francisco de Miranda, the general, diplomat, and ceaseless agitator for the Latin American cause, preceded Bolívar in London, and laid the groundwork for the latter's dealings with Britain. Miranda had fought as a general in the French Revolution, and upon Napoleon's expulsion of him from France, he sought asylum in London, where he began a campaign for British support of Latin American independence, including audiences with William Pitt, and William Wilberforce. For a discussion of the activities of Miranda and other Latin Americans in Britain, see Casa de Bello, vol. 1 and 2; Almeida 197-209; Racine 141-208. For a recent fictional treatment of Miranda's life, see Duncker, where Miranda figures as the stepfather of James Miranda Barry, a woman who passed as a man for over fifty years so she could study medicine.

[7] The London-Kingston-Latin America connection is dramatized in Robert Dunbar's *The Caraguin*, a Caribbean epic published in 1839. *The Caraguin* chronicles the failed love affair between Amy, a British planter's daughter, and Guzman, a Venezuelan revolutionary.

[8] Other papers carried similar bulletins. On July 6, 1806, *The Morning Herald* reported "A Jamaica mail arrived yesterday, and has brought us later and more authentic intelligence relative to Miranda's expedition

than any we have yet received." On July 7, the *Times* continues "The arrival of the Jamaica Mail puts it beyond all doubt that Gen Miranda effected a landing on the Spanish Main about the end of April." See Miranda 23: 165-7.

[9] Robert Madden identifies Hyslop in his narrative *Twelve Months in the West Indies*: "My friend, Mr. Hyslop, agent of the legatee, one of the most respectable men in the islands, furnished me with these particulars" (165). Absentee planters regularly hired agents to represent their interests in Kingston while they lived in London and lobbied Parliament. See Dunn 200-217.

[10] Pons gives an excellent analysis of how Burkean thought finds its way into Bolívar's writing via Blanco White. See Pons 507-529.

[11] Galeano explains how Britain's financial world was dependent on slavery In the early nineteenth century "an Englishman could live on £6 a year; Liverpool slave merchants garnered more than £1.1 million a year in the Caribbean alone . . . An economist described the slave trade as 'basic and fundamental principle of all the rest, like the mainspring of the machine which sets every cogwheel in motion.' Banks proliferated in Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, London, and Glasgow; Lloyds piled up profits insuring slaves, ships and plantations" (81).

[12] Grases notes that no original manuscript for the Spanish has been found (706).

[13] "Las Casas's writings criticizing the Spanish colonists were used by Spain's enemies as propaganda in the sixteenth-century conflicts between Protestant England and Catholic Spain. . . . These editions carried the message of Spain's cruelty throughout Europe. The Spanish conquest, not Las Casas' struggle for justice, was emphasized in these editions. Conquest, not the struggle for justice, came to define the Spanish legacy in America, at least for the English-speaking world" (Traboulay 187).

[14] See Quintero for an analysis on race relations in Bolívar's army; she notes that Bolívar had Piar executed because he allegedly was advocating a race war.

[15] For a discussion how Bolívar constructs the "family narrative" in terms of gender in the 'Jamaica Letter,' see Davies 5-19.

[16] Ramos Guédez's original reads "Tal medida no logra consolidar los esfuerzos de los independentistas por destruir a las fuerzas españolas que en poco tiempo frustran los dos primeros intentos de organización republicana. Además, en el transcurso de la guerra, muchos esclavos logran su libertad al participar como soldados en los distintos bandos en conflicto y en otras circunstancias, cuando huyen de sus sitios de trabajo y se trasladan a las comunidades integradas por negros cimarrones, en las cuales consiguen tanto protección como alimento."

Works Cited

"A Coroner's Inquest." *Royal Gazette* Dec 9-16. 1815.

"A Special Slave Court." *Royal Gazette* Dec 16-23. 1815.

Almeida, Joselyn. "Romanticism and Non-Fictional Prose, 1780-1850." *Nonfictional Romantic Prose: Expanding Borders. Eds. Steven Sondrup and Virgil Nemoianu*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004.

Aguirre, Robert D. *Informal Empire: Mexico and Central America in Victorian Culture*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press, 2005.

Aravamudan, Srinivas. *Tropicopolitans: Colonialism and Agency, 1688-1804*. North Carolina: Duke UP 1999.

Archivo del Libertador en La Red. 14 Apr. 2005. U de Los Andes, Dept. of History. Apr. 21 2005.

Bakhtin. *The Dialogic Imagination*. *Ed. Michael Holquist*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.

Bello y Londres: Segundo Congreso del Bicentenario. Fundación La Casa de Bello. 2 vols. Caracas: Venezuela, 1980-81.

Blanco White, Jose. "Noticia biográfica de Don Simón Bolívar." *Variedades* Jan. 1823: 1-12.

Blanchard, Peter. "The Language of Liberation: Slave Voices in the Wars of Independence." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 82.3 (2002): 499-523.

Benítez Rojo, Antonio. *La isla que se repite: el Caribe y la perspectiva postmoderna*. Barcelona: Casiopea, 1992.

Bolívar, Simón. "Carta de Jamaica (1815)." Soriano 61-84.

---. "A Sir Ricardo Wellesley." *Archivo del Libertador en La Red*, 117.

---. "Al Señor Don Maxwell Hyslop." *Archivo del Libertador en La Red*, 134.

---. "Carta al editor de la Caceta Real de Jamaica." Soriano 85-90.

---. "To the Editor of the Royal Gazette." *Royal Gazette* 23 Sept. 1815.

Burnard, Trevor. "'A Matron in Rank, a Prostitute in Manners. . .': The Manning Divorce of 1741 and Class, Race, Gender, and the Law in Eighteenth-Century Jamaica." *Working Slavery, Pricing Freedom*. Ed. Verene Shepherd. London: Palgrave, 2002.

Byron, Lord. "The Age of Bronze." *Literature On Line*. Apr. 2005. O'Neill Library, Boston College. Jan 2003.

Carmichael, Mrs. *Domestic Manners and Social Condition of the White, Coloured, and Negro Population of the West Indies*. New York: Negro University Press, 1969.

Clarkson, Thomas. Preface. *An Essay on the Slavery and Commerce of the Human Species*. London, 1788.

Davies, Catherine. "Colonial Dependence and Sexual Difference: Reading for Gender in the Writings of Simón Bolívar." *Feminist Review* 79 (2005): 5-18.

Duncker, Patricia. *The Doctor: a Novel*. 1st US edition. New York: Ecco Press, 1999. Rpt. of *James Miranda Barry*. London: Serpent's Tale, 1999.

Dunbar, Robert. *The Caraguin: A Tale of the Antilles*. London: John Macrone, 1837.

Dunn, Richard. *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713*. North

Carolina: U of North Carolina P, 2000.

Equiano, Olaudah. *The Interesting Narrative and Other Writings*. 1789. Ed. Vincent Carreta. London: Penguin Books, 1995.

Essick, Robert and Morton Pailey. *Robert Blair's* The Grave *Illustrated By William Blake: a Study with Facsimile*. London: Scolar Press, 1982.

Galeano, Eduardo. *Open Veins of Latin America*. New York, Monthly Review Press, 1997.

Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Grases, Pedro. "Simón Bolívar" *Diccionario de Historia de Venezuela*. Caracas: Fundación Polar, 1997.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.

Gruesz, Kirsten Silva. *Ambassadors of Culture*: *The Transamerican Origins of Latino Writing*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Kaplan, Amy and Nina Gerassi-Navarro. "Between Empires: Frances Calderón de La Barca's Life in Mexico." *Symbiosis* 9 (2005): 3-27.

Keach, William. "A Transatlantic Romantic Century". *European Romantic Review* 11 (2000): 31-5.

Lacan, Jacques. "Seminar on the Purloined Letter." *The Purloined Poe*. Eds. John P. Muller and William J. Richardson. Baltimore: John's Hopkins UP, 1988.

Leask, Nigel. *Curiosity and the Aesthetics of Travel Writing*, *1770-1840*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004.

Lee, Debbie. *Slavery and the Romantic Imagination*. Pennsylvania: U of Pennsylvania P, 2002.

Lewis, Monk. *Journal of a West India Proprietor*. Ed. Judith Terry. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.

Linebaugh, Peter and Marcus Rediker. *The Many Headed Hydra*. Boston: Beacon P, 2000.

Ramos Guédez, José. "Simón Bolívar y la abolición de la esclavitud en Venezuela, 1810-1830." *Revista de Historia de América* 125 (1999): 7-19.

Mathurin-Mair, Lucille. "Women Field Workers in Jamaica During Slavery." *Caribbean Slavery in the Atlantic World*. Ed. Verene Shepherd and Hilary Beckles. Princeton: Markus Wiener, 2000.

Mill, James, "Emancipation of Spanish America." *Edinburgh Review* 26 (1809): 277-311.

Miranda, Francisco. *Archivo del General Miranda*. 24 vols. Caracas: Editorial Sur América, 1929-1950.

Montgomery, James. "The West Indies." *The Poetical Works of James Montgomery*. Vol 1. London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1841.

Nugent, Lady Maria. *Lady Nugent's Journal*. Ed. Philip Wright. Kingston: Institute of Jamaica, 1966.

Pons, André. "Bolívar y Blanco White." *Anuario de Estudios Americanos* 55 (1998): 507-529.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Quintero, Inés. "Fue la Independencia una revolución social?" *Biblioteca Electrónica: Caracas, Venezuela*. 14 Apr. 2005. Ed. Roberto Hernández Montoya. 21 Apr. 2005.

Racine, Karen. *Francisco de Miranda: A Transatlantic Life in the Age of Revolution*. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 2003.

Richardson, Alan. "Romantic Voodoo: Obeah and British Culture." *Studies in Romanticism* 32 (1993): 3-28.

Robertson, William. *The History of America*. London: 1777.

Rodriguez, Richard. *Days of Obligation: An Argument with My Mexican Father.* New York: Penguin, 1993.

Roldán Vera, Eugenia. *The British Book Trade and South America*. London: Ashgate, 2003.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

"Sketch of the Political Career of Simon Bolivar, President of the Republic of Colombia." *New Monthly Magazine* Jan-Jun 1823: 4-16.

Soriano, Gabriela. *Simón Bolívar: Escritos políticos*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1990.

Sweet, Nanora. "Hitherto Closed to British Enterprise: Trading and Writing the Hispanic World Circa 1815." *European Romantic Review* 8 (1997): 193-147.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Conquest of America*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: HarperPerennial, 1992.

Traboulay, David. *Columbus and Las Casas*. Lanham: UP of America, 1994.

Williams, Eric. *Capitalism and Slavery.* Ed. D.W. Brogan. Worcester: Billing and Sons, 1990.

Williams, Helen Maria. "Peru." *Poems 1786*. Ed. Jonathan Wordsworth. Oxford: OUP, 1994.

Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism

Children Playing by the Sea: the Dynamics of Appropriation in the Brazilian Romantic Novel

André Cardoso, New York University

1. The Brazilian novel is born in the early 1840s as a response for the demands of a reading public formed by an incipient bourgeoisie that, although limited (only 14.8% of the Brazilian population was literate by 1890, and this number was probably even lower by the middle of the century [Carvalho 65]), avidly consumed European novels either in the original—brought by the ships that docked in the harbor of Rio de Janeiro after their periodic trips across the Atlantic—or in translations sold by the budding publishing houses in the capital or published by newspapers in the form of *feuilletons* (Cândido 119-22). Novels available in the country ranged from eighteenth-century sentimental novels, such as Saint-Pierre's *Paul et Virginie* and Isabelle de Montolieu's *Caroline de Lichtfield*, to the latest productions by Balzac.[1] As it searched for its own form, the early Brazilian novel had to establish itself in relation to the novelistic corpus circulating in the country at the time. How did it navigate this sea of foreign models? And more importantly, how did it imagine its position in this broader transatlantic literary culture?

