Table of Contents

- About this Volume
- "Introduction"
- Orrin N. C. Wang, University of Maryland
- Essay
- "The Ruins of Empire: Nationalism, Art, and Empire in Hemans's *Modern Greece*"
- Francesco Crocco, Graduate Center, City University of New York
- Essay
- "'A nation or a world': Patriotism in Shelley"
- Matthew C. Borushko, Boston University
- Essay
- "Projection, Patriotism, Surrogation: Handel in Calcutta"
- Daniel O'Quinn, University of Guelph
- Essay
- "Walter Scott, Politeness, and Patriotism"
- Andrew Lincoln, University of London
- Essay
- "'Manlius to Peter Pindar': Satire, Patriotism, and Masculinity in the 1790s"
- Noah Heringman, University of Missouri-Columbia
- Essay
- "Patriot Acts: The Political Language of Heinrich von Kleist"
- Jan Mieszkowski, Reed College
- Essay

Romanticism and Patriotism:
Nation, Empire, Bodies, Rhetoric

About This Volume

This volume of *Romantic Circles Praxis Series* includes an editor's introduction by Orrin N. C. Wang, essays by Francesco Crocco, Matthew C. Borushko, Daniel O'Quinn, Andrew Lincoln, Noah Heringman, and Jan Mieszkowski.

The current cretinization of public, political language is often viewed as synonomous with the discourse of patriotism. This volume begins to demonstrate how complex the vocabulary of patriotism actually is, by investigating its diverse use during the Romantic era. Patriotic nation building is at once linked to and disarticulated from the adventures of empire, the vulgar and excremental body, the cosmopolitan imaginary, and the compulsions of language. These interstices and disconnections constitute the very *recits* of a material, social antagonism that enmesh us to this day.

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 at the University of Maryland. The volume cover and contents page were also designed and marked up by Lisa Marie Rhody.

The cover image *The Hopes of the Party, Prior to July 14th* by James Gillray is reproduced with permission from the Library of Congress.

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 most exciting critical writing of contemporary Romanticist scholarship.

About the Contributors

Orrin N. C. Wang teaches English and Comparative Literature at the University of Maryland. He is the author of *Fantastic Modernity: Dialectical Readings in Romanticism and Theory* (Johns Hopkins, 1996, 2001). He has published in such journals as *Diacritics*, *Studies in Romanticism*, *MLQ*, and *ELH*. He is the

series editor of the *Romantic Circles Praxis Series*.

Francesco Crocco is a Writing Fellow at Lehman College and a graduate student in the Ph.D. Program in English at The Graduate Center of The City University of New York. He is currently writing a dissertation on the role of British Romantic poetry in the construction of British nationalism. He has taught literature and composition courses at Rutgers University-Newark, Baruch College, and Lehman College.

Matthew Boruskho is a doctoral candidate at Boston University. He has published on Percy Bysshe Shelley, and his research concerns the conceptualization and representation of Necessity in Romantic literature.

Daniel O'Quinn is the author of *Staging Governance: Theatrical Imperialism in London, 1770-1800* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2005) and numerous articles on sexuality and empire in the late eighteenth century.

Andrew Lincoln teaches in the School of English and Drama at Queen Mary, University of London. He is currently completing a book entitled *Walter Scott and Modernity*.

Noah Heringman is Associate Professor of English at the University of Missouri-Columbia. He has published a monograph, *Romantic Rocks, Aesthetic Geology* (Cornell UP, 2004), an edited collection, *Romantic Science* (SUNY Press, 2003), and various articles relating poetry to natural history. This is his first publication having nothing to do with rocks.

Jan Mieszkowski is Associate Professor of German and Humanities at Reed College. He is the author of *Labors of Imagination: Aesthetics and Political Economy from Kant to Althusser* (Fordham UP, 2006), and has written a number of other articles about Romanticism, Idealist philosophy, and modern literature and aesthetics.

Romanticism and Patriotism: Nation, Empire, Bodies, Rhetoric

Introduction

Orrin N. C. Wang, University of Maryland

1. In the wake of 9/11 and the U.S. invasion of Iraq, public discourse has undergone a radical impoverishment. It would be naive to assume simply the sophistication of a prior civil discourse, but the cretinization of political argument—the reduction of the current political and global catastrophe we face to a few catch phrases of the "war on terrorism," "good versus evil," and "civilization versus barbarism"—has been too stunning to ignore. Given the martial narrative that U.S. foreign policy has embedded this deracinated vocabulary within, we might assume that such a diminishment of discourse has always been served by the language, or event, of patriotism. However, as the Iraqi war enters a new stage of diminished expectations and increased U.S. public restiveness, and the language of a loyal opposition begins to be spoken, it is clear that reducing patriotism to martial language is not simply a given. Following Claude Levi Strauss and Jim Chandler, we might then note how a prior "hot chronology" of history, one also of national panic and imperial overreach, as well as patriotic dissent, demonstrates even more vividly how patriotism actually registers the contradictions of a time lived and represented in apocalyptic terms (Chandler, 3; Levi-Strauss, 259). The writings of the Romantic era reveal patriotism to be neither simple nor transparent in either its ideological inscriptions or rhetorical performances, a predicament that this collection of *Romantic Circles Praxis* essays, first presented at the NASSR 2005 annual conference in Montreal, begins to explore.

2. Patriotism in its triumphalist form is arguably always melancholic, either implicitly so as the presence that jingoism defends itself against, or explicitly so as that which jingoism in its memorializing mode exploits. As Freud reminds us, melancholy designates a fixed attachment to a lost loved one; in the case of the melancholic triumphalist the patriotic fixation can center on either the lost martial body or the lost purpose of a war increasingly difficult to justify (124-40). As inhabitants of modernity we might, however, first and foremost associate the "lost one" of patriotic melancholy with the nation state, that which paradoxically can never be lost, if patriotism has any constative or performative value to it. Patriotism repudiates this loss by turning itself into the ongoing affirmation, or discovery, of the nation, which makes the obdurate, patriotic professions of nationless individuals an especially melancholy sight.

3. Yet, as Frank Crocco's and Mathew C. Borushko's contributions to this volume attest, the equation of patriotism and nation is itself a complicated reification. Crocco's essay, "The Ruins of Empire," reminds us that the 18th -century historicism of Gibbon and Volney actually disarticulates two terms that we might assume are synonymous with patriotism: nation and empire. For Crocco, Felicia Hemans's *Modern Greece* (1817) paradoxically mimics a Gibbonesque vision of ancient history in order to bring these ideas together, via a modern patriotism that is at once a polemical incursion of female agency into the public arena. Borushko's piece, "`A Nation or A World,'" considers the Romantic non-patriot par excellence, Percy Bysshe Shelley, and shows how much his politics are actually underwritten by what could be called a poetics of patriotism. In Borushko's estimation, Shelley's patriotism is actually one with his visionary cosmopolitanism, an ethical demand for a life lived centrifugally, a love always taking one out of one's private and national self.

4. Danny O'Quinn resituates patriotism within the twin projects of nation-making and imperial adventure, though in a way that transforms the melancholic triumphalist into an even more phantasmic agent of

conflicting desires. In O'Quinn's contribution, “Projection, Patriotism, Surrogation,” the 1793 Calcutta celebrations of the defeat of Tipu Sultan at the hands of the British Army, culminating in the performance of excerpts from Handel's operetta *Judas Maccabaeus*, expose a “masochistic nationalism” that reenacts the trauma of past colonial disasters in order to imagine (never quite successfully, nor simply) the pleasures of future empire. Andrew Lincoln's essay, “Walter Scott, Politeness, and Patriotism,” also measures the distance between metropole and empire in terms of the patriotic envisioning of a nation, in this case Sir Walter Scott's creation of Great Britain out of England and Scotland. Scott's patriotism also takes a surprising form in Lincoln's argument, a Swiftian vulgarity now employed at the start of the nineteenth century to unite disparate social groups separated by modernization. Playing off of Peter Stallybrass's and Allon White's argument about the production of refined politeness, Lincoln sees patriotism in Scott as a “relibidnization” of a national body whose gross reality cuts across class lines but whose unsettling powers are also limited by the mediating procedures of the novel.

5. The gross body also plays a central role in Noah Heringman's study of the “satire wars” of the 1790s. In his “`Manlius to Peter Pindar,'” that body becomes the very material by which the invectives of either a patriotic or unpatriotic stance are made intelligible, as they swirl around the figure of Georgian political satirist (and nemesis) John Wolcot. In their fascination with anal violation and unbridled corpulence, the attacks by and against Wolcot tie the patriotism of a nation to a masculinity in stark contrast to the opportunistic feminine patriotism that Crocco's Hemans will formulate two decades later.

6. Concluding the volume, Jan Mieszkowski's contribution, “Patriot Acts,” departs not only for the continent but also for another perspective beside the historical, focusing on a materiality as ineluctable as that of the body's in Lincoln and Heringman, but one whose generation of affect is now conceived in terms of its linguistic, rather than simply physical, properties. In Heinrich von Kleist, Mieszkowski argues, patriotism is actually the impossible intervention in language's self-affection, “ in the acts by which language seeks to correspond with a form, structure, or law that is, strictly speaking, inconceivable.” Mieszkowski thus both summarizes and reorients one key coordinate in this collection. The patriotic link between nation and self, the problem of political philosophy, becomes the dilemma of a subject subtended by linguistic violence—in Kleist's play, *Die Hermannsschlacht, The Battle of Hermann* (1808), cathected as the redundant sovereignty of one word, “heil.”

7. Both Mieszkowski and Borushko also connect the question of patriotism to that of love, albeit in very different ways. Still, Misekowski's attention to the alterity of language and Borushko's sense of patriotism as a falling out of one's self speak to a further question about patriotism upon which this introduction can conclude. Is there a more radical form of patriotism than that of the loyal opposition, one that, after Derrida, strains past every self-reification, even the ones that cosmopolitanism produces? Can there be a patriotism of the Other? If the force of this question feels like an impossible task that we at this moment cannot afford to fail, Romanticism models for us, both historically and transhistorically, a practice shot through by that same urgency. Dialectically, Romanticism's expressions of social transformation, both libidinal and traumatic, become something more than the cries of a supererogatory utopianism. They constitute instead the very récits of a material, social antagonism that enmesh us to this day.

Works Cited

Chandler, James K. *England in 1819: The Politics of Literary Culture and the Cause of Romantic Historicism* . Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Freud, Sigmund. “Mourning and Melancholia.” *A General Selection From the Works of Sigmund Freud* . Ed.

John Rickman, M.D. New York: Doubleday Anchor. 124-40.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. *The Savage Mind* . Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Romanticism and Patriotism: Nation, Empire, Bodies, Rhetoric

The Ruins of Empire: Nationalism, Art, and Empire in Hemans's *Modern Greece*

Francesco Crocco, Graduate Center, City University of New York

Nothing beside remains. Round the decay
Of that colossal Wreck, boundless and bare
The lone and level sands strech far away
—Percy Bysshe Shelley [1]

Such dim-conceived glories of the brain
Bring round the heart an undescribable feud,
So do these wonders a most dizzy pain,
That mingles Grecian grandeur with the rude
Wasting of the old time—with a billowy main—
A sun—a shadow of a magnitude.
—John Keats [2]

1. At the conclusion of his magisterial history, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* Edward Gibbon confesses, "It was among the ruins of the Capitol that I first conceived the idea of a work which has amused and exercised near twenty years of my life" (II.642-3). Over a decade later and across the channel, C.F. Volney would write *The Ruins or Meditations on the Revolutions of Empires and the Law of Nature,* a text which gained instant popularity among select British reading circles. The invocation to the text echoes Gibbon's sentiment by hailing those sublime and "solitary ruins, holy sepulchers and silent walls" (1), which, while traveling "in the Ottoman dominions, and through those provinces which were anciently the kingdoms of Egypt and Syria" (3) inspired his plan for a philosophical reverie on the causes of the decline and fall of empires. These texts illustrate the depth of interest in relics, ruins, and antiquities that prevailed among late eighteenth- and early ninteenth-century British culture, fed as it were by the parallel developments of Ossianic nation-making and imperial travel narratives. They also establish a unique rhetoric and paradigm of the cyclical decline and fall of empire that will inform later nationalist texts.