2. Joaquim Manuel de Macedo's *A Moreninha* represents a privileged entryway to a discussion of the formation of the novel in Brazil. Published in 1844, it is one of the first Brazilian novels, but, more interestingly, it can show how the interplay of different foreign literary models was pervasive in that period, and how the manipulation of these models was conscious and deliberate. Far from being an automatic attempt to copy the latest trends of European literature, the appropriation of foreign models by the early Brazilian novel was highly selective and in itself played important aesthetic and ideological roles. More importantly, *A Moreninha* may also show how the formation of a national identity, so important for the Brazilian novel at the time, was largely based on the interplay of these literary models imported from Europe, and that it takes place in an intermediary space that can be called transatlantic.

3. "This little novel owes its existence solely to the days of leisure and relaxation that I spent in beautiful Itaboraí during my vacations last year," declares the author in his preface to the novel (Macedo 43).[2] If we take the preface at face value, the novel is supposed to have been written very casually, as a pastime to fill out the days of a pleasant but uneventful vacation, and the constant appeals to the leniency of the reading public imply that it is meant to be read in the same spirit. The authorial persona goes out of his way to stress that *A Moreninha* is an amusing fiction, the result of the "frolics" of his imagination, and should not be taken seriously. More than a disclaimer for the possible shortcomings of the novel—or for eventual breaches of propriety in the text, which are never too daring and are always controlled by the narrative itself—the preface seems to serve the purpose, above all else, of grounding the novel not as a breakthrough in Brazilian literature (and certainly not as "art"), but as an unpretentious and agreeable entertainment.

4. Nevertheless, this avowedly unpretentious novel demonstrates a great concern with the European literary models circulating in the country at the time it was written, and it seems more interested in situating itself in relation to these models than to the social environment it is supposed to portray—or, more accurately, it translates the relationships that give form to this social environment in terms of the

circulation of European literary paradigms. Indeed, the first chapter of the novel already places the whole narrative that is to follow in the context of the circulation of styles, none of which is considered essentially Brazilian, in spite of the chain of identifications in which they are involved, as we will see presently. Filipe, a student in Rio de Janeiro, invites three of his colleagues to spend a weekend at his grandmother's house on an island near the city. As an enticement for his friends, he uses the allurement of his two beautiful cousins. He describes the eldest as having black hair, dark eyes, and as being pale. The youngest is blond, with blue eyes, and has an "alabaster breast" (50). The two girls are respectively —and explicitly—associated to the literary paradigms of romantic and classical beauty in the text, and it is this explicit association that makes them irresistible. Nevertheless, as a further incentive to drag his friends to an otherwise appalling weekend with his grandmother, Filipe mentions his younger sister, who is only described as a fourteen-year-old *moreninha*.[3] The students cannot place her under an existing literary paradigm. Her characterization as a *moreninha*, however, is enough to posit her as a typical Brazilian beauty, opposed to the romantic and classical beauties of the other two girls, which, in their paleness, have a foreign aspect. Apparently, it is also enough to establish her character: she is no doubt "interesting, unruly and funny" (51), as declares one of the friends—and that is indeed what we find she is, when we finally get to meet her.

5. The promise to meet the three girls convinces even Augusto, the most recalcitrant of the four friends. Augusto is also accused of being a romantic—"accused" because his romanticism is associated to his inconstancy, to his continuous flirting. He defends himself by insisting that he is sincere in his insincerity: he tells all his girlfriends he is inconstant. Augusto's romanticism is criticized as an affectation, an imitation of fashionable mannerisms made popular by French novels, and as an excuse for his inconstancy. His claims to sincerity, however, point to the possibility of a hidden truthfulness behind the coat of form and appearances.

6. Augusto boasts that he will probably flirt with the three girls at the same time, without growing truly attached to any of them. But Filipe insists Augusto will fall madly in love with one of them and remain hopelessly absorbed by her—at least for a while. They decide to settle the dispute in a bet: if Augusto falls in love with any girl in the island—and is faithful to her for at least fifteen days—he will have to write a novel telling of his defeat; if, on the other hand, he leaves the island unscathed, Filipe will have to write another novel on the triumph of Augusto's inconstancy. Yes, *A Moreninha* is the final result, as we learn in the last chapter of the book.

7. The whole narrative of the novel, therefore, is bracketed into a literary game—and, as Sant'Anna points out, the figure of the game is central in *A Moreninha* (95-96). The people gathered on the island engage in a series of games throughout the novel, and these include courtship, a game with very specific rules. This gaming is tied to the playful tone of the book and to the kind of pleasure it tries to create. But games are first and foremost the domain of form. They are based on a set of arbitrary rules that elicit a certain number of gestures which are therefore typified, stylized by them. These gestures have no meaning outside the motions of the game. In *A Moreninha*, games are the way forms circulate and are negotiated. Most of the social interactions in the book revolve around flirting or are erotically tinged. Love is no doubt the social glue of the little society on the island. But flirting, or courtship, in this novel involves the assumption of very specific rules and kinds of behavior, based on transatlantic literary codes. Social interaction, then, is seen as a game that promotes the circulation of forms—represented here by European literary paradigms—and where identities are constructed according to adherence or opposition to those forms. And these forms, these literary paradigms, mostly of Portuguese, French or British origins, are strangely eroticized, in accordance to the importance of love as a social binder in *A Moreninha*.[4]

8. One example may make this clearer. Before going to the island, Augusto receives a letter from Fabrício, one of the friends at the bet scene. Fabrício reveals that in fact he is courting Filipe's

avowedly "romantic" cousin, but the whole thing bores him terribly. D. Joaninha writes him endless letters in which she pours out her soul. He is forced to reply, writing at least four letters each week, and is at a loss as to how to find more idiocies to write and money to buy more paper. D. Joaninha has established a whole set of signs that they must exchange when they meet at the theater, and she wants to regulate how he dresses, how he cuts his hair, and what kind of cigars he smokes.

9. D. Joaninha forces upon Fabrício a set of attitudes and behaviors directly extracted from her romantic readings. Fabrício, of course, is perfectly aware of that, for he, too, is a reader: "I must call her 'my beautiful cousin' and she calls me 'dear cousin'. From this I conclude that D. Joana has read the Faublas. Now, that's a commendable quality!" (66). Fabrício's disapproving tone casts suspicions on D. Joaninha's readings as consisting of useless and morally questionable popular French novels, but it is possible that a criticism based on matters of national identity is also present.[5] The love affair between Fabrício and D. Joaninha constitutes itself in the playing out of literary stereotypes, which finally shape their identities. D. Joaninha has no psychology besides playing the romantic heroine, and Fabrício's character is established in his opposition to romanticism (although he is familiar with D. Joaninha's reading matter, he insists he is a classicist). His complaints against D. Joaninha reflect an aesthetical incompatibility, a desire to return to his previous literary affiliation. He declares that, being a classicist "body and soul," he "calls things by their real names." Although everybody says D. Joaninha is "pale," Fabrício thinks rather that she is "yellow." "What used to be considered insipidity in a girl is now just the opposite: sublime languidness! There are no longer impudent or vain girls… Those who were like that are now called girls of spirit! The romantic school has reformed all this in consideration to the fair sex," complains Fabrício (67-68). Actually, Fabrício's classicism reveals a very practical mindset: he prefers real kisses to the ones only dreamed of as dictated by romantic platonic love; he also immensely enjoys the pastries and sweets served during visits of courtship (61).

10. Classicism, in Brazil, was associated to a colonial literature, directly influenced by Portuguese culture, while romanticism was associated with the desire to create an independent, national literature, and the search for new models and a greater formal liberty. Nevertheless, in spite of all its claims of attempting to create a national culture, Brazilian romanticism is largely molded after French romanticism, which serves as a sort of template for the first Brazilian romantics, most of whom published their first works in the 1830s in literary magazines written and published in Paris (Cândido 11-13). Given Fabrício's nostalgia for a more "classicist" time when "things were called by their real names," it may not be too far-fetched to associate him to the colonial past and to the practical and exploitative Portuguese colonizer. It is indeed this practical mindset and the materiality associated to it that Augusto condemns when trying to convince Fabrício of the beauties of romantic spirituality and idealism—and Fabrício's curiosity concerning the romantic lifestyle confirms it as new and modern. The clash between classicism and romanticism represented in the relationship between Fabrício and D. Joaninha points to the moment of a shift in paradigms and the replacement of one circle of cultural influences by another. In rough terms, this may be described as a shift from classicism, associated with tradition, the colonial past, and a set of rigid formal rules directly connected to Portuguese literary practices, to romanticism, associated with modernity, formal liberty and French culture—which was a symbol of cosmopolitanism in nineteenth-century Brazil and which seemed to offer an escape from the limiting, exclusivist exchange between the recently independent nation and its former Portuguese colonizer.

11. What is most interesting in Fabrício's complaints against D. Joaninha, however, is that different lifestyles and points of view are directly and inescapably linked to literary trends, and that what would be in principle a clash between two competing literary/cultural paradigms is converted into a problematic love affair. Fabrício's courtship of D. Joaninha involves a circulation of international literary models ready to be "tried out" and left aside when found unsatisfactory. If the association of Fabrício's classicism to his longing for pastries presents this particular paradigm under a ludicrous light (and romanticism as represented by D. Joaninha and her irritating mannerisms does not fare much

better), it is in the circulation and interaction of these literary models—and their being posited as objects of desire—that their characteristics, their merits and their usefulness can be played out. This logic of circulation, however, soon reveals itself as a logic of consumption. Fabrício sees D. Joaninha for the first time at the theater, but to reach her he must use her young slave, Tobias, as a go-between. Tobias, of course, charges dearly for his services, which are very similar to those of a pimp. D. Joana is one of the few characters whose affiliation and social situation are clearly and precisely stated in the novel: she is the daughter of a rich merchant. But here she becomes the merchandise, and the slave, who is her property, becomes the merchant. Finally, Fabrício literally pays for his love affair (buying paper and theater tickets, and bribing Tobias) and in the process he almost exhausts his allowance.

12. The association of this love affair to consumptive circulation and monetary expenditure dooms it to failure. D. Joaninha's compulsive writing is more a formal exigency of her role as the romantic heroine of an imaginary epistolary novel—the kind of novel which was so popular in eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Britain and France, and which was still being translated and widely read in 1840s Brazil—than a means of expression, and although she is genuinely in love with Fabrício, she obviously fails to establish a satisfactory communication with him. The whole chapter describing this unhappy, but very funny love affair is a criticism against classicism and especially romanticism as two sets of formal mannerisms turned into objects destined exclusively for consumption.

13. On the other hand, the island where most of the novel is set opens a space where the circulation of transatlantic literary paradigms can occur more freely—and where the monetary element is absent. It is a kind of isolated haven where these paradigms are detached from the social context in which they are usually articulated and are made to interact on an empty, unmarked stage, and where they are accessible without the kind of obstacles Fabrício has to buy his way through. The contours of the whole island remain vague: it is never named, nor is its precise location ever given in the book. It is probably a fictitious island, but it would more likely be located inside Guanabara Bay, on whose shores the city of Rio de Janeiro was built (the island is not far from the city; the characters reach it on a small boat). It is never really described, either; it apparently consists only of the house where the characters meet, placed exactly at its center and surrounded by trees and flowers, "always bright and lively thanks to the eternal spring in our good land of Santa Cruz" (71). "Land of Santa Cruz" was one of the first names given to Brazil by the Portuguese when they took possession of their new colony in the West. This very concise description evokes traditional images of the island as an earthly paradise—images that abounded in the reports of travelers who visited Brazil, or the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in America in general, soon after their discovery in the late fifteenth century.[6] The use of this image in conjunction with one of the first appellations given to Brazil evokes the very first stages of colonization, a time when what would later become the Brazilian territory was still conceived as a pristine land, ready to be taken, untouched by civilization and associated with a bountiful nature. The sparseness of description reinforces the identification of the island with the open, unmarked space that characterized Brazil in the imaginary of the first colonizers and reactivates this conception of the country in the present. As we will see ahead, this desired return to a point of origin has an important ideological role to play in the structure of *A Moreninha*.

14. W. H. Auden describes the symbol of the island as being "like the city in that it is an enclosed place of safety and like the sea-desert in that it is a solitary or private place from which the general public are excluded and where the writ of the law does not run. The primary idea with which the garden-island image is associated is, therefore, neither justice nor chastity but innocence; it is the earthly paradise where there is no conflict between natural desire and moral duty" (28-29). The island in *A Moreninha* is also a place of transition between the city (for Auden, the place of necessity) and the sea (the place of possibility): it is close enough to the city to be considered part of the Court, but is separated from it by the sea—or rather by the bay, an *inner* sea. Crossing the waters to reach it is like crossing into another reality, or like sailing in a dream; it is a kind of suspension, of magical passage.

15. When Augusto first sees Carolina, the *moreninha*, he finds her ugly and impertinent. She is very unruly, and even makes faces at him. But the problem is that she is very hard to define. If she seems ugly, that is because her beauty does not fit any preconceived type—she is neither romantic nor classic, and the narrator complains how difficult it is to paint her. The fact that she is not associated with any existing international literary paradigm marks her as original and places her outside the realm of culture, identifying her with nature—it is significant that, rather than receiving cultural "labels," like her "romantic" and "classical" cousins, she is identified by her skin color: a physical, natural trait. Her characterization, then, reproduces the old Rousseauvian dichotomy between culture as the domain of appearances and constraint, and nature as the domain of spontaneity, transparency and, ultimately, truthfulness—a dichotomy made popular by a veritable host of eighteenth-century British and French sentimental novels which still circulated in Brazil by the time *A Moreninha* was published.[7] Her misbehavior also puts her outside the roles usually assumed in the game of social interaction. She plays other kinds of games, more chaotic: those of a child. She sits in six different chairs in five minutes, playfully dismantles a bunch of roses, pours perfume in a guest's hat, pinches her brother, all in the first moments Augusto sees her (73). She refuses to hold any gentleman's arm when strolling in the garden, as the other girls do, because she would rather run around free (106). Her inability to stand still, her passion for movement, makes her an embodiment of circulation—but an aimless, spontaneous circulation, very different from that implied in Fabrício's and D. Joaninha's epistolary exchange, which was molded by literary/social conventions and was associated with monetary expenditure.

16. On the one hand, then, we have an adult game, controlled by rules of conduct and locked in the circulation of forms, represented by the young people who flirt on the island, whose behavior is dictated by their literary affiliation and follows highly strict codes in its playfulness. On the other, we have children's play, which is described as amorphous and "invented at each moment" (113), and is associated with Carolina. She, in fact, actively opposes the codified rules of the game. When Augusto and his friends are playing a card game, Carolina bursts into the scene, throws a bunch of flowers on the table, steals one of the cards and completely disrupts the game (188-89).

17. Although Carolina is consistently associated to spontaneity in this novel, we must be careful not to read her as representing a rupture in the circulation of transatlantic literary models or as an indictment against it. *A Moreninha* seems to carefully avoid ruptures of this kind, and Carolina can be seen as a re-articulation of the way foreign literary models are appropriated in this novel. For besides functioning as a positive allegorical figure for circulation, she herself is based on a literary model, that of the sentimental heroine. Her very spontaneity, her childlike innocence and her unruliness, which are supposed to make her unique, are traits she shares with many of her sentimental predecessors, such as Adèle in Mme. de Souza's *Adèle de Sénange*, Ernestine in Mme. Riccoboni's *Histoire d`Ernestine* and Camilla in Frances Burney's *Camilla*. These traits were also the basis for these characters' claims for originality in their respective novels, but although in the sentimental novel childlike spontaneity is an endearing or even desirable characteristic, it is also seen as a danger if not properly controlled, while in *A Moreninha* it is intensified and more freely embraced.

18. The insistent positing of Carolina as a typical sentimental heroine through her embodiment of the culture versus nature dichotomy, her association with childlike innocence, and the stress given to her sensibility, elements that define Caroline as a character and which are marked with a positive valence in the novel, seems to offer her as a more satisfactory counterpoint to classicism and romanticism taken as mere formal mannerisms. If, at first, Carolina seems to evade the possibility of being inserted into a model, now it appears that she in fact represents the adoption of a model that is never as explicitly discussed in *A Moreninha* as classicism and romanticism: the sentimental novel that was so central in French and British literature from the second half of the eighteenth to the first decades of the nineteenth century. How far, then, does the adoption of this model entail the exclusion of other transatlantic models and bring to an end the circulation of literary forms that is such a driving force in the narrative

of *A Moreninha*?

19. The role of the sentimental paradigm is central in this novel not only in terms of characterization, but also of plot. It is Carolina who fixates Augusto's wandering desire when he visits the island, but this can only be achieved by a return to the past and by an even stronger association with childhood. For Augusto's notorious inconstancy was merely a screen, a way to avoid any serious commitment while remaining faithful to his one true love: a young girl (about seven years old) he had met on a beach years earlier when he was still an adolescent, and who he had never seen again. The growing attachment the two children felt while playing on the beach had been clinched and converted into a promise of marriage when they witnessed and were profoundly moved by a sentimental tableau of a poor fisherman dying in a miserable hut nearby. The consciousness of shared feelings cemented their love and the young girl has remained an ideal love object in Augusto's mind for the rest of his life—until he meets Carolina, who increasingly shows signs of being imbued with the same kind of sensibility. Augusto's "false" romanticism was, then, a cover for a "truer" romanticism: he was after all faithful to the kind of spiritual attachment that he explicitly associates to romantic love in his discussions with Fabrício. What finally opens the possibility of a "true" romanticism, as opposed to romanticism as a set of formal mannerisms, is the presence of this attachment with all its spiritual and idealistic overtones, and which is only achieved in this novel by invoking the sentimental tradition.

20. The threat of unfaithfulness brought by Carolina's presence on the island (Augusto is torn for a long time between his increasing attachment to her and his desire to remain faithful to his young bride) is defused in the end by his discovery that Carolina was really the little girl on the beach. The idealized attachment between the two protagonists, then, is established when desire is partially de-sexualized by being fixated to childhood. This is already attempted by positing the fourteen-year old Carolina, with all her childlike innocence, as the main erotic object of the novel, and is finally achieved in the beach scene. For when Augusto met the young girl on the beach, he was already becoming aware of his own sexual desire—he already searched his "blasphemies" in the Latin dictionary, meaning, of course, Latin words with a sexual content (112)—and he promptly converts this budding sexual awareness into child's play, re-inscribing it in the realm of childhood innocence. This tendency is later reproduced in his courtship of Carolina, which involves playing with dolls and mock embroidery lessons.

21. The possibility of a "true" romanticism associated with childhood and nature, where deeper attachments can be formed outside the domain of culture, does not constitute, however, an opposition to the circulation of forms. As we have already seen, the possibility of such attachments is firmly grounded on the tradition of the sentimental novel, which is also behind the way childhood innocence is articulated in *A Moreninha* in the first place. Terms like "true" or "false" are not the most adequate to describe the way this novel establishes a relationship with its models, since what seems to be central here is putting the available literary codes in circulation and selecting from them those aspects that can elicit certain affective and moral effects, and which will be activated more intensely, as opposed to those that remain dormant as purely formal possibilities, but which are never actually rejected and whose presence still retains the promise of a potential use. Hence, if the idealization of the amorous connection between Augusto and Carolina seems to point to a preference for the spirituality and sentimentality associated to romanticism in this novel, and to a tacit defeat of classicism in the literary dispute outlined in its first chapters, classical elements are still present in the construction of the idyllic atmosphere of the island.

22. But even the attachment to romanticism and sentimentality remains somewhat qualified in *A Moreninha*. When Augusto and Carolina are temporarily separated by the intervention of Augusto's father, who is afraid the young man has been neglecting his studies, both lovers fall into a fit of melancholic sickness, which prompts the following remark from the narrator: "Our lovers had just reached the sentimental, and with their sentimentalism were spoiling the life of those who wished them

well. Lovers are like children: first they amuse us with their antics, then annoy us with their crying" (256).

23. At first, this seems to throw a jarring note into the narrative. The comment not only offers a satirical view of sentimentality, but also ridicules the image of love as child's play that is laboriously developed in the novel and that is so important for the effects it tries to achieve. An apparently contradictory position seems to have been reached between the wholehearted adoption of a foreign literary model and a reluctance to fully embrace it—a position reminiscent of the place in-between that Silviano Santiago describes as the one typically occupied by the Latin American writer, whose appropriation of foreign models is always accompanied by their criticism in a process closer to parody than to copy.[8] The tone of the narrator's comment on Augusto's and Carolina's love-sickness, however, is more good-humored than properly sarcastic, and it does not seem to properly constitute an attack on the sentimental model nor to question in any way its adoption in the rest of the novel.

24. If we bear in mind the author's assertion in the preface that the novel was written as a pastime and therefore should not be taken too seriously, this comment can offer a glimpse of the kind of attitude that is the precondition for the textual enterprise carried out in *A Moreninha*. Poking fun at the sentimental model is less a criticism of this model than a refusal to take *any* literary model too seriously, even those that play a central role in this novel. It is a means to maintain a certain distance from it, while simultaneously stressing its visibility as a model, as something that the author can appropriate and use for his own ends – a move that marks the process of appropriation as conscious and deliberate. Moreover, in not taking his own models too seriously, the author, like his heroine, does not strictly adhere to the codified rules of the game and inscribes his exercise of appropriating European models—and of novel writing – under the heading of child's play. The eventual contradictions among different models, or even within a single model, can be conciliated or at least left suspended in this process of playful appropriation.

25. The question of identification is, of course, very important in the mechanism of appropriation, where adopting a literary model is a form of insertion into the context of its original production. In absorbing models created in Europe, the nineteenth-century Brazilian novelist was asserting his right to belong to the same literary tradition as the "civilized" nations. In the case of Macedo, the circulation of models involves a knowledge of them *as models*, that is, as pre-existing paradigms that cannot be naïvely appropriated. This awareness, like the sexual awareness of the characters in *A Moreninha*, is, however, safely absorbed by the element of play, so that the whole process maintains an aspect of childlike innocence. The process of appropriation borrows from Europe a history for the genre of the novel, still virtually nonexistent in Brazil by the time *A Moreninha* was published, at the same time that it neutralizes this history in presenting the Brazilian novel as a child who has not yet fully absorbed its education and is still largely free from the dictates of any tradition.

26. This neutralization of literary history is paralleled by an effacement of Brazilian history in *A Moreninha*. When any references are made to the Brazilian past in the novel, some three hundred years of colonization are skipped over and we return to an image of the country as a pristine natural garden. As we have already seen, the description of the island in *A Moreninha* associates it with the narratives of the first travelers who visited the country, identifying the Brazil of the narrative present to the newly discovered territory, still untouched by civilization, still unformed and still a land of limitless possibilities. This seems to reveal a desire for a return to a point of origin where the essence of Brazilian national identity is to be found—a desire shared by most romantic writers of nineteenth-century Brazil in their relentless search for what constitutes the spirit of the new nation (Süssekind 61). In the case of *A Moreninha*, however, this return to a point of origin seems less concerned with the rediscovery of an essence already formed in the past than with bringing this point of origin to the present and associating it with the innocence and openness of childhood—the endless becoming so

stressed in the main character, and the limitless possibilities involved in child's play. But in *A Moreninha*, child's play also characterizes the exercise of novel writing itself, so that yet another identification is possible. The novel is also like a child in its formative stages; it plays with its models in its process of becoming, a process full of possibilities. The novel and the nation are imagined in the same way, and one mirrors the other—they are part of the same process of formation.

27. In *A Moreninha*, the island is also an in-between space that offers a detachment from the demands of a commercial society without relinquishing its advantages: its cosmopolitanism and its modernity. It may be possible to read in it an idealized imaginary picture of the young Brazilian nation itself: placed on the margins of the sea of international commerce, retaining its childlike innocence and originality, but at the same time engaging in an intensive interaction with European civilization—especially by consuming its products. In this interaction, it becomes a part of this civilization (it knows its codes) while still remaining its more childlike and natural other. Its "civilized" knowledge, like the sexual awareness of the characters in *A Moreninha*, does not destroy its childlike innocence, neither does it force its insertion in the world of necessity dictated by the weight of a long historical tradition.