2. The literature of the long eighteenth century reflects an uneasiness about the pursuit of empire in the trope of ruins. Proceeding from eighteenth century antiquarianism, the literature of ruins converted the congeries of ruins, relics, and forgeries into artifacts that naturalized and codified a cohesive British identity and continuity of community. [3] But the ruin also performed a separate and sometimes subversive function as a symbol for the historical process of the rise and decline of nations. This hermeneutic diverges into two distinct but related traditions in the eighteenth century. Whereas Gibbon's *Decline* expresses the classical ruin sentiment, which mourns the inevitable decline of empire, in the eighteenth-century this sentiment adopts a different tone—that of the prophet's scorn for the self-destructive pursuit of power and worldly splendor most poignantly expressed in Volney's *Ruins*. [4]

3. Nestled between the fall of the Bastille in 1789 and the fall of Napoleon in 1815, the figurative landscape of British Romantic poetry is frequently littered with ruins. In Romanticism, the ruin motif is expressed and interpreted in various ways; here the literal ruin or monument, there the figurative ruin

of the self, and elsewhere still the formalistic ruin of the Romantic fragment poem, with all of its unsettled meaning. [5] Among other readings, this study proposes that the literal ruin is politically overdetermined as a motif in Romantic poetry, possessing an acute political currency in a stormy period characterized by war, transience, and political extremes. Bruce Haley has argued that when Romantics write about ruins and monuments, they act "to restore damaged, faded, or unfamiliar figures to the status of living forms"—forms that can express meaning (5). Because there is an essential anxiety that the ruin or monument, as a record, fails to express its *idea* or even the characteristics of its central figure without the aid of an interpretive apparatus often consisting of adjoining visual forms and inscriptions, the monument poem must recover the muted and dead form of the central figure and make it live and speak again (3). However, this imagines that the poet can imaginatively recreate the cultural and ideological matrix that once determined meaning for the figure, a kind of Romantic archeology. My contention is that rather than *restore* meaning, the poet *refurbishes* meaning using contemporary ideological materiel. The monument poem breathes life into a dead form so that it may speak to a contemporary audience. Furthermore, the message is mediated in transmission and reception, and is thus subject to a host of aesthetic, cultural, historical, and ideological forces. For instance, if we take Shelley's *Ozymandias* (1818) and Keats' *On Seeing the Elgin Marbles* (1817) and reread these poems from within this hermeneutic they do not appear as restorations at all. Hence, when Shelley recovers the figure of Ozymandias, it is not his leadership and omnipotence that is conveyed by the poem's interpretative apparatus, which would have been the intention of the record, but rather his cruelty and the transience of empire (which admittedly may have been how it was originally received). Likewise, Keats takes the Elgin Marbles not as evidence of everlasting Grecian grandeur, but as symbols of the inevitable decay wrought by time. The refurbishing of meaning that occurs in these poems, as I stated above, is overdetermined by the political unconscious of a less sanguine age, where the drive for insatiable power and grandeur appear as deadly hubris. Ultimately, these poems are mediated by historical, cultural, and ideological transactions that place them within a broader national and international conversation over the direction of national politics, the arc of imperial desire, and the anxiety generated by these overlapping vectors, an anxiety frequently troped as ruin.

4. Proceeding from this methodological stance, this study will discuss the importance of the trope of ruins and the paradigm of decline and fall to the rhetoric of nationalism and imperialism in Felicia Hemans's *Modern Greece* (1817). In the poem, Hemans adopts a historicist narrative position reminiscent of Gibbon and Volney, replete with "objective" detachment, episodic flashbacks, sentimentalism, and magniloquent conclusions. Yet, contrary to the republican commonplace that nation and empire are ultimately incompatible, Hemans draws the opposite conclusion: Western nation-making and imperialism are *interdependent* . But this contention is made conditional upon the active participation of women in patriotic discourse. Through the discourse of (uncritical) patriotism, a site where women could in fact make their presence felt during her time, Hemans sought to broaden the role of women in political and public English life, and would herself become widely hailed as a model of domestic patriotism. In *Modern Greece,* which is an adaptation of the conventionally masculine travelogue genre, she is sensitive to the hazards of this project, employing innovative generic modes and narratological structures to manage the public fallout of gender-based discursive transgressions. Once accessible by this stage work, the poem can then specifically accomplish the broadening of the role of contemporary women by arguing that the fall of ancient Greece occurred because of the failed education of its youth, itself a consequence of restricting the influence of Greece's mothers in Greek civil society. In making this argument, Hemans actively disputes the view that Greece's national decline was fated because of its imperialist designs, thereby restoring the link between nation-making and empire that Gibbon, Volney, and a tradition of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century texts had warned against. Instead, she issues her own equally apocalyptic warning to the nation: if Britain is to avoid Greece's tragic but avertable fate, it must find a place for patriotic women to speak and write in the public sphere.

I. Nation and Empire in British Self-Construction

5. The centrality of empire to the constitution of British identity is by now fairly well established. Picking up from Renan's claim that forgetting is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation (45), and Anderson's claim that a nation is above all an "imagined community," Linda Colley has argued that Britishness was quite literally "forged" from conflicting and internally fractious Scottish, Welsh, English, and Irish communities—not primarily through political Acts of Union (1707 & 1801), but through the mechanism of othering. Colley argues that Britain was "an invention forged above all by war." She continues,

   > They [the British] defined themselves as Protestants struggling for survival against the world's foremost Catholic power. They defined themselves against the French as they imagined them to be, superstitious, militarist, decadent and unfree. And, increasingly as the wars went on, they defined themselves in contrast to the colonial peoples they conquered, peoples who were manifestly alien in terms of culture, religion and colour. (*Britons: Forging the Nation, 1701-1837* 5)

   Conflicting class and ethnic interests could only be successfully negotiated and subsumed within a constructed British sodality by their hostile alterity to various others defined in national, religious, or racial terms.

6. This raises two questions. How long can a nation maintain such specious and tenuous commonalities after the war is over and the empire is lost? And is there a greater danger of incessant warfare and unbridled expansionism consuming and corrupting the very essence of the nation? Many cultural historians have spent a good deal of time studying the trauma inflicted upon British national identity in its post-imperial phase, particularly as fears mount about the fragmentation of Britain in a federated European Union. [6] For now, I only wish to pause on this subject in order to point up the dialectic of nation and empire intrinsic to the modern British nation-state before I move from this observation to the latter question. If imperialism, in all its many permutations, helped forge a nation, could it also lead to its ruination? It seems to me that at the heart of Gibbon and Volney's texts is a fundamental assurance of this fact.

7. Not surprisingly, in British literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries we often discover a troubling conflation of imperial discourse with nationalist rhetoric, particularly since Thomson's patriotic "Ode: Rule, Britannia" first articulated a pattern of providential national election and commercial/colonial supremacy which confirmed the centrality of the artist to the project of national invention. [7] Thomson's claim dovetails with the sanguinary disposition of 18th -century political economists towards the rise of a capitalist society. Bernard Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* elaborates a commercialist stance which defends the extremes of "private vice" or self-interest as the vehicle for ensuring the common good, despite the ostensible contradiction with conventional morality. [8] Mandeville's argument presages Smith's more developed analysis of mercantile capitalism, with its serene faith in the benevolent and invisible hand of the free market to produce utopian conditions. [9] Both understood that the untrammeled freedoms of the market, when hitched to a compliant "fiscal-military state" [10] would and did lead to expansionist tendencies. Hence, like Thompson, both countenanced imperial expansion as the necessary outcome of a prosperous and free commercial society.

8. But where Thomson, like Mandeville and Smith, is unequivocally in favor of commerce and empire as the twin springs of Britain's liberty and prosperity, other interlocutors in this conversation weren't so sure. Cowper and Goldsmith expressed anxiety about the compatibility of progress, commerce and empire. Hume warned that overrefinement, which is born of excessive luxury, is the most extreme

danger to taste and national sensibility. [11] Gibbon attributed the decline of Rome to the perils of imperial expansion. [12] And Malthus, portending Marx, would later question the wisdom of placing trust in market forces to serve the public good.[13]

9. The belief in the fundamental incompatibility between a prosperous republican state and a powerful imperial state has a classical provenance. David Armitage has traced this discourse back to the Roman historian Sallust, who argued that the Roman Republic's thirst for glory eventually led to cultural decline and the loss of republican freedoms under the dictatorship of the caesars (*The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* 126-27). The Sallustian tradition, which poses an irreconciliable relationship between republican liberty and empire, informs Machiavelli's *Discorsi,* where he too remarks on the dilemma of sustaining liberty or pursuing imperial greatness or *grandezza*. Armitage locates this tension at the very beginning of the English Republic, during the years of the commonwealth. Milton, he argues, perceived the crisis and failure of the commonwealth in precisely these terms as the Rump Parliament gave way to a Cromwellian Protectorate, evaporating political liberty in the wake of a Sulla-like military dictatorship that hastily pursued expansionist commercial policies (134-6).

II. Women and Patriotism in British Romantic Literature

10. From Milton to the Romantics—who witnessed a similar period of revolution, empire, and colonial expansion—there is a continuous theme of patriotic discourse and imperial anxiety underlying much of British literature. Many authors, particularly female authors, entered the literary milieu by intervening in this conversation, precisely because patriotism was such a convenient front for eighteenth- and nineteenth-century women to enter the literary public sphere. Since the woman's purview is primarily concerned with domesticity and private relations, it is within reason to expect that women should want to be concerned with the preservation of the nation (often gendered female as in the case of "Britannia"), which is the guarantor of this private sphere. Hence, as female patriots increasingly stake out a civic role in support of their male compatriots, concern for the nation, especially one like Britain that was defined by intermittent warfare, supersedes the doctrine of separate sexual spheres (Colley 261). And who better to assume the domestic guardianship of the nation than those women entrusted with the reproduction and transmission of its bodies, values, and subjectivities?

11. The popular conception of female moral authority, rooted in the domestic roles of child-rearing and education, converted the female desire for civic participation into a *duty* to act and often to write.[14] Female writers sometimes translated this duty into conservative reform initiatives to discipline the laboring class, as with Hannah More's tracts; or conversely into liberal or radical reform initiatives, such as Wollstonecraftian feminism or abolitionism. [15] As Anne Mellor has suggested, female writers were also expected to embody Christian virtue, adding piety to patriotism. [16]

12. Yet, if writing were a duty, it was also a form of dissension against the increasingly strict mandates of a society of separate spheres. [17] In a growing print culture where the status of the "literary lady" as a feminine icon contributed to the marketability of female texts, the viability of a woman writer's career often depended upon the strategy selected to manage the public fallout of this transgression. [18]

13. In light of this, Felicia Hemans's prodigious authorial career, extending through nineteen volumes of poetry and two dramas from the publication of *England and Spain; or, Valour and Patriotism* (1808) to the second edition of *Songs of the Affections* (1835), exhibits perhaps the most successful attempt at self-definition as a "literary lady," but one which also manifests a patriotic role. Indeed, her status as "England's most famous female patriotic poet" [19] garnered her a place in the British canon for over a century. What Victorian schoolchild could forget the famous verses of *Casabianca, Homes of England,* or *England's Dead*? So successful was she at trademarking an orthodox image of domestic femininity

that she outsold almost all of her male and female competitors in the literary marketplace, and this during a period of reaction and war.[20] Her contemporary reviewers and Victorian biographers would proceed to relish the delicacy and refinement of her feminine traits. The *Edinburgh Monthly Review* raved that Mrs. Hemans "never ceases to be strictly *feminine* in the whole current of her thought and feeling."[21] Francis Jeffries, writing for the *Edinburgh Review,* summed up her poetry as "a fine exemplification of Female Poetry." [22] This sentiment is corroborated by her biographer, Henry F. Chorley, in his *Memorials,* who tells us that her letters "give so fair a picture of her mind in all its *womanliness* " and approvingly cites one critic who swears that her poems "could not have been written by a man" (112-13).