28. Another example from this period of formation may show how some of these questions are pervasive in the nineteenth-century Brazilian novel. José de Alencar's *Lucíola*, published in 1862, is also structured on an intensive exercise of model appropriation, although here this process is not associated with child's play and follows a different dynamic. Nevertheless, a concern with childlike innocence, with the possibility of a return to a pristine point of origin, and a desire to escape from the determinations of history are also vividly present in this novel.

29. *Lucíola* is to a great extent a re-writing of Dumas fils' *La Dame aux camélias*. It also tells the story of a courtesan, Lúcia, who finds redemption through love. In appropriating the premise, and some plot elements (the jealousy of the lover, the prostitute's contempt for her position and for her paying clients, for instance) of Dumas fils's novel, Alencar reveals a strong admiration for his model. Nevertheless, towards the middle of his narrative, he has his heroine read *La Dame aux camélias*, only to contemptuously reject it as a lie (Alencar 82).[9] This is a much stronger rejection of the model than Macedo's humorous jabs against sentimentality, and it marks the point from which the differences between *Lucíola* and Dumas fils' novel become more pronounced.

30. Before exploring these differences, it is useful to point out that the explicit reference to a model is also present in *La Dame aux camélias*. The model in question is, of course, *Manon Lescaut*, which Marguerite Gautier also reads with some misgivings: "lorsqu'une femme aime, elle ne peut pas faire ce que faisait Manon" (Dumas fils 169). It is interesting that the point which marks the explicit departure from the model in Alencar is also a reference to this same model and reproduces it at another level: Lúcia is supposed to humble Marguerite, just as Marguerite was supposed to humble Manon. In inscribing his novel in this textual dynamic, Alencar connects it to the European novelistic tradition, which now supplies—as was the case in *A Moreninha*—a historical literary background for *Lucíola*. But, again as in Macedo's novel, it is a desire to transcend the constraints dictated by history that seems to motivate Alencar's work.

31. Lúcia condemns *La Dame aux camélias* because Marguerite maintains a sexual relationship with Armand, offering him the same body that so many others had enjoyed: "Didn't this girl [Marguerite] feel, when she threw herself in her lover's arms, that it was the leftovers of corruption she was offering? Wasn't she afraid that her lips at that moment still throbbed with the kisses she had sold?" (82). This is, of course, essentially a moral objection which radicalizes the question of moral redemption already present in Dumas fils's novel, re-inscribing it in a much more absolute conflict between vice and virtue reminiscent of sentimental literature, whose rhetoric supplies the terms in which this conflict is developed in Alencar's novel. The absence of the kind of financial entanglements that made it so hard

for Marguerite to fully relinquish her condition as a courtesan (the narrative of *Lucíola* stresses again and again that Lúcia was in fact quite rich and had no debts) is another element that firmly grounds Lúcia's story on a purely moral level.

32. *Lucíola*, then, effaces several realistic traits present in *A Dame aux camélias* in favor of a more intensely spiritualistic and idealized stance. As opposed to Marguerite, Lúcia's redemption is in no way influenced by disease and remains connected to her desire to regain her virtue and to her own sensibility—to her characterization as a sentimental heroine, in short. Unlike Marguerite, she strives for—and will successfully attain—the kind of relationship with her lover associated in Brazilian romanticism (as we have already seen in *A Moreninha*) to platonic love, and which is fundamentally spiritual and sentimental. More importantly, because her conflict is essentially moral and free from any sort of objective determinism, she is able to effectively erase her own history by an act of will, and return to the original state of innocence that preceded her prostitution when she was only fourteen years old.

33. This is marked in the novel by a literal return to Lúcia's point of origin, to the house where she spent her childhood, which she visits in the company of her lover. This house shares many of the traits of the island in *A Moreninha*, and is also a sort of in-between place by the sea, rurally idyllic but still located on the outskirts of the city. Like Lúcia's past, it remains intact and unchanged, ready to be retaken. There she can playfully run through the gardens like Carolina and cast the period she worked as a courtesan into oblivion: "I suppose I've slept through these last seven years and woke up today all of a sudden" (103). From that moment on, she will be like a "fifteen-year old girl, pure and innocent" (102).

34. It is this return to the past, this complete effacement of personal history, that is barred to Marguerite. More than any moral flaw, it is the impossibility of a return to the *tabula rasa* of a pristine point of origin that Alencar seems to be rejecting in his model. But it still is in a dialogue with this model that he manages to make his point. It is only by explicitly bringing it into his own text that he can assert his own difference. On the other hand, this pristine state of childlike innocence, which is presented as natural and spontaneous, is only established in *Lucíola*, as much as in *A Moreninha*, by activating other European literary models, such as the sentimental novel and a romantic view of spirituality. If indeed these novels promote the creation of this image of childlike innocence and indeterminacy as what is specifically Brazilian about them, then their search for a literary and national identity remains relational. This image is connected to the search for an in-between state that, as far as the appropriation of models is concerned, offers less the possibility of a critical stance than of acting out the desire for a limitless inclusiveness, where different—and often contradictory—stances can coexist side by side, and where potentially any model or literary paradigm can be incorporated.

35. The explicit way in which this inclusiveness is translated into children's play in *A Moreninha* points to a deliberateness in the process of appropriation, and an enjoyment of it, indicative that this place in-between where the novel is located—and which is metaphorically represented by the island as its setting, since it is placed in the bay where the most intense interaction between the Brazilian capital and the European nations occurred (a space we may safely call transatlantic)—is not a place occupied by necessity by the Latin American writer, as Silviano Santiago seems to imply, but rather a place actively created in works such as *A Moreninha* and occupied by choice. It is first and foremost an object of desire. In the case of the nineteenth-century Brazilian novelist, it seems to offer the opportunity of avoiding the commitment to a specific national or social project which would necessarily preclude other options. More importantly, it makes it possible to evade the relative determinism of the historical past and an established cultural tradition. The indeterminacy it supplies offers a much easier and open access to the future and modernity than the highly hierarchical structure of nineteenth-century Brazil, based on centuries of exploitation of slave labor, could offer. If the maintenance of this rigid hierarchical structure precludes an advancement towards modernity in

European lines, this possibility remains open, paradoxically enough, in a return to a pristine past and the indeterminacy of a childlike *tabula rasa*, inconsequential and free of guilt.

Notes

[1] See Marlyse Meyer, *Folhetim: uma história* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1996).

[2] Future references to this novel will appear between parentheses in the text. All quotations from Brazilian texts have been translated by me.

[3] *Moreninha* is a difficult term to translate into English. It is the affectionate diminutive form of the adjective/noun *morena*, which has two meanings in Portuguese: it may simply refer to a dark-haired girl, or it may refer to a girl who also has dark, or tanned, skin, without being black. In opposition to her pale "romantic" cousin, Filipe's sister is described as having a "rosto moreno" (154)—a tanned, dark skinned face. The *morena* is a common Brazilian type, and we tend to picture her as the typical Brazilian woman.

[4] One must only remember the fascination Filipe's cousins exert over his friends by the simple fact of their being identified with classicism and romanticism. Here is an account of Augusto's reaction to one of the cousins, when he first sees her on the island: "D. Joaninha's black locks and romantic face made a terrible breach in his heart" (73).

[5] Jean-Baptiste Louvet de Couvray's novel trilogy, *Les Amours du chevalier de Faublas* (1787-89), which dwells mainly on the sexual escapades of its hero—a sort of amiable young libertine—and on the corrupted morals of eighteenth-century France, would indeed be a peculiar reading matter for a nineteenth-century Brazilian girl of good standing. Its amoral tone throws a suspicious light on D. Joaninha's readings. Faublas's inclination towards cross-dressing, however, does raise the question of appearances and circulation of forms that is also an issue in *A Moreninha*. The kind of humor present in the Faublas novels—not to mention the fascination with the youth of their protagonist, whose budding (but intense) sexual experience still carries many elements of child's play—also bear some striking similarities to Macedo's novel, so it is hard to guess where his sympathy actually lies in this seeming condemnation of Faublas.

[6] See Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, *Visão do paraíso* (São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional/Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 1969) xii-xvii. The first accounts on the colonies often stress the fact that the Americas are in an eternal spring.

[7] The contrast between culture and nature is a widespread concern of French sentimental novels, and it is also present in British novels. Examples range from Rousseau's own *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, published in 1761, to Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's *Paul et Virginie*, first published in 1788 as part of *Etudes de la Nature*.

[8] See Silviano Santiago, "O entre-lugar do discurso latino-americano."

[9] Future references to this novel will appear between parentheses in the text.

Works Cited

Alencar, José de. *Lucíola*. 16th ed. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1992.

Auden, W. H. *The Enchafèd Flood: or the Romantic Iconography of the Sea*. London: Faber and Faber, 1951.

Carvalho, José Murilo de. *A construção da ordem: a elite política imperial*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Campus, 1980.

Cândido, Antônio. *Formação da literatura brasileira, vol. 2 (1836-1880)*. 6th ed. São Paulo: Livraria Martins Ediotra, 1981.

Dumas, Alexandre, fils. *La Dame aux camélias*. Paris: Pocket, 1998.

Holanda, Sérgio Buarque de. *Visão do paraíso*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional/Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 1969.

Macedo, Joaquim Manuel de. *A Moreninha*. Rio de Janeiro: Lacerda Editores, 1997.

Meyer, Marlyse. *Folhetim: uma história*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1996.

Sant'Anna, Affonso Romano de. "*A Moreninha*," *Análise estrutural de romances brasileiros*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 1979.

Santiago, Silviano. "O entre-lugar do discurso latino-americano." *Uma literatura nos trópicos: ensaios sobre dependência cultural*. São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva, 1978.

Süssekind, Flora. *O Brasil não é longe daqui: o narrador, a viagem*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1990.

Sullen Fires Across the Atlantic: Essays in Transatlantic Romanticism

The Allure of the Same: Robert Southey's Welsh Indians and the Rhetoric of Good Colonialism

Rebecca Cole Heinowitz, Bard College

> "[S]ince the period of the conquest. . . Western Europe has tried to assimilate the other, to do away with an exterior alterity." (Todorov 247)

1. Much has been made over the last two decades of the power relationships that inhere in the opposition between selfhood and otherness, particularly within the context of British colonial expansion. Often overlooked, however, is the complex rhetoric of *sameness* that attended British imperialism in India, and more importantly, in Spanish America, during the early decades of the nineteenth century. The rhetoric of otherness was useful in justifying colonialism by the emphasis it placed on the necessity of improving allegedly benighted and savage peoples. The rhetoric of sameness, on the other hand, functioned to allay the anxieties of an era beset by the horrors of colonial mismanagement by stressing the naturalness and moral uprightness of imperialism. The most famous instance of such colonial mismanagement was that of Warren Hastings, Governor General of India, whom Edmund Burke condemned in no uncertain terms:

> He is never *corrupt* without he is *cruel*. He never *dines without creating a famine*. He feeds on the *indigent*, the *decaying*, the *ruined*. . . not like the generous eagle, who feeds upon a *living, reluctant, equal prey*: No, he is like the *ravenous vulture*, who feeds upon the *dead*. . . Mr. Hastings feasts in the dark alone; *like a wild beast he groans in a corner over the dead and dying*.(*Trial of Warren Hastings* 64)[1]

2. In the most widely attended public trial of the period, Burke brought to light a staggering exegesis of Britain's colonial guilt. With deliberate awareness, Burke attempted to do for late eighteenth-century Britain what Bartolomé de Las Casas had done for Spain over two hundred years earlier: to exonerate his nation by exposing its violence and greed before the very leaders responsible for its colonial policy. Pleading his case before the court of Ferdinand and Isabella, Las Casas declaimed:

> Those who have gone over there . . . have had two principal methods for extirpating and razing from the face of the earth those miserable nations. The first was by way of unjust, cruel, bloody and tyrannical wars. The other . . . oppressing them with the hardest, harshest, and most horrible servitude under which men or beasts have ever been placed . . . The reason why so many have been destroyed and killed . . . is simply their ultimate end of obtaining gold and to glut themselves with riches in the fewest possible days, and to rise to very high states out of all proportion to their persons.(Las Casas 78-9)[2]

3. In the impeachment proceedings against Hastings, Burke drew upon Las Casas's vocabulary in order to stress the dangerous parity he perceived between British India and Spanish America:

> Were we to be driven out of India this day, nothing would remain, to tell that it had been possessed, during the inglorious period of our dominion, by anything better than the ouran-outang or the tiger . . . My lords, the business of this day . . . is . . . whether millions of mankind shall be made miserable, or happy . . . We are to decide by this judgment . . .

> whether this Nation will convert the very offenses, which have thrown a transient shade upon its Government, into something that will reflect a permanent luster upon the honour, justice, and humanity of this Kingdom. (Burke 310, 383)

4. Yet as was the case with the pious missionary, Las Casas, Burke, the conservative M.P. did not set himself against colonialism *per se*, but rather, against its corruption by unscrupulous fortune seekers. Burke defends colonialism—as he defends all of his beliefs—by reference to tradition. Because colonialism boasts an exalted pedigree tracing back to the empires of the classical world, it is therefore good.[3] But Burke's reference to the Spanish empire is complicated: Though he converts Warren Hastings into a unique aberration in the long line of good colonialists, a solitary straw man, the pervasiveness of Spanish colonial corruption suggests an intrinsic flaw in the moral structure of expansionism. The very language he uses to banish Hastings from the line of good colonialists, in short, exposes the atrocities of the traditional colonialism Burke would defend as the proper expression of the English constitution.[4]

5. The shocking idea that enlightened Britain might present the mirror image of the Spain of the Inquisition flew in the face of two centuries of the Black Legend, that nearly ubiquitous notion that defined British expansionism as the antithesis of everything its Spanish precursor had been: gold-thirsty, inhuman, and hypocritical. Since the publication of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, British liberals had come to regard traditional colonialism, of the sort practiced by Spain, as counterproductive and unprofitable. Was not Spain's mercantile reliance on the extraction of bullion from its colonies directly responsible for its languishing industry, agriculture, trade, and wealth? By contrast, Britain's policy of indirect rule in South America cost nothing to maintain or defend, and amply compensated the kingdom for the loss of trade privileges with North America. Indeed, as early as 1707, that forerunner of modern capitalism, Daniel Defoe, had plainly stated:

> We want not the domination of more countries than we have; we sufficiently possess a nation when we have an open and free trade to it . . . our trading to Old Spain has been a full trade to New Spain, a trade by which England has always drawn as much money from America as Old Spain itself. (Quoted in Liss 4-5)

6. By the end of the eighteenth century, Britain had come to believe that "large-scale overseas settlement . . . could ultimately be only destructive to the metropolis." By contrast, British India "was to be a place not of settlement, but of exploitation." Because the Indian people were alleged to live "under the 'tutelage', rather than the rule" of Great Britain, they were "likely to prove more cooperative and more productive" (Pagden 6-7).

7. When Warren Hastings went on trial, the legitimacy of indirect rule as a benevolent commercial contract went on trial as well. Under the aegis of establishing a program of "harmonious exchange" with India and Bengal, Hastings had created a despotic and corrupt reign that undercut and destabilized native power structures and required the erection of a militaristic British colony to safeguard his rule (Pagden 10). Better would it have been, argued Burke, to have established a traditional colony in India, one pledged to improve the country in which it was founded, rather than to tacitly maintain a military-commercial colony with no civic responsibility beyond the aggrandizement of its rulers. Whereas it had been possible before the Hastings trial to imagine liberal commerce as the salvation from Spanish-style colonialism, now the old, protectionist imperialism emerged as a haven from the ravages of irresponsible British-style exploitation.

8. While Spain still nominally held the reins of power in Spanish America, however, it was all too easy to frame incursions into the area by British capitalists as missions of political liberation. Black Legend rhetoric condemning the tyrannical Spanish incumbency counterbalanced the fact that Britain's

economic rapacity was beginning to effect uncomfortable parallels with Spain. But so powerful was British commercial domination of Spanish America, both legal and illegal, that when Spain declared war against Britain in 1796, the British navy was able to sever communications between Spain and the New World (Williams 45). As with India, Britain's proudly vaunted "harmonious exchange," or free trade, with America ended neither with trade nor with freedom. British merchants financed, and British soldiers and seamen facilitated, the establishment of new Spanish American governments sympathetic to British interests. Intrigues involving the outright seizure of Spanish America were the order of the day. In the year before his death, Prime Minister Pitt schemed to take Spanish America, while Sir Popham, followed by General Auchmuty, Brigadier-General Craufurd, and General Whitelocke attempted to commandeer Buenos Aires and administer it as a British colony.[5]

9. For Burke, the quintessential error of both Spanish colonialism in America and British colonialism in India was in observing too great a difference between the Euroimperial subject and the colonized native. This position was at once radically universalist and radically chauvinistic. In his writings on America and India, Burke's logic was that subjection to the British constitution—that repository of all human freedom and justice—was the highest form of independence a struggling nation could expect. Good British colonialism, then, offered the only meaningful freedom to a colony, a freedom guaranteed by the essential similitude of conqueror of and conquered. Thus, for Burke, the dominant feature of the North American colonists was their "fierce spirit of liberty," which, it happened, was their natural inheritance from the English character and constitution: "the people of the colonies are descendents of Englishmen. They are therefore not only devoted to liberty, but to liberty according to English ideas, and on English principles" (Burke 81). America was in revolt because the Americans were being denied their fundamental bond with the British, their rights as subjects under the British constitution. Burke rhetorically transformed the Americans into Britons in order to argue, not for their independence, but instead that their liberation was synonymous with their continued peaceful colonization. To wit, "the more ardently they love liberty, the more perfect will be their obedience" (Burke 129). Burke's arguments for humane government in India admitted of greater differences between colonizer and colonizer, yet the same principle of intimate mutual interest inhered.[6] In his defense of Fox's East India Bill, Burke asserted that good management in India was tantamount to the protection of British rights: "I am certain than every means effectual to preserve India from oppression is a guard to preserve the British constitution from its worst corruption" (Burke 289). For America and India alike, the principle maintained that the generous exercise of British empire guaranteed the rights and interests of both Britain and its colonies.

10. In 1795, despite Burke's eloquence, Warren Hastings was acquitted. Burke's failure to expiate Britain's colonial guilt left an indelible mark on Romantic-era ideology. Poets such as Coleridge, Southey, Anna Letitia Barbauld, P. B. Shelley, and others would continue to challenge and develop Burke's fear of the new imperialism and his assertion that the recognition of the sameness of colonized and colonizer could bring about a form of good colonialism. Indeed, the ideological excess of Burke's colonial rhetoric laid the foundation for the curious blending of utopianism and guilty paralysis that has become synonymous with the Romantic character. It was under the influence of this Burkean amalgam of good colonial rhetoric and uncontainable colonial guilt that Robert Southey first imagined his American epic, *Madoc*, in 1789.[7]

11. *Madoc* was born with Southey's drive to abandon what he perceived as a corrupted Europe. In 1793, Southey wrote, "the visions of futurity are dark and gloomy—and the only ray enlivening the scene beams on America" (Carnall 23). In a letter of 1794 to Horace Walpole Bedford, Southey elaborated his plan of escape:

    > Calmly and firmly—after long deliberation I pronounce—I am going to America . . .
    > Should the resolution of others fail, Coleridge and I will go together, and either find repose

> in an Indian wig-wam—or from an Indian tomohawk, but this is the last resource of disappointment and despair . . . .Horace would the state of society be happy where [labor] two hours a day at some useful employment, where all were equally [. . . .] where the common ground was cultivated by common toil, and its produce laid in common granaries, where none were rich because none should be poor, where every motive for vice should be annihilated and every motive for virtue strengthened? . . . far removed from treachery corruption and slaughter [of the present European wars], I go with my brethren and friends to establish that system which can alone prevent such convulsions in the future. (Southey, *New Letters* v. I 70, 73).

The Pantisocratic movement envisioned by Southey, Coleridge, and their circle held that the present unequal distribution of property was the principle cause of immorality in the world. By removing the cause of this evil in a society, based variously on the abolition of private property and on the equal division of shared property, immorality could be eradicated.[8]

12. Southey never reached America. In his original plan for *Madoc*, however, Southey transposed his utopian vision of Pantisocracy onto the Inca society of Peru.[9] Southey conflated Prince Madoc of twelfth-century Wales with Manco Capac, the reigning Inca King during the invasion of Pizarro, thereby suggesting, somewhat anachronistically, that the Incas were originally Welsh. Southey explains:

> it is my intention ‹on› the basis of the isocratic system to erect my Madoc— when Peru was discovered by Pizarro the whole country was divided into three parts. the King & the Priests had one each. the remaining part was the property of the nation—they cultivated it by their common toil—the produce was laid up in common storehouses—& enjoyed by all according to their respective wants. individual property thus annihilated—all motives for vice necessarily ceased. this system was established by Mango Capac. suppose the King & the Priests two wens of the state that sprung forth in after ages—make Mango Capac—Madoc & you see the main design of the poem. (Quoted in Pratt, "Pantisocratic" 34-9)[10]

Despite this plan, the final published version of *Madoc* was set, not in Peru, but in Florida, and in a Florida identified as Mexican Aztlan, mythical homeland of the Aztecs, explicitly described in language borrowed from the Spanish chronicles of the discovery of Mexico.[11]

13. In the 1805 version of *Madoc*, Southey drew upon the legend, then experiencing renewed popularity, that Prince Madoc discovered America in the year 1170, there to found a harmoniously integrated colony of Welsh Indians. Madoc and his followers were believed to have assimilated into Mexican life while preserving the Welsh language and religion. Hosts of European travelers from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, as well as the wave of Welsh settlers that arrived in America around 1666, bore this story out, attesting to encounters with Welsh-speaking Indians in the southern parts of North America and areas of the West Indies. These accounts were in turn used to argue that Britain's peacefully established claim to America predated Spain's by over 300 years. By contrast with the Black Legend, in Southey's retelling, Madoc and his people are not motivated by the desire for gain. Madoc and his followers, rather, are political exiles, fleeing the tyrannical reign of Madoc's brother, King David, who has been duped into marriage with an English princess as part of the Plantagenet strategy of Celtic conquest. Madoc arrives in America as anything but a conquering hero. On touching land, he is beseeched by the oppressed native Hoamen to free them from the Aztec warlords who demand human sacrifice from them. Madoc is drawn into war, but only, Southey insists, to protect the innocent Hoamen. After the expulsion of the Aztecs, the Hoamen found a new society with their Welsh protectors.