14. However, modern critics have examined the reality fo teh failed marriage and disregard for domestic matters that characterized Hemans's life behind her traditional reprsentation as a paragon of womanly virtue.[23] Felicia Hemans, neé Felicia Dorothea Browne, was born in Liverpool in 1793 to a middle-class family of six children. In 1808, after her father abandoned the family, they moved to Bronwylfa in Wales and Felicia began writing poetry for publication to defray household expenses. In 1812, she married Captain Hemans, moved to Daventry, and conceived the first of five children—all boys. Suddenly, in 1818, her husband left for Italy and never returned, leaving her pregnant with their last son and bereft of sufficient income to care for their children. It is at this point that Hemans moved back in with her mother, older brother, and sister who effectively raised her children while she devoted herself to full-time writing—at least until her mothers death in 1827. Of this period, Chorley writes,

    > [The] peculiar circumstances of [her] position, which, by placing her in a household, as a member and not as its head, excused her from many of those small cares of domestic life, which might have either fretted away her day-dreams, and, by interruption, have made of less avail the search for knowledge to which she bent herself with such eagerness; or, more probably still, might have imparted to her poetry more of masculine health and stamen, at the expense of some of its romance and music. (I.35-6)

    To allay potential criticism of Hemans, Chorley cleverly converts Hemans's shirking of the prescribed domestic role into a positive good for the production of a feminine poetry sans the adulteration of a "masculine health" that would have been imparted to it, ironically, by the rigors and interruptions of domestic labor. This apologia points up the work of literary fabrication that went on behind Hemans's proscenium of domestic femininity throughout much of her adult life. Ultimately, after a lifetime of disappointments by male providers and being early thrown into the competitive literary market to eke out a living for herself and her family, the trauma of her mother's death precipitated the onset of physical decline that eventually leds to her early death at the age of 41 in 1835.

15. Because her writing came as a result of financial necessity, considerations of pubic taste frequently impinged upon her selection of topoi and style to ensure commercial success. [24] *England & Spain* (1808), her first published poem, was calculated to exploit contemporary interest in the continental war. Likewise, *The Restoration of the Works of Art to Italy* (1816), a work that sealed her literary fame, exploited popular contempt for Napoleon's plundering of Italian and Roman art. In the case of *Modern Greece* (1817) we know from a correspondence with her publisher, John Murray, that she chose the topic in order to exploit the nationwide scandal ensuing from the importation of the Elgin Marbles, and, moreover, that because of its academic style she thought it circumspect to publish the poem anonymously to increase its salability. [25]

III. Ruins and Empire in *Modern Greece*

16. In *Modern Greece*, one finds a peculiar sentimentalism towards the quest for imperial *grandezza*. Perhaps deliberately, the poem takes off from the success of Byron's *Childe Harold* in content and

form. Like *Childe Harold*, it utilizes the rich features of the travelogue genre and engages the simmering debate over the Elgin Marbles. It also shares a similar stanzaic structure, notational apparatus, and episodic form. But here the similarities end. The poem's contiguous 101 stanzas reveal a non-chronological episodic structure with multiple rhetorical modes. It begins ostensibly in the present with a sublimely picturesque Grecian landscape colored by wild vegetation and moldering ruins. The narrator guides us through this scene by following the meandering path of a wandering *enthusiast* — ostensibly a western traveler captivated by ancient Greece. We move from this to the tragic account of a Grecian émigré in the Americas, reflecting on the phenomenology of the refugee who has lost his homeland. From here, the poem shifts into a specious historicity, narrating the fall of classical Greece (and conflating this with the decline of the Byzantine Empire) on the very morning "When Asia poured / Her fierce fanatics to Byzantium 's wall" (XXXVI). From this re-enactment, the poem turns back to the present to magnify the contrast between past glory and present ruin. It then concludes by shifting into prophecy, reclaiming Greek heritage (manifested in the expropriation of the Elgin Marbles) for an emergent British imperium and striking a potentially jarring final note with a disturbing vision of Britain's future ruins. This vision is reminiscent of Volney's sentiment in *The Ruins*, where the narrator witnesses the ruination of past civilizations and ponders whether one day a traveler like himself might also sit silently amidst the ruins of Europe and "weep in solitude over the ashes of their inhabitants, and the memory of their former greatness" (8). [26]

17. Central to the poem's machinery of anonymity is its sophisticated notational apparatus, whose erudition fooled one reviewer into believing that the poem could not have been the work of a "female pen" and must certainly be the production of an ostensibly male "academical pen." [27] Furthermore, the notes are freighted with frequent citations of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, and the poem's subject matter clearly betrays a line of influence to this text as well. [28] In fact, Peter Trinder's biography states that this was one of Hemans's favorite books. [29]

18. Trinder also reveals that Hemans "spent much of her [childhood] time lingering and reading in the ruins of the castle [Conway]," indicating a fascination with place and romantic ruins. This corresponds with her description of the Grecian landscape as "the ruin Time and Fate have wrought" (XXX). Just as she would steal off to the ruins of Conway Castle to suffuse her imagination with sublime thoughts as she read, so too she constructs modern Greece as a vast and desolate wasteland of tombs and monuments for the wandering enthusiast to stray and seek inspiration. It is a "Realm of sad beauty . . . a shrine / That Fancy visits with Devotion's zeal, / To catch high thoughts and impulses divine . . . Amidst the tombs of heroes" (XXI).

19. There are two observations that need to be made here. The first has to do with Hemans's creative destruction of contemporary Greek culture and society. Hemans orientalizes modern Greece by reducing its territory to a vast wilderness of "savage cliffs and solitudes" (XLIX) that is ready for European colonial intervention in the guise of a wandering enthusiast. [30] Through a clever temporal disjuncture that posits a radical and unmediated cultural dislocation between past and present, she is able to reconcile this orientalized image of modern Greece with a concomitant Hellenic revival that contrarily depicts Greece as the cradle of Western civilization. Greece *was* part and provenance of the constellation of western civilization; its ruins signify this former identity. But now, we are told, these ruins litter a territory inhabited by another culture, dubiously "Greek," but bearing no connection to the land's past inhabitants. In fact, the only thing these cultures share in common is a geographic coordinate. Interestingly, Greece's geographical location, on the metaphoric borderline between East (Levant) and West (Europe), sustains such a condition of categorical confusion. These factors fertilize the orientalist imaginary in which modern Greece is transformed into a sublime sepulcher of tombs, ruins, and silent plains where all is "silence round, and solitude, and death" (XXXII). It is easy thus to imagine the modern Greeks as belonging to a debased "second race" who "inherit but their name" and for whom "No patriot feeling binds them to the soil . . . Their glance is cold indifference, and their toil /

but to destroy what ages have revered" (LXXXVII). The specter of cultural miscegenation is duly exorcized by insisting that this "second race" is really the progeny of an invading "Crescent horde" whose Moslem regions are "to intellect a desert space, / A wild without a fountain or a flower, / Where towers Oppression ‘midst the deepening glooms." The vast chasm separating this "second race" from the ancient Hellenes is glibly denoted by the use of the modifier "modern" in the title *Modern Greece*. The phrase is presented as an oxymoron, because we are led to believe that there is nothing really modern about them. [31] Instead, they appear wholly the production of an expansionist, despotic, and conventionally oriental culture that has plundered and destroyed the ancient glories of Hellenic Greece; exterminated or exiled its people; annexed its territories to the landscape of the oriental sublime; and, tragically for the "civilized" West, subjected the cradle of culture itself to a primitive regime of barbarism. [32]

20. This narrative tour-de-force legitimates intervention by Western forces, who are figured as the proper heirs and descendants of that "nobler race" now displaced by a "second race" which lacks the intellect and sensibility to appreciate the Grecian legacy. Gibbon provides the sub-text for this passage when he cites Petrarch's astonishment at the "supine indifference" of the modern Romans towards the stupendous monuments and ruins of ancient Rome, and who marvels that a "stranger of the Rhone was more conversant with these antiquities than the nobles and natives of the metropolis" (II.638). Gibbon viewed himself as just such a stranger, characterizing himself as a "devout pilgrim from the remote and once savage countries of the North" who has now returned to the cradle of western civilization to pay homage and resurrect its glories (II.641-2).

21. This takes us to a second point, for if the "savage" natives cannot appreciate the relics and ruins of a fallen empire, then it behooves the "civilized" nations to send their own archeological teams to recover this history for the presumed benefit of humanity. True to the orientalist mold, Hemans's *Modern Greece* posits that Hellenic Greece's ruins can be metaphorically read, appreciated, and understood only by an enthusiast possessed of an equivalently western sensibility. [33] Like Gibbon, Hemans offers us a pilgrimmatic figure—a "wandering son of other lands"—possessed of a remarkably British temperament. I would argue that Hemans's enthusiast is a specimen of British Romantic sensibility. Our narrator, who functions as a guide and chronicler, describes our wandering enthusiast who traverses the vast solitudes and sublime ruins of modern Greece as one "whose enthusiast mind / Each muse of ancient days hath deep imbued / With lofty lore, and all his thoughts refined / In the calm school of silent solitude" (III). We have here the quintessential Wordsworthian traveler "fostered alike by beauty and by fear," who exhibits a penchant for introspection and a profound sensitivity to one's natural surroundings. This traveler is distinguished from the modern Greek in every way that matters. In fact, the only character similar in disposition and sensibility to our peripatetic protagonist is the figure of the exiled Greek, who is also portrayed as possessing a Romantic demeanor as he traverses the North American wilds.

22. We must pause here and note that this characteristically British Romantic traveler operates within the narrative in a manner similar to that of Mary Louise Pratt's "sentimental narrator" of contemporary travel narratives who feigns innocence and vulnerability while performing the interior exploration of native lands slated for expropriation, exploitation, and colonization. [34] In this sense, our restless Romantic enthusiast is also an imperialist agent, culturally expropriating Grecian territory and artifacts based on a presumed commonality of sensibility and shared historical experience of imperial and civilizational *grandezza*. When we consider this in conjunction with the fact that Hemans's text also comes equipped with a panoply of ethnographic and topographical notes that subject Greece to a scrupulous investigation by Western academics, we can begin to see the various layers of cultural appropriation that operate within the text. Ultimately, Hemans's poem displaces and deterritorializes the modern Greeks, offering instead a genealogy in which the modern Briton, who is presented as the Romantic antithesis of the savage modern Greek, becomes the legitimate heir to Hellenic Greece.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in the mirroring of the modern Briton in the Romantic figure of the exiled Greek.