14. The necessity of rewriting the Spanish conquest of America as a peaceful and benevolent British conquest could not have been more palpable.[12] Even while the lessons of the Hastings trial weighed heavily on the British conscience, Britain was accelerating its aggressive policy of indirect rule in Spanish America. Despite the power of the Burkean rhetoric of good colonialism, a sense of guilty implication lurked behind Britain's keen interest in the death throes of the Spanish empire. [13] Cautioning against the dangers of Britain's Spanish American speculation, one early nineteenth-century commentator had this to say about Spain:

    > No sooner did they obtain wealth without labor, than unbridled passions began to predominate, and a love of immoderate enjoyments stamped the Nation with the horrible character of treachery and licentiousness. Woe to the people who obtain wealth without labor! (Quoted in Carnall 109-10) [14]

    Spain was the dominant European colonial power of the immediate past, Britain of the present and future. As such, Spain presented an object lesson about the pitfalls of imperialism. Other commentators recalled Volney's accounts of the ruins of Palmyra, and prophesied that Britain was "doomed, a second Rome, to fall under the attack of the modern Franks" (*Monthly Magazine* 3-4). During this same period, Anna Barbauld's poem, *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven*, appeared, foretelling the decline of London into a primitive state as a result of imperialism and the insatiable expansion of trade.[15]

15. By asserting that the natives of Aztlan had been British from 1170 onwards, Southey could legitimate modern British intervention in the area as having a reference point historically anterior to (and morally superior to) Spain's. To support this claim, Southey noted in the preface to *Madoc*: "Strong evidence has been adduced that [Madoc] reached America, and that his posterity exist there to this day, on the southern branches of the Missouri, retaining their complexion, their language, and, in some degree, their arts" (Southey, *Madoc* 8-9).[16] But Southey's portrayal of good colonialism exceeds its own rhetoric even more terrifically than Burke's. In the first place, the very existence of the Madoc legend depends upon violent colonial encounter. England's brutal and unjust invasion of Wales is the exact condition of possibility for Madoc's guiltless colonization of America. If Burke's "myth of imperial venerability" relied on the scapegoating of Warren Hastings as the repository of all colonial evils, then Southey outdid his predecessor in casting England itself as the villain whose abjection would ensure the goodness of Madoc's colonial mission (Suleri 45). And if Hastings's acquittal was preordained by a nation seduced by the nascent ideology of free trade, one could hardly expect the indictment of ancient England in the era that witnessed the birth of English nationalism. The contemporary reader of *Madoc* was thus caught between his or her allegiance to England as a colonial power and the growing awareness of the Celtic victims of English colonialism, thus forwarding the Romantic-era identification of the British subject with both colonizer and colonized.

16. This contradictory double allegiance was at the center of Southey's depiction of the exploits of the Welsh Prince Madoc. The growth of Welsh nationalism, in which Madoc and other Welsh heroes were called upon to support the growth of a Welsh identity as separate from, and even opposed to a British identity, was concomitant with that of English nationalism in the late eighteenth century.[17] According to Gwyn Williams, "Madoc fever was part of a crisis of modernization of much of Welsh society in this period, and the dream of rediscovering the lost Welsh Indians had much in common with the desire to recreate Druidism or the patriarchal language" (G. Williams 569).[18] Welsh nationalism reached men such as Southey and Dr. Johnson via a strong cadre of Welsh intellectuals living in London, one of their most prominent members, the mythologist and cultural activist, Iolo Morganwyg, being the man who persuaded Southey to tackle the theme of Madoc. Welsh patriot-scholars now held themselves—and not the English—to be the continuators of the originary Britons; it was the Welsh Druids and Celts who had staved off Saxon, Norman, and Roman invasions until their defeat by the English. While, on the one hand, shared imperial endeavor abroad aided the formation of an authentically British governing

elite, on the other, Britain was being riven apart by budding Celtic patriotism.[19] As such, the internecine warfare racking the house of Owen evoked for *Madoc*'s British readers the conflicts erupting as the Celtic periphery struggled for greater independence from its English overlords. Southey's treatment of Madoc, thus, did not convey a neutral presumption of Welsh history *as* British history but rather, thanks to the success of the Romantic Celtic revival, the celebration of a radical Britishness that might indeed exclude England.[20]

17. Even as Southey necessarily foregrounded the violence of conquest, he awkwardly strove to banish it from his poem by rejecting the trappings of epic in favor of those of sentimental literature (Southey, *Madoc* 9).[21] The 1794 version of *Madoc* openly rejects Aeneas as a heroic role model:

    > Daring was he who on the wild waves first
    > Launched his bold bark and to the inconstant wind
    > Unfurld the sail—an iron-hearted man!
    > So sang the Roman lyrist. But more firm
    > Deem I that man who the unfrequented path
    > Of Justice, firmly treads, unheeding he
    > The contumelies of that misguided crowd
    > That thronging in the beaten road of Error
    > Scoff at the traveller of the unknown way. (Southey, *Madoc* 1794)

    After attributing such "justice" to their cause, Southey proceeded to cleanse his conquerors of their obligatory violence by portraying them as the victims of a cruelty that outstripped that which they would exert. By repeatedly identifying the Welsh-English conflict with the Hoaman-Aztec conflict, and then by melding the Welsh and the Hoamen into one race, Southey could ultimately present the conquest of the Aztecs as direct and natural retribution for the incursions of England upon Wales.

18. This transposition from the Welsh stage to Aztlan depended first on the *a priori* sameness of the Hoamen and the Welsh. Upon encountering the Hoamen, Madoc aptly notes:

    > . . . Fearless sure they were,
    > And while they eyed us, grasped their spears, as if,
    > Like Britain's injured but unconquered sons,
    > They, too, had known how perilous it was
    > To let a stranger, if he came in arms,
    > Set foot upon their land. (Southey, *Madoc* 45-6)

    Then, as the Hoamen, discerning the good intentions of Madoc's men, proceed to kill a deer with which to feast their guests, they bring more honor upon themselves, even outdoing the Welsh with whom they are compared, and, like Burke's Indians, inverting the standard trope by which natives are to civilized Europeans what children are to adults:

    > . . . the true shaft
    > Scarce with the distant victim's blood had stained
    > Its point, when instantly he dropped and died,
    > Such deadly juice imbued it. Yet on this
    > We made our meal unharmed; and I perceived
    > The wisest leech, that ever in our world
    > Culled herbs of hidden virtue, was to these
    > A child in knowledge. (Southey, *Madoc* 46)

Southey not only admits the Hoamen's similarity to the Welsh—and indeed, their superiority in certain arts, he also emplots an extensive set of parallels between his Hoaman and Welsh protagonists. The most significant of these parallels is that between Madoc and the Aztec leader, Malinal, who renounces his morally corrupt people to live among the Hoamen. Both Malinal and Madoc are conscientious exiles from their brothers' courts.[22] Both heroes, on quitting their native kingdoms, have taken up the righteous cause of the Hoamen. Madoc's proposal of marriage to Queen Erillyab:

> 'Sister and Queen . . . here let us hold united reign
> O'er our united people; by one faith,
> One interest, bound, and closer to be linked
> By laws and language, and domestic ties,
> Till both become one race, for evermore
> Indissolubly knit' (Southey, *Madoc* 357)

complements Malinal's betrothal to Madoc's sister, Goervyl. Madoc declares to Malinal:

> 'True friend . . . And brother mine . . .
> . . . Goervyl hath my charge
> To quite thee for thy service with herself;
> That so thou mayest raise up seed to me
> Of mine own blood, who may inherit here
> The obedience of thy people and of mine.' (Southey, *Madoc* 323-4)

In war as in love, Malinal functions as Madoc's double. While Madoc fights the Aztecs, Malinal drives the invaders from the Welsh-Hoaman village. As one assailant pursues Goervyl, Malinal valiantly "thrust[s] into his groin / The mortal sword of Madoc" (Southey, *Madoc* 314). And following their final defeat by Malinal, Southey notes significantly that the repulsed Aztecs retreat "as midnight thieves / Who find the master waking" (Southey, *Madoc* 308).

19. The relationship between Malinal and Madoc not only argues for the sameness of colonizer and colonized, it helps articulate the necessary hybridity of both. Though hybridity theory is rarely brought to bear on Americanist texts by British authors of the Romantic era, the relationship between Malinal and Madoc, like that between the English colonist and Indian native in Rudyard Kipling's "Naboth," exemplifies "the hybridity of imagined communities" through the "emergence of the interstices—the overlap and displacement of difference" where cultures are restructured (Bhabha, *Location* 5, 2).[23] Indeed, Southey's choice of the name, Malinal, was no accident. In her treatment of the figure of La Malinche, Cortés's Aztec mistress and the translator who made possible the Spanish defeat of Aztlan, Sandra Cypess explains that the name, La Malinche, was formed by combining the Nahuatl birth name, Malinal, and its variant Malintzin, with Marina, the name given to La Malinche at her Christian baptism. As such, according to Cypess, the name La Malinche must be understood as a quintessential "syncretic, mestizo form" (Cypess 2). Being widely read in the Spanish chronicles of discovery, Southey was undoubtedly aware of both the debt the Spaniards owed to La Malinche/Malinal for their victory over the Aztecs, and of the fact that La Malinche's/Malinal's child by Cortés, Don Martín, "was considered the first mestizo, origin of the Mexican nation, the union of Amerindian and European" (Cypess 9).

20. Southey's rewriting of La Malinche as the Aztec warrior and future husband of the Welsh Princess Goervyl restores honor to the much maligned, "traitorous" Malinche, just as the substitution of Prince Madoc for the barbarous Cortés resuscitates a righteous vision of colonialism. Together, these rewritings serve to replace the scene of desperate native betrayal by the Spanish with one of enlightened native collaboration with the British. By his identification with Malinal, Madoc too

becomes a figure of hybridity, redeeming the ideal of cultural blending from the degraded regimes of Aztec and English oppression. Though in 1805, America may not yet have been completely deprived of its alterity, the process of creolization was well under way, and the white creole populations of Spanish America, with the help of British patronage, were on the eve of declaring independence. In *Madoc*, the rhetoric of which "shows an 'Indianisation' of Europe as the inevitable corollary of the 'Europeanisation' of America," one feels the adumbration of Spanish American independence, and of Southey's hope that Britain's continuing involvement be beneficent rather than mercenary (Mason 8). [24]

21. Hartley and Godwin had provided Southey with the rationale for connecting self-interested affection with more capacious benevolence. According to Godwin, family affection represented personal love that, in a just and rational social order, blossomed into the love of one's nation, and from there, into the love of all peoples. Southey's envisioned bicultural merging between Welsh and Hoamen substitutes the consolidating turning-inward of familial affinity for the acquisitive turning-outward of imperial expansion. But when Madoc is drawn into tribal warfare on behalf of his new Hoamen relations, Southey's elaborate machinery for replacing conquest with reciprocal love reveals its fatal flaw. It is paradoxically by yielding himself too fully to his sympathy and identification with the Hoamen that Madoc ends by recapitulating the deeds of Cortés and annihilating the Aztec race. When a Hoaman boy "place[s] / The falchion in [Madoc's] hand, and g[ives] the shield, / And point[s] south and west, that [he] should go / To conquer and protect," Madoc works himself into a frenzy of sympathy that results in unreflecting violent retribution: "I shuddered, and my hand / Instinctively unsheathed the avenging sword" (Southey, *Madoc* 50, 54). Rather than providing a retreat from colonial violence, family love is marshaled to inspire and justify imperial punishment. Here, as elsewhere, Southey refused to differentiate between colonizer and colonized, designing instead "to elicit a sense of moral kinship with peoples of different customs and faiths" according to the belief that "self-transcendence, was the starting point for . . . human reformation" (Meachen 592). But while a belief in self-transcendence for the good of the group was seminal in Southey's disposition against violent conquest, it was precisely that impulse which involuntarily recapitulated the actions of the conqueror. Because "the justification of violence is developed in reaction to the dangers which threaten it," *Madoc* inadvertently foregrounds the violence it meant to suppress by its exaltation of the family (Meachen 605).