23. The British cooptation of a Grecian national heritage is further impelled by the act of mourning over its demise. In "Hemans and Home" Tricia Lootens has explored the complicity of mourning with nation-building in Hemans's poems. Heroes' graves bind national folk communities, and the work of the female poet is to memorialize these graves and thus impress them into the national imaginary as sentimental signposts of a shared national experience of loss (247). In addition, as in the case of *England's Dead,* these graves are often found spread across the empire, thus working to assimilate settler communities into a nationalist framework and thereby further legitimate expansionary imperialist polices. [35] In *Modern Greece,* we see the psychological annexation of Greece to a "Greater" Britain through the sentimental act of mourning for a supposedly long dead people whose territory remains a vast sepulcher which only the British romantic subject, as cultural heir to Grecian antiquity, is properly equipped to appreciate.

24. Hemans's choice of narratology is remarkable because it raises the gendered politics of the travelogue genre. Hemans's decision to publish the poem anonymously suggests a profound sensitivity to the gendered exclusivity of the travel narrative with its rigorous academic style and apotheosis of masculine mobility and independence. [36] To make it accessible to women authors writing within a discourse of patriotic inclusion, she finds it expedient to tamper with the conventions of the genre by retrofitting it with an overtly patriotic rhetoric and value, insinuating that she understood full well the consequences of unmitigated generic transgression. By resituating this generic form within the discursive horizon of patriotic texts, Hemans was quite deliberately fashioning a strategy whereby a "female pen" could experiment with a conventionally masculine genre without fear of reprisal.

25. The poem's narratological structure elaborates this strategy. Unlike Byron, who eventually outs himself as the protagonist of his travel narrative *Childe Harold*, Hemans cannot claim firsthand knowledge of Greece and must instead operate behind the invented persona of a Romantic enthusiast. I would argue that this ploy bespeaks Hemans's awareness of the severe limitations placed on women's geographical mobility in the early nineteenth-century. In light of this, Byron's hasty denunciation of the poem as "good for nothing; written by some one who has never been there" [37] comes off as a callously insensitive remark that carelessly overlooks the reality of immobility faced by middle-class women like Hemans. One way around this sad reality is to construct a protagonist that is recognizably a male Romantic while developing a narrator who is altogether disembodied (and thereby degendered), existing outside of space-time like Volney's Genius, and who is thus able to traverse time and reconstruct the minutia of historical events. Of course, this historical imaginary is largely enabled by Britain's privileged role as Queen of the seas: Britain's powerful navy and colonial infrastructure provide the unique vantage point from which Hemans can project her piercing and acquisitive vision of modern Greece.

26. Hemans's narrator can rather effortlessly distill the national essence and history of a bygone people largely by virtue of the statuary and architecture whose ruins litter the landscape. In the tradition of eighteenth-century ruinology, these fragments of art are mined for their unique expression of national identity. In the text, Hemans proffers the Athenian city-state as a synecdoche for Greece itself. And Athens is rendered knowable through an investigation of the ruins of the Parthenon, which Hemans calls "the purest model of Athenian taste" (LXXIV), locating in a nation's art its peculiar sensibility. She also subscribes to the eighteenth-century fascination with the nationalist role of the bardic artist when she hails Greece as the "fair land of Phidias," the renowned sculptor and architect who oversaw the building of the Parthenon and personally sculpted the statue of Athena (or Minerva in the Roman lexicon), which is stationed in its central shrine.

27. Yet, Hemans modifies this tradition by outfitting the study of ruins with a capacity for augury. At will, her narrator can recount the events that transpired during the "closing night of that imperial race" (XXXVII). Furthermore, by the agency of the creative imagination, the narrator can also conjure up vivid imagery of a pre-lapsarian Greece, recovering the splendid vistas of a once glorious Athens from the ruins of time:

> Again renewed by Thought's creative spells,
> In all her pomp thy city, Theseus! Towers:
> Within, around, the light of glory dwells
> On art's fair fabrics, wisdom's holy bowers.
> There marble fanes in finished grace ascend,
> The pencil's world of life and beauty glows,
> Shrines, pillars, porticoes, in grandeur blend,
> Rich with the trophies of barbaric foes;
> . . . .
> Athens! Thus fair the dream of thee appears,
> As Fancy's eye pervades the veiling cloud of years. (LXXII-LXXIII)

28. By meditating upon the nation's ruins, the narrator is able to precipitate a spell of imaginative reconstruction whereby imperial Athens is delivered from decay and presented at the height of its *grandezza*.

29. Interestingly, the Parthenon, which occupies a special place in the text's discursive topography, is a site that conflates Athenian nationalism and imperialism. At the time of its construction, Athens was pursuing an overt policy of imperial expansion. The processional frieze depicted along the metopes and pediments of the structure were meant to root the nation's present imperial exploits in the nation's past experience of warfare against human and mythological enemies, each time concluding with a Grecian victory that consolidated national identity and augmented Athenian *grandezza*.[38] So, in truth, the Parthenon is a special memorial which functions as a technology for channeling individual desire into the production of a national sodality premised on an invented tradition and its redeployment in support of imperialism.

30. This technology and its product are symbolically co-opted by Britain through the expropriation of the Elgin Marbles, which are quite literally fragments of this mythology because they are fragments of the Parthenon's processional frieze. Thus, continues Hemans's narrator: "Who may grieve that, rescued from their hands, / Spoilers of excellence and foes to art, / thy relics, Athens! Borne to other lands, / Claim homage still to thee from every heart?" (LXXXVIII). To paraphrase, better that Britain, heir to the legacy of imperial and civilizational *grandezza*, recover these fragments than that they be lost to the ignorance and obscurity of an orientalized and debased "second race" whose only claim to them is that they happen to be squatting upon the lands once occupied by a "nobler race" of antique Greeks.

31. "In those fragments" we are told "the soul of Athens lives" (XCI). Furthermore, "these [fragments] were destined to a noble lot . . . to light another land, the quenchless ray that soon shall gloriously expand" (XCVII). Hemans proposes that art, as the embodiment of national sensibility, can act as a conduit. This is, in effect, how British literature was utilized in India and elsewhere to interpellate Indian subjects with a uniquely British sensibility, and thus produce compliant colonial subjects under the ruse of spreading civilization. [39] In this instance, however, art becomes the vehicle for imperial *grandezza,* passing the torch of empire from one nation to the next, thus quickening the birth of another great civilization. Britain, we are told, "hast [the] power to be what Athens e'er hath been" (XCIX).

32. In a cautionary moment pregnant with patriotic fervor, Hemans warns that to realize this destiny

Britain must first cultivate its own native art—"treasures oft unprized, unknown"—instead of prizing foreign "gems far less rich than those, thus precious, and thus lost" (C). [40] Imitating Volney and Gibbon, the narrator imagines a post-lapsarian Britain whose imperial glory has flickered and extinguished. Yet it too, like Greece, can have an everlasting life-after-death in the splendid ruins of its art and architecture. These can serve to quicken the next turning of the imperial gyre:

> So, should dark ages o'er thy glory sweep,
> Should thine e'er be as now are Grecian plains,
> Nations unborn shall track thine own blue deep
> To hail thy shore, to worship thy remains;
> Thy mighty monuments with reverence trace.
> And cry, "This ancient soil hath nursed a glorious race!" (CI)

33. In turning from this passage to the conclusion of this study, I would like to point up the use of the modal verb "should," whose conditionality indicates that this apocalyptic vision is not an inexorable consequence of the pursuit of empire vis-à-vis the Sallustian and Machiavellian tradition. Returning to the narrator's Gibbonesque chronicle of Greece's fall, we discover that the cause of Greece's demise lay not in any perceived contradiction between liberty and empire, but in basic human frailty and error. The narrator concludes that the Crescent horde succeeded in single-handedly demolishing Greek culture not because of the decadence wrought by the pursuit of empire, but instead because of an avoidable and lamentable lack of patriotic vigilance on the part of the Greek defenders:

> Ye slept, O heroes! Chief ones of the earth!
> High demigods of ancient days! Ye slept:
> . . . .
> No patriot then the sons of freedom led
> In mountain pass devotedly to die;
> The martyr spirit of resolve was fled,
> And the high soul's unconquered buoyancy,
> And by your graves, and on your battle plains,
> Warriors! your children knelt to wear the stranger's chains. (XLII)

34. Unlike the boy in *Casabianca* who needlessly remains upon the burning deck out of filial affection and patriotic zeal, the sons of Greece shrank from patriotic self-sacrifice, and subsequently a once-mighty nation fell.

35. At the figurative center of this narrative is a re-inscription of the vital role of the domestic sphere in cultivating the proper degree of patriotism among the sons of the nation. "O, where were then thy sons" exclaims the narrator as the morning of Greece's fall unfolds. Their absence during the invasion of their homeland is telling because it reveals the ideological poverty of the Grecian women charged with their patriotic upbringing—who are also absent from the scene! If we once again compare Hemans's steadfast British child in *Casabianca* with these derelict Grecian sons and mothers we discover a subtext here about the vital role and presence of women in the service of patriotism. Put glibly, the nation is only as strong as its women.

36. One clue to this can be found in the fore-grounded figure of Minerva, the patron goddess of Athens who represents the merger of fertility, wisdom, and martial prowess. In the text, Minerva functions as a metonym for the nation. At one point, Hemans addresses Greece as "Minerva's land." She also uses the polysemic figure of "Minerva's rent veil" as a symbol of Greece's fall. Through the association of an ostensibly female, domestic goddess with the nation and its fate, Hemans proffers a symbolic affront to the modern notion of separate spheres and insinuates a pre-ordained role for women in civic discourse.

[41] The negligence or erasure of this role leads to spoliation and decline, figuratively represented by the tattered veil, which variously signifies the cultural and spiritual decline of the nation; the pillaging of the nation's most cherished sites—in this case the temple of Minerva within the Parthenon; or the literal and metaphorical rape of the nation, resulting in the extinction of a people and the procreation of an utterly distinct "second race." But, by signaling that these fates are in fact conditional and highly contingent upon the domestic infrastructure of patriotism, Hemans disputes the established position that liberty and empire are in contradiction by placing the blame for Greece's fall squarely on the deficient patriotic instruction of its youth, while simultaneously purveying an aggrandized and universal vision of female nationalism relevant to all epochs.

37. Ultimately, then, the ruins of modern Greece do issue a warning to British society, but not one consonant with Gibbon, Volney, or the tradition of pastoral and abolitionist poetry that railed against the corruptions of luxury wrought by unrestrained greed and imperial ambition. Rather, Hemans mobilizes these ruins to warn modern Britons not to pursue too vigorously the ideology of separate spheres, which, when too rigid, can foreclose the essential public role played by women in the patriotic instruction of youth and the maintenance of a patriotic morality in popular culture. Through the very act of authoring *Modern Greece,* Hemans underscores the participation of women in the patriotic defense of the nation, for only they, we are led to surmise from the text, can circumvent the decline of the imperial nation through the sedulous cultivation of the salutary and ultimately redemptive domestic affections. Her argument is compelling because it forces critics and historians to explore how the counter-hegemonic demand for greater female participation in public life and in the canons of literature can seemingly paradoxically be made from *within* the hegemonic and grossly masculine discourses of nationalism and imperialism. However, although this strategy ultimately did carve a public space for female patriotism, it left intact the institutions of patriarchy that continued to subjugate women. And, rather than challenge the prescriptive gender roles that propagated the figure of the lady, with its characteristic feminine delicacy, moral sympathy, and instinctive maternity, it objectively fortified them. But perhaps what should most perturb contemporary scholars about Hemans's argument is the manifest reality of Britain's rapid post-imperial decline. Strangely, it would seem that Hemans's new breed of civic-minded patriotic ladies may have helped to hasten Britain's decline precisely by fanning the flames of jingoism and imperial lust ever higher, and thus consuming in a shorter period the will and resources which it took Hellenic Greece several hundred years to exhaust. If imperialism has not brought to the British nation the utter ruin projected by the metanarratives of Gibbon and Volney, nonetheless it has effected a remarkable diminution of Britain's once formidable stature.

Notes

1 *Ozymandias* (1818), ll. 12-14.

2 *On Seeing the Elgin Marbles* (1817), ll. 9-14.

3 This argument is convincingly posed by Anne Janowitz in *England's Ruins: Poetic Purpose and the National Landscape* (1990).

4 This is Laurence Goldstein's argument in *Ruins and Empire: The Evolution of a Theme in Augustan Romantic Literature* (1977).

5 The conversation on Romantic ruins and fragments has had several notable episodes. Paul de Man's classic study of Shelley's *Triumph of Life*, “Shelley Disfigured” (1984), argues that we must resist the urge to seek semantic closure for the fragment poem through its “monumentalization” as historical or aesthetic object, a process that he claims arbitrarily settles meaning within a pre-determined historical or semantic order (121). In Thomas McFarland's *Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin*, the fragmentary is instead elevated to a cultural

theme. In this expressivist-essentialist model, Romanticism is the emblematic expression of a phenomenological reality characterized by the "diasparactive" triad of incompleteness, fragmentation, and ruin (5-7). This reality, which is not necessarily mediated by social and political history, manifests in Romantic literature as the expression of longing and melancholy that terminate in a "sentiment des ruines" (15). Marjorie Levinson's *The Romantic Fragment Poem: A Critique of a Form* (1986) disputes this claim and argues instead for a historically nuanced reading of the fragment poem that disentangles the history of its composition, publication, and reception from the signification produced by the early nineteenth-century literary milieu and the legacy of Romantic ideology influencing modern critical discourse (8). Methodologically, this study most closely resembles Levinson's in its attention to historical facts and ideological determination. Yet it is not, per se, a study of the fragment as phenomenon or form.

6 See also Nairn's *Break-Up of Britain* (1977) and *After Britain* (2000), Samuel's three-volume collection *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British Identity* (late 1980s), Hitchens's *The Abolition of Britain* (1999), and Marr's BBC documentary and book *The Day Britain Died* (2000). For an excellent review of this literature, see also Stuart Ward's "The End of Empire and the Fate of Britishness" (2004).

7 This, indeed, is the subject of Suvir Kual's *Poems of Nation, Anthems of Empire* (2000): 'Rule, Britannia!' . . . is testimonial to the fact that poets in the long eighteenth century imagined poetry to be a unique and privileged literary form for the enunciation of a puissant (and plastic) vocabulary of nation, particularly one appropriate to a Britain proving itself . . . great at home and abroad" (5).

8 Shaftesbury's *Characteristicks* (1714) is very much a recapitulation of the classical argument for Christian morality espoused by landed Tory aristocrats over and against an emergent bourgeois culture that emphasized the ameliorating effects of personal industry and commerce, despite being driven by self-interest and monetary reward. In many respects, Mandeville, a Dutch native raised in a commercial society where the state facilitated commercial and colonial expansion, is the mouthpiece for bourgeois cultural transvaluation against an established hegemonic aristocratic culture whose values and sensibility are rooted in the classical doctrine of "virtu," which is based on the ownership of land and feudal social relations. J.G.A. Pocock's "The Mobility of Property and the Rise of Eighteenth-Century Sociology" (1985) provides an excellent study of this tension.

9 Both arguments flow from Giambattista Vico's argument that destructive passions can be harnessed for the public good.

10 The term comes from John Brewer's *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783* (1989).

11 "It was thus," continues Hume in *Of Simplicity and Refinement*, "the ASIATIC eloquence degenerated so much from the ATTIC: It was thus the age of CLAUDIUS and NERO became so much inferior to that of AUGUSTUS in taste and genius: And perhaps there are, at present, some symptoms of a like degeneracy of taste, in FRANCE as well as in ENGLAND" (*Essays Moral Political and Literary* 196). Cultural refinement, swelled with age and imperial growth, leads to decadence and degeneracy, following the cyclical pattern of rise and decline.

12 In 1781, after completing the first part of his narrative on the fall of the Western Roman empire and before embarking on the second part concerning the fall of the Eastern Roman empire, Gibbon wrote his *General Observations on the Fall of the Roman Empire in the West*, an essay which was appended to the end of Chapter 38 of *The Decline*. In it, he writes, "The decline of Rome was the natural and inevitable result of immoderate greatness. Prosperity ripened the principles of decay; the causes of destruction multiplied with the extent of conquest; and as soon as time or accident had removed the artificial supports, the stupendous fabric yielded to the pressure of its own weight" (IV.XXXVIII.119).

13 Contra Smith, Malthus argues that “the increasing wealth of the nation has had little or no tendency to better the condition of the labouring poor” (*An Essay on the Principle of Population* XVI.112). Indeed, he suggests that the opposite may more likely be true.

14 See also Colley's chapter on “Womanpower” (237-81).

15 Kate Davies convincingly argues that female involvement in the early abolition movement strengthened it because of its presumed non-political character. Females were attracted to the movement because of the delicacy of “feminine sympathy” toward the suffering of slaves, which tinctured the abolitionist movement with a moral imperative ratified by the purported moral authority invested in females. See also “A Moral Purchase; Femininity, Commerce, and Abolition, 1788-1792” (2001).

16 See also Mellor's “The Female Poet and the Poetess: Two Traditions of British Women's Poetry, 1780-1830” (1997).

17 In “Configurations of Feminine Reform: The Woman Writer and the Tradition of Dissent” (1994), Marlon Ross argues that for Romantic women writers the act of writing, and furthermore of writing on behalf of liberal reform initiatives, constituted a “double dissension” that could be mitigated by generic manipulation of two sorts: either disguise women's political speech in acceptably feminine modes like the conduct manual or feminize conventional political modes (94).

18 In “Consuming women: The Life of the ‘Literary Lady” as Popular Culture in Eighteenth-Century England” (1993), Paula McDowell elaborates the argument that iconic images of femininity circulated alongside female texts in eighteenth-century print culture and lent them a unique marketing edge that also placed heavy constraints upon the public image of female authors. This is because readers consumed female texts as much for the commodified images of femininity associated with the author as for content of the texts themselves.

19 See also Tricia Lootens's “Hemans and her American Heirs: Nineteenth-Century Women's Poetry and National Identity” (1999) for a discussion of Hemans's American reception as a trans-atlantic patriotic poet.

20 With the exception of Scott and Byron, Hemans generated more revenue by the sale of the multiple editions of her works than any other Romantic contemporary. Paula R. Feldman documents this phenomenon in “The Poet and the Profits: Felicia Hemans and the Literary Marketplace” (1999).

21 *The Edinburgh Monthly Review* 3 (April 1820): 373-83, cited in Felicia Hemans: *Selected Poems, Letters, Reception Materials*, ed. Susan J. Wolfson, 531.

22 *The Edinburgh Review* 50 (October 1829): 32-47, cited in Wolfson 551.

23 In *Ambitious Heights* (1990), Norma Clarke reveals that “the poet of domesticity, of hearth and home, had skeletons rattling by the fireside,” including a husband's desertion and the abandoning of her children's welfare to her mother, sister, and brother's good will (45-8).

24 Susan Wolfson, in “'Domestic Affections' and ‘the spear of Minerva': Felicia Hemans and the Dilemma of Gender” (1994), has argued that Hemans deeply deplored the prescriptions of femininity that consigned her to a life of shattered domesticity after her husband's departure, and constrained her to write behind a domestic mask out of the economic necessity of providing for her family. She manages this situation by casting an array of female characters in her poetry that reflect the suffering endured by women as a result of their sequestration and subjection to losses inflicted by the masculine world of politics and war. As compensation, many of her characters model an almost stoical degree of heroism in the face of insurmountable suffering. Hence, her patriotic stance may well be an adaptation to the deplorable fate of women in a male-dominated

society where the tranquility of domestic space is constantly imperiled by political intrigue and warfare.

25 See the *Letter to John Murray* (26 February, 1817), cited in Wolfson 480-1. These marbles—scavenged from the ruins of the Parthenon and imported to London by Lord Elgin in 1804, and eventually sold to the British government in 1816—are featured in Keats's self-reflexive poem, *On Seeing the Elgin Marbles* (1817). But they were also the subject of a popular furor over their rightful ownership involving Byron when he, in Part II of *Childe Harold* (1812), explicitly deplores their theft. Interestingly, contemporary reviewers believed *Modern Greece* to have been written by Byron despite the fact that the poem clearly weighs-in in favor of this expropriation of Grecian art. See the review of *Modern Greece* in *The New British Ladies Magazine* n.s. 1 (1817): 70. See also Susan Wolfson's study of Heman's relationship with Byron and his poetry in "Hemans and the Romance of Byron" (2001).

26 We know from Chorley that Volney was also quite influential on the young poet Hemans. He cites a correspondence from Bishop Heber that reveals Hemans's abandoned plan for a syncretistic poem along the lines of Volney's *Ruins*, in which her design was "to trace out the symbolical meaning, by which the popular faiths of every land are linked together" (I.46-7). One can infer from Daniel White's "'Mysterious Sanctity': Sectarianism and Syncretism from Volney to Hemans" that Hemans most likely did eventually complete her syncretistic and pietistic poem under the title of *Superstition and Revelation*, a twenty-eight stanza poem that argues for the universality of Christianity as the root of all other creeds, which are revealed to be superstitious adulterations of Christian revelation.

27 See *The British Review and London Critical Journal* 15 (June 1820): 299-310, cited in Wolfson 532.

28 The erudition of these notes led one early reviewer to believe that the anonymous poem could not have been the production of a "female pen" and must surely have been the work of a presumably male "academical pen." See *The British Review and London Critical Journal* 15 (June 1820): 299-310, cited in Wolfson 532.

29 Trinder posits that Gibbon was the inspiration behind Hemans'*s Alaric in Italy* (24-5).

30 Hemans is here operating within the mode of modern orientalism. As Said has explicated, the modern orientalist performs a vital function for imperialism by discursively mastering and dominating those peoples and regions under its scrutiny. According to Said, the practice of "discovering" the East operates within a modern paradigm of orientalism that figures the East as backwards and essentially knowable because it occupies a past stage in Western development. Said explains that this paradigm is contrary to classical orientalism, which figures the East as exotic, essentially different from the West, and therefore inscrutable (*Orientalism* 120-3). Byron's treatment of Greece and the Levant in *Childe Harold* adheres closer to the latter mode.

31 In a letter to John Murray dated 4 September 1917, Byron, bristled by this wordplay, indignantly retorts, "Besides, why '*modern*?' You may say *modern Greeks*, but surely *Greece* itself is rather more ancient than ever it was" (cited in Wolfson 536; his emphasis).

32 Saree Makdisi makes a similar argument for Shelley's description of the East in *Alastor*, where he discursively depopulates and reduces to ruins the entirety of Eastern territories in order to enable a reframing of the East as pre-modern space situation within a historical continuum that leads teleologically to Western European civilization. See also his *Romantic Imperialism: Universal Empire and the Culture of Modernity* (1998) for a more advanced elaboration of this argument.

33 This difference can perhaps help to explain why Byron spoke so fervently in behalf of Greek nationalism while Hemans preferred to subject Greek society to the tutelage of a more "civilized" British empire.

34 See also *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. Pratt offers Mungo Park's *Travels in the*

Interior Districts of Africa as a text that exemplifies the central traits of a "sentimental narrator." The "sentimental narrator" is defined as experiential, innocent, passive, and imperiled by natives, thereby deflecting any claim to imperial ambitions, when, in fact, this narrator is performing the necessary task of collecting data on unexplored territories. The narrator also inverts imperial reality by presenting soon-to-be conquered natives as dangerous aggressors while depicting the imperialist West as fundamentally benign, inquisitive, and innocent.