22. The convenient identification with nature itself prevents this supplemental violence from destabilizing the precarious balance between aggressor and victim. Through a series of metonyms, Queen Erillyab is represented as the direct extension of Aztlan.[25] Madoc, as Erillyab's husband/brother, commands this relationship as well. As such, the final confrontation that determines the Aztecs' expulsion is resolved, not in a contest of arms, but in the combined natural disasters of a spontaneous volcanic eruption and flood which cause the retreating Aztecs to cry in dismay: "The Gods are leagued with them! . . . the Elements / Banded against us! For our overthrow / Were yonder mountain-springs of fire ordained; / For our destruction the earth-thunders loosed" (Southey, *Madoc* 383).[26]

23. The naturalized Welsh-Hoaman defeat of the Aztecs redeems the Welsh defeat by their Catholic English conquerors and represents the symbolic triumph of good British colonialism over Catholic Spanish conquest. Medieval England's identification with Spain by way of their shared faith eases the strain of Southey's anti-English rhetoric. Madoc's verbal assault on the English troops occupying his homeland is indeed conspicuous more for its anti-Catholic stance than for any anti-English sentiment:

> . . . we received the law of Christ
> Many a long age before your pirate sires
> Had left their forest dens . . .
> . . . Ye think, perchance,
> That, like your own poor, woman-hearted King,

> We, too, in Gwyneth are to take the yoke
> Of Rome upon our necks; but you may tell
> Your Pope, that, when I sail upon the seas,
> I shall not strike so much as a topsail for the breath
> Of all his maledictions! (Southey, *Madoc* 126-7)

The parallel between Catholicism and the Aztec religion that facilitates Madoc's defeat of the Aztecs is unmistakable in the following juxtaposition of scenes. In the first scene, Madoc discovers an English plot to exhume his father's bones and discard them "In some unhallowed pit, with foul disgrace / And contumelious wrong" (Southey, *Madoc* 128). Madoc succeeds in interrupting the "irreverent work" of their "polluted hands" and, turning the situation to advantage, forces the Catholic ministers to repackage King Owen's bones for transport to America (Southey, *Madoc* 130, 131). On American soil, Madoc performs a strikingly similar restitution of the defiled Hoaman patriarch. Coanocotzin, the Aztec King, has desecrated the Hoaman King Tepollomi's mummified corpse: "the dead Tepollomi / Stood up against the wall, by devilish art / Preserved; and from his black and shrivelled hand / The steady lamp hung down." Madoc exclaims, in an echo of his injunction to the Catholic gravediggers: " . . . till that body in the grave be laid, / Till thy polluted altars be made pure, / There is no peace between us," and proceeds to destroy the Aztec temple (Southey, *Madoc* 61).[27]

24. According to the Black Legend, the dissipation of Catholic Spain derived from its acquisitiveness, greed, and taste for ostentation. It was the dread lest Britain exhibit such traits in its actions abroad that had lent such force to Burke's attack on Hastings. As Britain began to emerge as "a state in the disguise of a merchant," Southey, like Burke, vilified all that was economically speculative in order to purge the colonial project of its perceived inhumanity (Burke, quoted in Browne 95). Southey warmly agreed with Charles Hall's polemic, *The Effects of Civilization*, which appeared in the same year as *Madoc*, when it claimed that "Trade knows no friends or kindred . . . —avarice no compassion—gain no bounds" (Hall, quoted in Carnall 4). From its opening stanzas, *Madoc* takes a firm stand against the celebration of commercial values:

> Blow fairly winds of Heaven! ye ocean waves
> Swell not in anger to that fated fleet,
> For not of conquest greedy, not the sons
> Of Commerce, merchandizing blood, they seek
> The distant land. —blow fairly winds of Heaven!
> Ye ocean waves bear safe your blameless load! (Southey, quoted in Pratt, 'Revising" 155)

From the debates on free trade to those on the dangers of nurturing too fine a sensibility engaged by sentimental novelists from Radcliffe to Austen, the fear that Britain might be hastening toward its decadence weighed on the public mind at the turn of the century. The conservative opposition to free trade that Southey shared with Burke is manifest in the former's attempt to free his Welsh protagonists from the stain of showiness by emphasizing instead the superstitious vanity of the Aztecs. According to Southey's sources, the Aztecs kept "the gods of the conquered nations . . . fastened and caged in the Mexican temples" (Southey, *Madoc* 419). Like the burgeoning British market for oriental commodities, the Aztecs' collection of specimens from their conquered subjects pretended to the classical glory of empire while nurturing avarice.[28] But even as Madoc's destruction of the Aztec temples marks an end to acquisitive empire, Southey's aim of rationality and sobriety is compromised by the poem's own explicitly exoticist allure.[29] Although Southey ostensibly privileges Welsh simplicity over Aztec gaudiness, this program is compromised by the dazzling visual effects of such lines as:

> Little did then his pomp of plumes bestead
> The Azteca, or glittering pride of gold,

> Against the tempered sword; little his casque,
> Gay with its feathery coronal, or dressed
> In graven terrors, when the Briton's hand
> Drove in through the helm and head the short-piked mace. (Southey, *Madoc* 301)

Such is the contradiction of an exoticist poem conceived as the embodiment of the rational humanist ideals of Hartley and Godwin.

25. Again, the reader of *Madoc* is confronted with a seemingly unassimilable composite identification with both the colonial aggressor and his victim. Yet whereas before, this double identification was sanctioned by nature itself, now the narration of Madoc's triumph implicates the hero and his partisans/audience in an enjoyment of the "pomp of plumes" that has come to define the Catholic/Aztec adversary. *Madoc*'s uncomfortable flirtation with the luxuriousness of the enemy was left to stand until 1815, when Southey prepared a new edition of the poem. The revised preface reversed the passage indicating the survival of Madoc's legacy in America. The new version read: "That country has now been fully explored; and, wherever Madoc may have settled, it is now certain that no Welsh Indians are to be found upon any branches of the Missouri" (Southey, *Madoc* 1815). This erasure of the Welsh Indians effectively neutralized Madoc's violent conquest, insofar as Madoc's progeny became the victims of a greater, but unnamed, expansionist violence that had wiped away Britain's claim to America, leaving nothing but a legend of legitimacy to counter the looming specter of culpability. Madoc's success as a colonist who achieves complete sameness with those he colonizes, and who therefore expiates the violence of his conquest, is thus ultimately contingent on his destruction by a later and less scrupulous European expansionism.

26. Burke's failure to change the course of the British empire in India and America, and Madoc's failure to sustain a viable British title to New Spain are essential to the Romantic ideology of good colonialism. Burke himself was keenly aware of the emotional force of such grandiose failures:

> I am convinced we have a degree of delight, and that no small one, in the real misfortunes and pains of others . . . The prosperity of no empire, nor the grandeur of no king, can so agreeably affect in the reading, as the ruin of the state of Macedon, and the distress of its unhappy prince. (Burke, *Philosophical Enquiry* v. I 80)

In his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Adam Smith had maintained that the harmonious natural order of the universe favored economic freedom—what would become free trade in *The Wealth of Nations*—as beneficial to the greatest number of people. According to Smith, a natural link inhered between moral virtue and free trade, insofar as "the road to virtue and that to fortune . . . are, happily in most cases, very nearly the same" (Smith 63). If a conservative vision of good colonialism were to compete with such powerful liberal rhetoric, it would need to insist on the cruel and unnatural efficiency of free trade imperialism.

27. The contrasting naturalness and inefficiency, and the resulting failure, of good colonialism, by its identification with the colonial victim, guaranteed its innocence and obscured its operations of power behind a veil of pathos. Burke and Southey saw good colonialism as the only principled reaction against self-interested commerce. But the rhetoric of colonial unassailability that they developed was short lived. By 1858, the British crown had assumed direct control over India, and Victoria had been crowned Empress of India. In place of indirect rule, "there had emerged a belligerent militarism which borrowed is rhetorical style, and its political culture if not its colonial policies, from the same Roman imperial imagery which had driven earlier European empires" (Pagden 8). It is a bitter irony that, in attempting to stem the tide of capitalist exploitation overseas, Burke and Southey unwittingly helped create the rhetorical resources upon which the distinctly *illiberal* imperialist resurgence of the Victorian

Era would draw.

Notes

[1] I am indebted to Sara Suleri's *The Rhetoric of English India* for drawing my attention to this document.

[2] My translation. The original text reads: "Dos maneras generales y principales han tenido los que allá han pasado . . . en estirpar y raer de la haz de la tierra a aquellas miserandas naciones. La una por injusticias, crueles, sangrientas y tiránicas guerras. La otra . . . opimiéndolos con la más dura, horrible, y áspera servidumbre en que jamás hombres ni bestias pudieron ser puestas . . . . La causa porque han muerto y destruido tantas y tales . . . ha sido solamente por tener por su fin último el oro y henchirse de riquezas en muy breves días, y a subir a estados muy altos y sin proporción de sus personas."

[3] In his *Speech on Conciliation with America*, Burke exemplifies this nostalgia for the colonial era before the Peace of Paris when he urges that Britain "return to that mode which a uniform experience has marked out to you as best, and in which you walked with security, advantage, and honor, until the year 1763" (Burke 108). Before the rise to power of Lord North and the application of George III's coercive bills, Burke continues, "everything was sweetly and harmoniously disposed" and the empire was "more united than it is now" (Burke 122). Burke's proposed conciliation with America, as opposed to economically "sophistical" imperialism, "is what becomes the dignity of a ruling people—gratuitous, unconditional, and not held out as a matter of bargain and sale" (Burke 76, 126).

[4] Sara Suleri insightfully notes: "Burke supplies imperial England with an idiom in which to articulate its emergent suspicion that the health of the colonizing project was dependent on a recognition of the potentially crippling structure of imperial culpability" (Suleri 26).

[5] Popham et. al. were far from the only British officers to make an attempt on Argentina. Among the more well-known British colonialists, John Constanse Davie, who wrote *Letters from Paraguay* (1805), one of the earliest British travel accounts about Spanish America, also conspired to wrest the Plata region of Argentina from Spain.

[6] In his *Speech on Mr. Fox's East-India Bill*, Burke explains that although the people of India are not descended of the English, they match—and even precede—the English in civilization and dignity: "This multitude of men does not consist of an abject and barbarous populace . . . but a people for ages civilized and cultivated; cultivated by all the arts of polished life, whilst we were yet in the woods. There, have been . . . princes once of great dignity, authority, and opulence . . . . There, is to be found an ancient and venerable priesthood, the depository of their laws, learning, and history . . . a nobility of great antiquity and renown; a multitude of cities, not exceeded in population and trade by those of the first class in Europe; merchants and bankers, individual houses of whom have once vied in capital with the bank of England . . . millions of ingenious manufacturers and mechanicks" (Burke 295-96).

[7] Originally envisioned in 1789, the first version of *Madoc* appeared in print in 1794. It was followed by a revised version in 1797 and a final, expanded version in 1805. *Madoc* was reprinted with minor alterations several times throughout the nineteenth century, and was particularly appreciated by the young Shelley and Byron.

[8] George Burnett, who planned to emigrate to America with Southey and Coleridge, described the "grand object" of the Pantisocratic movement as "the Abolition of Property; at least of individual property. Conceiving the present unequal distribution of property, to be the source of by far the greater part of the

moral evil that prevails in the world; by removal of the *cause*, we thought, and as it appears to me justly thought, that the *effect* must also cease" (Quoted in Roe 157).

[9] It should be remembered that Southey's foisting of Pantisocracy onto Inca law is a two-way street, as many of his Pantisocratic ideals came initially from the study of Inca and other Native American civilizations.

[10] Quotations from the Bedford letter follow Pratt's editorial decisions: "‹ . . . › indicates an ellipsis; [. . .] a deletion or an insertion written above the line. Southey's spelling, capitalization, and punctuation have all been retained" (Pratt, "Pantisocratic" 35). Southey habitually spelled Manco Capac as "Mango Capac."

[11] The sources *Madoc* draws on include Peter Martyr, Bernal Díaz's *Historia verdadera*, Gomara's *Conquest of the West India*, Cortés's *Cartas de Relación*, Clavigero, Torquemada, Garcilaso de la Vega, Ercilla y Zuñiga's *La Araucana*, Oviedo's *Relación sumaria de la Historia Natural de las Indias*, de Bry, *La Crónica de Pero Nino*, Herrera, Gregorio García's *Origen de los Indios*, Padilla's *Historia de la Fundación y Discurso de la Provincia de Santiago de Mexico de la orden de los Predicadores*, and del Techo's *History of Paraguay*. Southey also derives information from French, English and Anglo-American sources, such as Lafitau's *Sur les Moeurs de Sauvages Amériquains*, Charlevoix, Roger Williams, Heriot, Timberlake, Mackenzie, Brainerd, and Carver's *Travels*, intermingling details of various tribes and topographies of North and South America, and including the very occasional reference to Asia.