35 Ward contends that sameness, not alterity, is the primary force that consolidated a cohesive British identity by psychologically binding Britain with its white settler communities across the globe (245). Accepting this, their globally scattered graves also work to engrave a British presence upon disparate and far-flung regions of the globe, symbolically annexing these territories to a British Commonwealth.

36 See the *Letter to John Murray* (26 February, 1817), cited in Wolfson 480-1.

37 See Byron's *Letter to John Murray* (4 September 1817), cited in Wolfson 536.

38 Sophia Psarra promulgates this argument in "The Parthenon and the Erechtheion: The Architectural Formation of Place, Politics, and Myth." Her study focuses on two adjacent structures that stand upon the Acropolis: the Parthenon and the Erechtheion. The former roots present imperial exploits in the nation's past, thereby granting it legitimacy, while the latter anchors an ancient religion and mythology in the present, granting continuity to the nation's culture.

39 Sarah Suleri's *The Rhetoric of English India* (1992) and Gauri Viswanathan's *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India* (1989) pursue this theme at length.

40 Here, Hemans takes up the cause of the native arts movement, following in the footsteps of Blake, Wordsworth, and numerous other British poets and painters. For more on this, see also Morris Eaves's *The Counter-Arts Conspiracy: Art and Industry in the Age of Blake* (1992).

41 In "Minerva's Veil: Hemans, Critics, and the Construction of Gender" (1997), Eubanks suggests that the figure of Minerva, the warrior goddess, which is central to Hemans's description of the Greek national mythology, is a symbolic affront to the doctrine of separate spheres (345).

Works Cited

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso, 1991.

Armitage, David. "The Ideological Origins of the British Empire." *Ideas in Context* 59. Rpt. New York: Cambridge UP, 2004.

---. "John Milton: Poet Against Empire." *Milton and Republicanism*. Ideas in Context. Ed. David Armitage, Armand Himy, and Quentin Skinner. New York : Cambridge UP, 1998. 206-25.

Brewer, John. *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1988.

Byron, George Gordon. Byron. *The Oxford Authors*. Ed. Jerome J. McGann. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.

Chorley, Henry F. *Memorials of Mrs. Hemans*. 2 vols. New York, NY: Saunders and Otley, 1836.

Clarke, Norma. *Ambitious Heights: Writing, Friendship, Love—The Jewsbury Sisters, Felicia Hemans, and Jane Welsh Carlyle*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale, 1992.

Davies, Kate. "A Moral Purchase: Femininity, Commerce, and Abolition, 1788-1792." *Women, Writing and the Public Sphere, 1700-1830*. Ed. Elizabeth Eger, Charlotte Grant, and Cliona O Gallchoir. Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 2001. 133-59.

de Man, Paul. "Shelley Disfigured." *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*. NY: Columbia UP, 1984. 93-123.

Eubanks, Kevin. "Minerva's Veil: Hemans, Critics, and the Construction of Gender." *European Romantic Review* 8.4 (1997): 341-59.

Eaves, Morris. *The Counter-Arts Conspiracy: Art and Industry in the Age of Blake*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1992.

Feldman, Paula R. "The Poet and the Profits: Felicia Hemans and the Literary Marketplace." *Women's Poetry, Late Romantic to Late Victorian*. Ed. Isobel Armstrong and Virginia Blain. New York: St. Martin's, 1999. 71-101.

Gibbon, Edward. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. 1776. Introd. Hugh Trevor-Roper. Everyman's Library 95. 6 vols. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.

Goldstein, Laurence. *Ruins and Empire: The Evolution of a Theme in Augustan and Romantic Literature*. Pittsburgh, PA: U Pittsburgh P, 1977.

Haley, Bruce. *Living Forms: Romantics and the Monumental Figure*. Albany, NY: State U of New York P, 2003.

Hemans, Felicia. *The Poetical Works of Felicia Hemans*. Ed. & introd. Mrs. L.H. Sigourney. New York: A.C. Armstrong & Son, 1853.

---. *Selected Poems, Letters, Reception Materials*. Ed. & introd. Susan J. Wolfson. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2000.

Hitchens, Peter. *The Abolition of Britain: From Winston Churchill to Princess Diana*. San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2000.

Hume, David. "Of Simplicity and Refinement in Writing." *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary*. 1742. Ed. Eugene F. Miller. Rev. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1987. 191-6.

Janowitz, Anne. *England's Ruins: Poetic Purpose and the National Landscape*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1990.

Kaul, Suvir. *Poems of Nations, Anthems of Empire: English Verse in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Charlottesville, VA: UP Virginia, 2000.

Keats, John. *Complete Poems*. Ed. Jack Stillinger. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1982.

Levinson, Marjorie. *The Romantic Fragment Poem: A Critique of a Form*. Chapel Hill, NC: U of North Carolina P, 1986.

Lootens, Tricia. "Hemans and Her American Heirs: Nineteenth-Century Women's Poetry and National Identity." *Women's Poetry, Late Romantic to Late Victorian: Gender and Genre, 1830-1900*. Ed. Isobel

Armstong and Virginia Blain. New York: St. Martin's, 1999. 243-60.

---. "Hemans and Home: Victorianism, Feminine 'Internal Enemies,' and the Domestication of National Identity." *PMLA* 109.2 (1994): 238-53.

Makdisi, Saree. *Romantic Imperialism: Universal Empire and the Culture of Modernity*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Malthus, Thomas R. *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Norton Critical Edition. Ed. Philip Appleman. New York: W.W. Norton, 1976.

Mandeville, Bernard. *The Fable of the Bees*. Ed. F.B. Kaye. Facs. 2 vols. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1988.

Marr, Andrew. *The Day Britain Died*. London: Profile Books, 2000.

McDowell, Paula. "Consuming Women: The Life of the 'Literary Lady' as Popular Culture in Eighteenth-Century England." *Genre* 26 (1993): 219-52.

McFarland, Thomas. *Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin: Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Modalities of Fragmentation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1981.

Mellor, Anne K. "The Female Poet and the Poetess: Two Traditions of British Women's Poetry, 1780-1830." *Studies in Romanticism* 36 (Summer 1997): 261-76.

Nairn, Tom. *The Break-up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Nationalism*. 2nd ed. London: Verso, 1981.

Pocock, J.G.A. "The Mobility of Property and the Rise of Eighteenth-Century Sociology." *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History in the Eighteenth Century*. Ed. J.G.A. Pocock. NY: Cambridge UP, 1985. 103-23.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Psarra, Sophia. "The Parthenon and the Erechtheion: The Architectural Formation of Place, Politics and Myth." *The Journal of Architecture* 9 (Spring 2004): 77-104.

Renan, Ernest. "What is a Nation?" 1882. *Becoming National: A Reader*. Ed. Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny. New York: Oxford UP, 1996. 42-55.

Ross, Marlon B. "Configurations of Feminine Reform: The Woman Writer and the Tradition of Dissent." *Re-visioning Romanticism: British Women Writers, 1776-1837*. Ed. Carol Shiner Wilson and Joel Haefner. Philadelphia, PA: U Pennsylvania P, 1994. 91-110.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Samuel, Raphael, ed. *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*. 3 vols. London: Routledge, 1989.

Shaftesbury, Anthony, Third Earl of. *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times. 1714*. Fwd. Douglas Den Uyl. 3 vols. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2001.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe. *Shelley's Poetry and Prose*. Ed. Donald H. Reiman. New York: W.W. Norton, 1977.

Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. 2 vols. Ed. R. H. Campbell and A. S. Skinner. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1981.

Suleri, Sarah. *The Rhetoric of English India*. Chicago, IL: U Chicago P, 1992.

Trinder, Peter W. *Mrs. Hemans*. *Writers of Wales*. UK: University of Wales P, 1984.

Thomson, James. *The Seasons and The Castle of Indolence*. Ed. James Sambrook. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. New York: Columbia UP, 1989.

Volney, C. F. *Ruins or Meditations on the Revolutions of Empires and the Law of Nature*. Facsimile of the 1890 ed. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2004.

Ward, Stuart. “The End of Empire and the Fate of Britishness.” *History, Nationhood and the Question of Britain*. Ed. Helen Brocklehurst and Robert Phillips. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 242-58.

White, Daniel E. “’Mysterious Sanctity’: Sectarianism and Syncretism from Volney to Hemans.” *European Romantic Review* 15.2 (2004): 269-76.

Wolfson, Susan J. “’Domestic Affections’ and ‘the Spear of Minerva’: Felicia Hemans and the Dilemma of Gender.” *Re-Visioning Romanticism: British Women Writers, 1776-1837*. Ed. Carol Shiner Wilson and Joel Haefner. Philadelphia: U Pennslyvania P, 1994. 128-66.

---. “Hemans and the Romance of Byron.” *Felicia Hemans: Reimagining Poetry in the Nineteenth Century*. Eds. Nanora Sweet and Julie Melnyk. New York: Palgrave, 2001. 155-80.

Romanticism and Patriotism:
Nation, Empire, Bodies, Rhetoric

"A nation or a world": Patriotism in Shelley

Matthew C. Borushko, Boston University

1. At first glance nothing seems more un-Shelleyean than patriotism. Nothing seems more opposed to Shelley's professed cosmopolitanism, to his philosophical skepticism, to his Godwinian disinterestedness, to his moral universalism, and to his political radicalism than the idea of patriotism, especially if we associate, as we are prone to do, patriotic sentiment with chauvinistic nationalism. But if we recall that there was a politically radical version of British patriotism,[1] and if we realize that Shelley's politics were just as practical as they were radical, we can start to think through just what Shelley means when he invokes patriotism, which he does in a surprising number of writings. Not only is his appeal to patriotic sentiment rhetorical, as in the "*popular songs* wholly political" (*Letters* 2: 191), it is also philosophical and poetic, as in writings as diverse as the pamphlet *An Address to the People on the Death of the Princess Charlotte*, the essay *On Love*, the unpublished *Philosophical View of Reform*, and the manifesto *A Defence of Poetry*. What emerges from these various deployments is an idea of patriotism that at once motivates the political reformer, whom Shelley calls the "true patriot" in *A Philosophical View of Reform*, and also occasions community, offering proof, in the language of the *Princess Charlotte* pamphlet, "that we love something besides ourselves" (*Prose Works* 232). Combining the motive to reform with the necessity of community, the references to patriotism in *A Defence of Poetry* suggest that patriotism in Shelley is what Edward Blyden called "the poetry of politics" (qtd. in Appiah 26).

2. Shelley's Irish pamphlets, written mostly in England, show an acute awareness of the problems facing a reformer who would like to address those outside his national borders. *An Address to the Irish People* (1812) begins,

   > FELLOW MEN, I am not an Irishman, yet I can feel for you. I hope there are none among you who will read this address with prejudice or levity, because it is made by an Englishman; indeed, I believe there are not. (*Prose Works* 9)

   From a position of tenuous authority, Shelley's gesture of transcultural sympathy is careful to register cultural difference and then move on to assert that the accident of where we are born ought not to disqualify the desire of the English reformer to enlighten the Irish: "I should like to know what there is in a man being an Englishman, a Spaniard, or a Frenchman, that makes him worse or better than he really is. He was born in one town, you in another, but that is no reason why he should not feel for you, desire your benefit, or be willing to give you some advice, which may make you more capable of knowing your own interest, or acting so as to secure it" (9).