[12] William Robertson's *History of America* (1777) presents another excellent instance of Britain's rescripting of the Spanish conquest of America. In North America, Joel Barlow's epics, *The Vision of Columbus* and the *Columbiad*, represent a project similar both in historical scope and nationalist aims.

[13] Interestingly, Thomas de Quincey identifies the Iberia from which the good colonist of Egypt, Prince Gebir, hails in Walter Savage Landor's eponymous poem as "spiritual England" (Quoted in Leask, 26).

[14] *An Exposé*, 1810, 11. This warning came as a response to the increasingly prevalent wish that Britain, and not Spain, possessed the wealth of Spanish America. One English columnist expressed this desire as follows: "The more I contemplate on the filth and laziness of these people, the more I regret the miserly Henry, when applied to by Columbus, was not inspired by the demon of avarice, if no more laudable motive could have actuated him, to have fitted out that noble adventurer, and by that means to have secured this country, this rich delightful country, to the Crown of Britain. The Spaniards possess blessings they never did, nor ever will know how to appreciate; for, slaves to gold, they neglect every other advantage. Had the English possessed this southern world, thousands and tens of thousands, nay millions, would have blest the hour when they became their conquerors" (Quoted in Jones 65-6).

[15] Significantly, Barbauld's poem was met by an anxious rebuttal from Southey the reviewer, and the aging Barbauld suffered vicious attacks, both on her poem and her person, by a host of intellectuals who had previously supported her work.

[16] All further references to *Madoc* will be to this edition unless otherwise stated.

[17] In addition to Madoc, the example of Owain Glyndwr is particularly characteristic. After being considered throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as a "usurper or misguided rebel . . . . Glendwr seems to burst forth in splendor in the 1770s as a national hero" (Morgan 81). During the same period, a new and widely-read version of Madoc's history appeared in 1790, by Dr. John Williams.

[18] See also Gwyn Williams's *In Search of Beulah Land* for an extensive treatment of the Welsh renaissance.

[19] Linda Colley notes, "Rich, landed, and talented males from Wales, Scotland, England, and to a lesser extent Ireland became welded later in the 1770s into a single ruling class that intermarried, shared the same outlook, and took to itself the business of governing, fighting for, and profiting from greater Britain" (Colley, 325-6).

[20] Significantly, when John Evans was sent in 1790 to investigate the Welsh Indians, he was financed, not by the British government, but by the Welsh. Kindled by the American Revolution, Welsh interest in America focused on the movement to immigrate to America in order to found a Welsh-speaking colony in the new republic.

[21] Southey believed that the "general fault of Epic Poems is, that we feel little interest for the Heroes they celebrate [. . .] to engage the unprejudiced, there must be more of human feelings than is generally to be found in the character of Warriors." (Southey, *Joan of Arc*, quoted in Pratt, "Revising" 153). However, as Pratt says, "This did not mean that Southey was to follow the example of some of his contemporaries and attempt to produce a pacifist epic" (Pratt, "Revising" 153). The example of a pacifist epic cited by Pratt is Joseph Cottle's rather limp *Alfred, An Epic Poem, in Twenty-Four Books* (1800). Southey's generic revisionism did not sit well with reviewers, one of whom sardonically quipped: "We behold the author mounted on a strange animal, something between a rough Welsh pony and a Peruvian sheep, whose utmost capriole only tends to land him in the mud," and more sarcastically: "there is nothing in Homer, Virgil, or Milton, in any degree resembling the beauties of *Madoc*" (Ferriar 104).

[22] The link between Madoc and Malinal is naturalized via ritual engagement with American soil. Malinal approaches Madoc just as the latter has finished interring his father's bones. As Malinal speaks, "In sorrow come I here, a banished man . . . Cut off from all my kin, from all old ties / Divorced," one recalls Madoc's flight from his brother's corrupt reign. Poignantly, Malinal's brother, the Aztec leader, Yuhudthiton, is there to hear this speech, and like the Welsh King David, haunted by his brother's righteous words, "hearkened he as one whose heart perforce / Suppressed its instinct" (Southey, *Madoc* 227-8).

[23] Work by Sara Suleri, Homi Bhabha, and Gayatri Spivak has opened the subject of colonial complicity in the representation of British India, revealing "the dynamic of powerlessness underlying the telling of colonial stories" (Suleri, 1). See Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* and Homi K. Bhabha, "The Other Question: The Stereotype and Colonial Discourse."

[24] In this context, it is worth exploring the extent to which Southey's *Madoc* was influenced by Alfonso de Ercilla y Zuñiga's sixteenth-century creole epic *La Araucana*, which he knew of through William Hayley's *An Essay on Epic Poetry* (1782).

In 1807, Southey wrote, without much hope, "We are going upon a wrong plan with respect to South America, and a ruinous one . . . . What should be done is to throw the Spanish colonies open, and leave them alone" (Quoted in Humphreys 8).

[25] Madoc's encomium on Aztlan reveals an inability to separate the land from the woman he conquers: "Queen of the Valley! thou art beautiful!" (Southey, *Madoc* 356). This aspect of Southey's strategy for naturalizing conquest is very much in line with the tradition of Spanish conquest narratives against and over which he wrote. Annette Kolodny points out that standard colonial discourse encodes a gendered ur-narrative by which the American land is conflated with the native woman. See Annette Kolodny, *The Lay of the Land: Metaphor as Experience and History in American life and letters*.

[26] Southey's implicit reference to the natural devastation of imperial Rome is clearly no accident, and

participates in a larger discourse that defined Spanish American volcanic activity, like its Italian correlative, as a warning against the arrogance of empire.

[27] Conflations of Catholics and Aztecs abound in *Madoc*. In another scene, the Aztecs "piled a heap of sedge before our host, / And warned us: 'Sons of Ocean! from the land / Of Aztlan, while ye may, depart in peace! / Before the fire hence shall be extinguished, hence! / Or, even as yon dry sedge amid the flame, / So shall ye be consumed.' The arid heap / They kindled, and the rapid flame ran up, / And blazed, and died away (Southey, *Madoc* 65). Southey furnishes this action with a footnote that leaves no room for misunderstanding his design of dissolving Aztec crimes into Catholic ones: "As the sacring of the new-elected pope passeth (as the manner is) before St. Gregory's Chapel, the master of the ceremonies goeth before him, bearing two dry reeds, at the end of the one a burning candle tied, and at the other a handfull of flax, the which he setteth on fire, saying, with a loud voice, 'Pater Sancte, sic trasit gloria mundi" (Southey, *Madoc* 171n).

[28] Nigel Leask explains that British demand for Chinoiserie in the Romantic Era is "rationalized in terms of an (always risky) analogy with the imperial triumphs of the classical world. For the orientalist poet Tom Medwin, English Romantic literature found a precedent and alibi in the Athenian practice of incorporating the imagery of its subjugated enemies into its own culture, caryatids from the Peloponnese, flowery eastern capitals from Persia" (Leask 8).

[29] For an shrewd analysis of how eighteenth-century British painting also worked to soften the violent seizure of American lands by portraying Native Americans, rather than their conquerors, as seduced by commodities, see B. Fowkes Tobin, *Picturing Imperial Power: Colonial Subjects in Eighteenth-Century British Painting*, 56-80.

Works Cited

Barlow, Joel. *The Columbiad: A Poem*. Philadelphia, 1807.

---. *The Vision of Columbus: A Poem in Nine Books*. Hartford, 1787.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

---. "The Other Question: The Stereotype and Colonial Discourse." *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory, A Reader*. Ed. K. M. Newton. New York: Saint Martin's Press, 1997. 293-301.

Browne, Stephen H. *Edmund Burke and the Discourse of Virtue*. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 1993.

Burke, Edmund. *On Empire, Liberty, and Reform: Speeches and Letters*. Ed. David Bromwich. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000.

---. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful*. *The Works of the Right Honourable Edmund Burke*. Vol. 1. London, 1869.

Carnall, Geoffrey. *Robert Southey and His Age: The Growth of a Conservative Mind*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Colley, Linda. "Britishness and Otherness: An Argument." *Journal of British Studies* 31.4 (1992): 309-329.

Cottle, Joseph. *Alfred, An Epic Poem, in Twenty-Four Books*. London, 1800.

Cypess, Sandra Messinger. *La Malinche in Mexican Literature: From History to Myth*. Austin: U of Texas,

1991.

Davie, John Constanse. *Letters from Paraguay : describing the settlements of Montevideo an[d] Buenos Ayres; the presidencies of Rioja Minor, Nombre de Dios, St. Mary and St. John, &c. &c. with the manners, customs, religious ceremonies, & c of the inhabitants*. London, 1805.

de Ercilla y Zuñiga, Alfonso. *La Araucana*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1993.

de las Casas, Bartolomé. *Brevísima relación de la destruición de las Indias*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1996.

Ferriar, John, unsigned review. *Robert Southey: The Critical Heritage*. Ed. Lionel Madden. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972. 102-104.

Hall, Charles. *The Effects of Civilization on the People in the European States*. London, 1805.

Hayley, William. *An Essay on Epic Poetry*. London, 1782.

History of the Trial of Warren Hastings: Containing the Whole of the Proceedings and Debates in Both Houses of Parliament. London, 1796.

Humphreys, Robert A. *Robert Southey and his 'History of Brazil'*. London: The Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Council, 1978.

Jones, Calvin. *Spanish America in Selected British Periodicals, 1800-1830*. Diss., U of Kentucky, 1966.

Kolodny, Annette. *The Lay of the Land: Metaphor as Experience and History in American life and letters*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1975.

Leask, Nigel. *British Romantic Writers and the East: Anxieties of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Liss, Peggy K. *Atlantic Empires: The Network of Trade and Revolution 1713-1826*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1983.

Mason, Peter. *Deconstructing America: Representations of the Other*. London, New York: Routledge, 1990.

Meachen, Edward. "History and Transcendence in Robert Southey's Epic Poems." *Studies in English Literature* 19 (1979): 589-608.

The Monthly Magazine. London, Feb. 1811.

Morgan, Prys. "From a Death to a View: The Hunt for the Welsh Past in the Romantic Period." *The Invention of Tradition*. Ed. E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983. 43-100.

Pagden, Anthony. *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain, and France c. 1500 - c. 1800*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.

Pratt, Lynda. "The Pantisocratic Origins of Robert Southey's *Madoc*: An Unpublished Letter." *Notes and Queries* 244 (March 1999): 34-39.

---. "Revising the National Epic: Coleridge, Southey and *Madoc*." *Romanticism: The Journal of Romantic Culture and Criticism* 2.2 (1996): 149-62.

Robertson, William. *The History of America*. London, 1777.

Roe, Nicholas. *The Politics of Nature: Wordsworth and Some Contemporaries*. New York: Saint Martin's P, 1992.

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Ed. D. D. Raphael and A. L. Macfie. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1976.

Southey, Robert. *Madoc*. *The Poetical Works of Robert Southey*. Vol. 5. Boston, 1860.

---. *Madoc* (1794). K. Curry, "Southey's *Madoc*: The Manuscript of 1794." *Philological Quarterly* 22 (1943): 347-69.

---. *Madoc* (1815). *Poetical Works of Robert Southey, collected by himself*. Vol. 5. London, 1838.

---. *New Letters of Robert Southey.* Vol. 1. Ed. Kenneth Curry. New York: Columbia UP, 1965.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Methuen, 1987.

Suleri, Sara. *The Rhetoric of English India*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1992.

Tobin, B. Fowkes. *Picturing Imperial Power: Colonial Subjects in Eighteenth-Century British Painting*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1999.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. Trans. Richard Howard. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1999.

Williams, Gwyn. "John Evans's Mission to the Madogwys, 1792-1799." *Bulletin of Celtic Studies*. Cardiff: U of Wales P (1978): 569-601.

---. *In Search of Beulah Land*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1980.

Williams, J. "The Establishment of British Commerce with Argentina." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 15 (Feb., 1935): 43-64.