3. But is there tension between the apparently deracinated interests of the cosmopolitan reformer speaking political truth to the Irish people, and the "interests," however unspecified, of the Irish people themselves, interests that the cosmopolitan claims to be able to help the Irishman know? On a Shelleyean account the answer would be no: by virtue of feeling for and speaking to the Irish people, the cosmopolitan reformer performs the benevolence with which he or she hopes to animate his or her readership. As Shelley puts it in another of the Irish pamphlets, the "benevolent passions . . . generalize and expand private into public feelings, and make the hearts of individuals vibrate not merely for themselves, their families, and their friends, but for posterity, *for a people*; till their country becomes

the world, and their family the sensitive creation" (*Prose Works* 41). The idea of feeling "*for a people*," italicized by Shelley in *Proposals for an Association of Philanthropists*, is probably deliberately unspecific as to who "the people" is, because "a people" in this sense can be either a nation or the world. So long as we move beyond the circles of families and friends and into the larger, often inconceivable circles of nation and world—and here is where patriotism becomes a vital concept even for the young Shelley — we negate the tendency toward self-centeredness: "In proportion as he feels with, or for, a nation or a world, so will man consider himself less as that centre, to which we are but too prone to believe that every line of human concern does, or ought to converge" (41).

4. Phrases such as "a nation or a world" suggest that Shelley thought the moral imagination capable of feeling for more than one "people" at once; additionally, they suggest that he thought patriotism and cosmopolitanism not incompatible. The compatibility of cosmopolitanism and patriotism was not an uncommon trope in the rhetoric of English radicalism after the French Revolution, a tradition which came to Shelley most of all through William Godwin, his intellectual hero and eventual father-in-law, but also through Paine, Tooke, Coleridge, and the Wordsworth of the 1790s. In a sermon called *A Discourse on the Love of our Country* on 4 November 1789, the Dissenting minister Richard Price asserted that there was no problem in celebrating the English constitution along with the events in France. The love of our country, Price says, "does not imply any conviction of the superior value of it to other countries, or any particular preference of its laws and constitution of government" (25). Moreover, Price says of our country that "[w]e ought to seek its good, by all the means that our different circumstances and abilities will allow; but at the same time we ought to consider ourselves as citizens of the world, and take care to maintain a just regard to the rights of other countries" (26).

5. As David Bromwich notes, the "pretension" of Price's cosmopolitan sympathies was a central target of Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, which argues passionately that such sympathy, in Bromwich's paraphrase, is "morally impossible" because "before you can be a citizen of the world, you must be a member of a family, then a neighbor of others in a small community, then and only then a citizen of a nation. . . . After the abstraction of a nation, long after, comes mankind" (73). Burke's expression of the communitarian thesis contains the memorable idea of our "little platoon":

   > To be attached to the subdivision, to love the little platoon we belong to in society, is the first principle (the germ as it were) of public affections. It is the first link in the series by which we proceed towards a love to our country and to mankind. (46-7)

   Shelley's idea of patriotism encompasses both Burke's organic localism and Price's radical world-citizenship: it would extol them both equally for the basic virtue of countervailing our tendency to self-love, and for the expansion of private into public feelings for either a nation or a world.

6. Unlike the patriotism of Burke or Price, however, Shelley's idea of patriotism was not based on an ancient English constitution or even what Price calls "that event in this country to which the name of THE REVOLUTION has been given" (28). Shelley did not, as Paine charged of Burke, look to antiquity for authority. This much is made clear in Shelley's obscure prose fragment *The Elysian Fields* (1815 or 1816), which E. B. Murray identifies as a lesson in political philosophy addressed to the Princess Charlotte (*Prose Works* 400):

   > The English nation does not, as has been imagined, inherit freedom from its ancestors. Public opinion rather than positive institution maintains it in whatever portion it may now possess; which is in truth the acquirement of its own incessant struggles. (*Prose Works* 163)

7. Yet in "The Mask of Anarchy" (a poem included among his "popular songs"), Shelley addresses the

"Men of England, heirs of glory, / Heroes of unwritten story" (147-148), bringing together the acknowledgement of a common past with the idea of a shared future, while "unwritten" asserts the agency of the "men of England," the "heroes," in that future. "Unwritten" also indicates their heroic though yet-to-be written role in the past "glory" of England to which the present generation is "heir." The as-yet-imagined, "unwritten" quality of the future of England aligns Shelley with the radical constitutionalism of Paine's *Rights of Man*, and against the interpretation of the English constitution in Burke's *Reflections*. But how does Shelley get from the assertion in *The Elysian Fields* that "the English nation does not, as has been imagined, inherit freedom from its ancestors" to the idea in the popular songs of 1819 that the "men of England" are not only the "heroes" of their nation's "incessant struggles," but also that they are the "heirs of glory"?

8. The transition can be explained by a look at a series of texts in which Shelley invokes patriotism, proceeding from the political pamphlets of 1817 to *A Defence of Poetry* in 1821. Patriotism appears at the intersection of Shelley's practical politics of reform, as in the appeals to it in the pamphlets, and his developing aesthetics of sociality, as in *On Love* and *A Defence*. The ideas that Shelley associates with patriotism, as well as the uses to which he puts it, originate as the going-out-of-ourselves, however contingent and varied the occasion, be it for the sake of aesthetic experience, material necessity, or public mourning. While the political pamphlets of 1817 encourage patriotism—and in fact are composed out of patriotic feeling—Shelley's philosophical and poetic writings locate this patriotism in the affections. It is located in "our best affections," in fact, according to the *Princess Charlotte* pamphlet, and it is "at war with every base desire," in the language of *A Defence*. Variously deployed, patriotism in Shelley is a form of what he would come to call Love: a sympathetic identification with something besides our selves, something larger. It is both cause and effect; which is to say, it is both that out of which we act, writing pamphlets or poetry, and what it is we hope to achieve, the history that is yet unwritten.

9. Intended for an imagined readership of enlightened reformers, *A Proposal for Putting Reform to the Vote throughout the Kingdom* (1817) appeals to love-of-country as the solution to partisan gridlock:

> That the most eloquent, and the most virtuous, and the most venerable among the Friends of Liberty should employ their authority and their intellect to persuade men to lay aside all animosity and even discussion respecting the topics on which they are disunited and by the love which they bear to their suffering country conjure them to contribute all their energies to set this great question at rest—whether the nation desires a reform in Parliament or no. (*Prose Works* 173)

10. With the concept of patriotism unstable in the second decade of the nineteenth century, Shelley attaches it to eloquence, virtue, authority, intellect, and even to rhetorical persuasion—all characteristics of the enlightened. There is a distinction between the "most venerable among the Friends of Liberty" and the "men" whom they must persuade, suggesting that those who are enlightened already love their country and ought, for practical political reasons, convince others to love it too. As such, patriotism has a dual function in this passage: it is both what motivates the eloquent and virtuous Friends of Liberty to persuade others to set aside their differences *and* what the result of such persuasion is; which is to say, patriotism is both cause and effect.

11. In his other major pamphlet of 1817, Shelley locates patriotism not in the perfection of a mythical pre-Norman constitution or in "public opinion," but instead in the "bosoms of men," "revived" along with other "glorious emotions" such as "a noble spirit" and "the love of liberty" (*Prose Works* 236). The revival of patriotism in the "bosoms of men" occupies a crucial juncture in the brief historical narrative that Shelley presents in the pamphlet *On the Death of the Princess*. The narrative is an economic and social history of England from the war in America to the juxtaposed death of the Princess Charlotte and

the execution of laborers Jeremiah Brandreth, William Turner, and Isaac Ludlum. A précis of the socioeconomic analysis in the 1819 *Philosophical View of Reform*, the version of "things as they are" in the 1817 pamphlet not only shows Shelley's proto-Marxian vision of alienated labor, but also, in its indictment of the "double aristocracy" effected by the public debt, betrays Shelley's often overlooked aristocratic disposition.[2] Shelley posits a necessary connection between the prosperity of the new aristocracy of "villainous trade" and the "miseries" of the "day labourer":

> The labourer, he that tills the ground and manufactures cloth, is the man who has to provide, out of what he would bring home to his wife and children, for the luxuries and comforts of those, whose claims are represented by an annuity of forty-four millions a year levied upon the English nation. . . . Many and various are the mischiefs flowing from oppression, but this is the representative of them all; namely, that one man is forced to labour for another in a degree not only necessary to the support of the subsisting distinctions among mankind, but so as by the excess of the injustice to endanger the very foundations of all that is valuable in social order, and to provoke that anarchy which is at once the enemy of freedom, and the child and the chastiser of misrule. (236)

12. According to Shelley the agent of redress is "the nation," which "began to be weary of the continuance of such dangers and degradations," and its means is "the public voice," which "loudly demanded a free representation of the people" (236). And while "the nation itself" was reacting to the "hard necessity" following from the public debt, at some point, perhaps without "the nation" even knowing, "[a] nobler spirit also went abroad, and the love of liberty, and patriotism, and the self-respect attendant on those glorious emotions, revived in the bosoms of men" (236). United in the sense of "self-respect" that they generate, the "glorious emotions" of patriotism, liberty, and nobility of spirit are in fact not presented as the cause of the nation's "daring to touch the question" of parliamentary reform; rather, they are presented by Shelley as being there all along, having "[gone] abroad" uncaused or been "revived" unknowingly by and in each who contributed to the "public voice." But in Shelley's historical narrative the "public voice" gets "overpowered by the timid and the selfish" (237), showing the contingency of progressive reform on the confluence of daring and selflessness. Only a "regularly constituted assembly of the nation" can conjure again the "public voice" that brings with it a nobler spirit, the love of liberty and patriotism—in short, the self-respect—necessary for wresting power away from the despots of England in 1817 and their "infernal agents." For the time being, however, Shelley advises the English people to mourn, not just for the Princess Charlotte or even just for the executed laborers, but for "British Liberty":

> Mourn then People of England. Clothe yourselves in solemn black. Let the bells be tolled. Think of mortality and change. Shroud yourselves in solitude and the gloom of sacred sorrow. Spare no symbol of universal grief. Weep—mourn—lament. Fill the great City—fill the boundless fields, with lamentation and the echoes of groans. (238-39)

13. The idea of public mourning is addressed at the start of the pamphlet *On the Death of the Princess*. Shelley comes out in favor of it for reasons that have everything to do with what he means when he invokes patriotism: "Men do well to mourn the dead," Shelley writes, "because it proves that we love something besides ourselves" (232). Patriotism proves the same thing, and it becomes clear that patriotic sentiment is involved in Shelley's vision of public mourning, as he writes that "[t]o lament for those who have benefitted the state, is a habit yet more favorable to the cultivation of our best affections" (*Prose Works* 232). While patriotism is not mentioned in Shelley's dissertation on public mourning, it is undoubtedly present as the name for what happens when we mourn, like the Athenians, for "those who have benefitted the state." Feeling for a loss beyond our little platoon is a characteristic of a "liberal mind":

> We cannot truly grieve for every one who dies beyond the circle of those especially dear to us; yet in the extinction of the objects of public love and admiration, and gratitude, there is something, if we enjoy a liberal mind, which has departed from within that circle. It were well done also, that men should mourn for any public calamity which has befallen their country or the world, though it be not death. This helps maintain that connexion between one man and another, and all men considered as a whole, which is the bond of social life. (232)

14. Public mourning and patriotic sentiment are affairs of the heart, grounded in the "feelings of men" rather than in their intellects (232). They "occasion" a "pouring forth" of "those fertilizing streams of sympathy," which Shelley calls "solemnity": "This solemnity should be used only to express a wide and intelligible calamity, and one which is felt to be such by those who feel for their country and for mankind; its character ought to be universal, not particular" (233). Seeing no problem with feeling for both the country and for mankind at the same time, Shelley looks to public mourning as an occasion for patriotic sentiment—an occasion, however contingent, for the sociality that comprises our "best affections."

15. Our "best affections" are the subject of the 1818 essay *On Love*, which defines them as our search for community when we discover that merely our own thoughts are not enough: "[Love] is that powerful attraction towards all that we conceive or fear or hope beyond ourselves when we find within our own thoughts the chasm of an insufficient void and seek to awaken in all things that are a community with what we experience within ourselves" (*Shelley's Poetry and Prose* 503). Directed "beyond ourselves," this "powerful attraction" is what is at work in the kind of patriotism Shelley imagines and invokes. Indeed, patriotism, or more specifically "patriotic success," is referenced in *On Love*, occurring remarkably in a group with both natural beauty and the singing of a loved one:

> There is eloquence in the tongueless wind and a melody in the flowing of brooks and the rustling of the reeds beside them which by their inconceivable relation to something within the soul awaken the spirits to a dance of breathless rapture, and bring tears of mysterious tenderness to the eyes like the enthusiasm of patriotic success or the voice of one beloved singing to you alone. (504)

16. The specific comparison in this passage between the effect of natural "eloquence" and "melody" on "the soul" and that of "patriotic success" and a beloved's voice, both eliciting "tears of mysterious tenderness," suggests that while the true nature of patriotic sentiment is utterly inconceivable and thus profoundly mysterious, it can still be judged by its emotional impact. Like eloquence, melody, and a lover's voice, it belies our self-centeredness and shows us that we have a stake in what is public, that our "souls" bear a relationship to a nation or a world.

17. In *A Philosophical View of Reform* (1819), the idea of patriotism as both cause and effect, as both the motivation of the reformer and what reform would look like, informs Shelley's definition of the "true patriot": "The true patriot will endeavor to enlighten and to unite the nation and animate it with enthusiasm and confidence" (*Trumpet of a Prophecy* 257). The true, reformist patriot by definition goes out of herself and identifies with something larger; and the task of reform is to elicit this going out of self and identification—in short, this kind of Love—in others. Patriotism is both what impels the reformer and what she hopes to achieve. Refraining from any talk of enlightening, uniting, or animating all of mankind (a task left to the poets, those "legislators of the world"), Shelley assigns a central role to the "true patriot" in his vision of English social reform. In fact, the projects that Shelley sets forth for the "true patriot" encompass many of Shelley's own activities as a socially-committed poet: the tireless promulgation of political truth, the appeal to the Friends of Liberty to put aside their differences and come together on issues of common concern, the proposal of "open confederations" or

philanthropic associations, and the incitement of the people to exercise their right of assembly in reasonable numbers. The "true patriot" is also the prophet of nonviolence:

> Lastly, if circumstances had collected a more considerable number as at Manchester on the memorable 16th of August, if the tyrants command their troops to fire upon them or cut them down unless they disperse, [the true patriot] will exhort them peaceably to risk the danger, and to expect without resistance the onset of the cavalry, and wait with folded arms the event of the fire of the artillery and receive with unshrinking bosoms the bayonets of the charging battalions. (257)

18. The logic of Shelleyean nonviolence is manifold, but it includes at its heart the confrontation of the soldiers with their fellow men and fellow countrymen—or perhaps more accurately with their fellow men whom they only know, by virtue of the accident of being born in one country instead of another, as their fellow countrymen. Shelley notes twice this dual citizenship, both times pointing out that the soldiers are men and Englishmen: "In the first place, the soldiers are men and Englishmen, and it is not to be believed that they would massacre an unresisting multitude of their countrymen drawn up in unarmed array before them and bearing in their looks the calm, deliberate resolution to perish rather than abandon the assertion of their rights" (257). In the next use of the phrase—"[b]ut the soldier is a man and an Englishman" (257)—such dual citizenship is what "would probably throw [the soldier] back upon a recollection of the true nature of the measures of which he was made the instrument, and the enemy might be converted into the ally" (257). The sympathetic identification of soldier and laborer is not only a going-out-of-self by each party, but an expansion of passion, benevolence, and affection that is concomitant with the soldier's realization of his merely instrumental, and thus repressive, agency.

19. Although Shelley's "popular songs" prescribe just this kind of nonviolent resistance, there is no mention of poets and poetry in Shelley's description of the "true patriot" in *A Philosophical View of Reform*. Yet in *A Defence of Poetry* patriotism clearly depends for its vitality on poetry, and on the delicate sensibility and enlarged imagination of the true poet, which elevate patriotism to the realm of virtue, friendship, and love. Shelley mentions patriotism three times in *A Defence*, once in a discussion of Homer's heroes, and then twice in a list with virtue, friendship, and love, implying that each is equivalent to the others not only for their common grounding in poetry, but also for the fact that each is a version of the great secret of morals, which is "the going out of our own nature" (*Shelley's Poetry and Prose* 517):

> What were Virtue, Love, Patriotism, Friendship &c.—what were the scenery of this beautiful Universe which we inhabit—what were our consolations on this side of the grave —and what were our aspirations beyond it—if Poetry did not ascend to bring light and fire from those eternal regions where the owl-winged faculty of calculation dare not ever soar? (531)

20. Poetry, "unlike reasoning" but more like "something divine," "that from which all spring, and that which adorns all," or "the perfect and consummate surface and bloom of things," not only accompanies, expresses, and embodies patriotism, but also participates wholly in it. Poetry is the origin of patriotism as well as its performance. The expression of patriotism, or its influence on thought or action, is poetry, because a patriot by definition proves that she loves something besides herself. This is "the poetry of politics," the Shellyean patriotism that is what happens when "self appears as what it is, an atom to a Universe," the part of a necessary whole (532). But this applies, as Shelley's repeated invocations of patriotic sentiment contend, whether the "whole" be a nation or a world, for love of either mankind or England is equally a going out of our own nature, equally enough to motivate reform and to occasion sympathy.

Notes

I would like to thank Chuck Rzepka for conversations about and comments on this essay, Orrin Wang for some suggestions, and Melanie Adley for reading and commenting on several drafts.

1 The radical patriotism of the eighteenth century came to an end with the American war because of the patriots' generally pro-American, pacifist stance. After 1780 the relationship between radicalism and patriotism became strained, and the next two decades saw the vocabulary of patriotism enfolded in the rhetoric of conservatism—although the Tories grew increasingly fond of the idea of "loyalism" over the idea of patriotism. See Linda Colley, "Radical Patriotism in Eighteenth-Century England."

2 For the classic statement of Shelley's aristocratic politics, see Donald H. Reiman's "Shelley as Agrarian Reactionary."

Works Cited

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Cosmopolitan Patriots." *For Love of Country?* Eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996. 21-29.

Colley, Linda. "Radical Patriotism in Eighteenth-Century England." *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*. Ed. Ralph Samuel. Vol. 1. London and New York: Routledge, 1989. 169-187.

Bromwich, David. "A Note on the Romantic Self." *Raritan* 14 (1995): 66-74.

Burke, Edmund. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Ed. L. G. Mitchell. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Price, Richard. *A Discourse on the Love of our Country*. *Burke, Paine, Godwin and the Revolution Controversy*. Ed. Marilyn Butler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. 24-32.

Reiman, Donald H. "Shelley as Agrarian Reactionary." *Keats-Shelley Memorial Bulletin* 39 (1979): 5-15.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe. *The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. Frederick L. Jones. Vol. 2. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1964.

---. *The Prose Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Ed. E. B. Murray. Vol. 1. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1993.

---. *Shelley's Poetry and Prose*. Eds. Donald H. Reiman and Neil Fraistat. New York: Norton, 2002.

---. *Shelley's Prose: or the Trumpet of a Prophecy*. Ed. David Lee Clark. New York: New Amsterdam, 1988.

Romanticism and Patriotism: Nation, Empire, Bodies, Rhetoric

Projection, Patriotism, Surrogation: Handel in Calcutta

Daniel O'Quinn, University of Guelph

1. Unlike the 1770s and 80s, the 1790s were a period of consolidation in the British empire. Military victories over Tipu Sultan in Mysore and the establishment of the Permanent Settlement not only confirmed actual British domination in India, but also provided an occasion for phantasmatic constructions of global supremacy.[1] I've written elsewhere about how these events were staged at Astley's Royal Amphitheatre and at Sadler's Wells, but in this essay I am more concerned with the enactment of masochistic nationalism among Britons in Calcutta—i.e. a nationalism that coheres in the pain of its mutilated members[2]—whose dynamics are deeply connected to the recalibration of British subjectivity following the loss of the American colonies. Masochistic nationalism may seem counter-intuitive to our normative understanding of national character since masochism carries with it the connotation of perversion, a turning aside from truth or right, and specifically a turning from pleasure to pain. But it helps to explain the allegorical tactics employed in Calcutta on the particular evening I will be discussing in this essay. Prior catastrophic losses both in Mysore and in America had a lingering effect on future actions in India not only because the British could not afford further defeat, but also because the primary British actant in the Mysore Wars and the Permanent Settlement, Lord Cornwallis, carried his experience of defeat at Yorktown, and other American campaigns to India when he was appointed Governor-General of Bengal.[3] As an icon of both imperial humiliation and domination, Cornwallis plays an oddly double role in the celebration of victory over Mysore. Because the commemoration of Cornwallis's actions in India always carries the threat of re-activating traumatic memories of the American war, the performance of fragments from Handel's oratorios that I discuss in this essay compulsively repeat and repudiate scenes of national humiliation. What interests me is the way both the actants and the audience, who are largely indistinguishable from each other, tie their fantasies of national and imperial election to an unresolved cultural wound.

2. The chequered history of British conflict with the Sultans of Mysore prior to the early 1790s activated deeply felt anxieties not only about the susceptibility of British subjectivity to Indianization, but also about the viability of the imperial enterprise. As Linda Colley has reminded us, news of Britain's spectacular defeat at Pollilur in the first Mysore War reached London at almost precisely the same time as the news of the fall of Yorktown and there was general consternation that the entire empire was going to collapse (269-77). These anxieties were only exacerbated not only by heavily contested accounts of British atrocities in India, but also by widely circulated captivity narratives from the 1780s which revolve around scenes of bodily degradation and mutilation. Many of Tipu's prisoners were enslaved and forced to fight against the British forces. These cheyla battalions were the site of intense anxiety because most of the cheylas, or slaves, were forced to convert to Islam and were circumcised. As Kate Teltscher states, "The British cheylas, marked with the stigma of Muslim difference but otherwise unconverted to Islam, were stranded in a doctrinal no man's land, and the texts reveal their sense of marginalization" (240). However, she is also quick to point out, following Pratt, that the very fact of the existence of the survival narratives performs a kind of inoculation of their dangerous contents (243). Presented within the frame of a survivor's tale, the mutilation of the penis, and by extension of the religious and national subject, can be presented and contained. However, the line separating circumcision and castration is at times hard to discern in these texts because the mutilation, whether partial or complete, seems to instantiate a form of subjectivity that for all attempts at

containment continues to inhere in the narratives and haunts even the most triumphant accounts of victory over Tipu in the early 1790s.

Projection, or the Volatility of Paternalism

3. Like earlier campaigns against the Sultans of Mysore, the Third Mysore War did not start well for the British forces. The initial campaigns were conducted under the leadership of General William Medows, the Governor of Madras. Medows served under Cornwallis in the American war and despite his prior experience made a number of tactical errors that reminded Cornwallis of his own miscalculations in Pennsylvania and South Carolina.[4] Tipu took almost immediate strategic advantage in the early phases of the conflict and forced Cornwallis to take over Medows's command in mid-December of 1791. Cornwallis undertook one of the most massive deployments of men, animals and artillery in British military history and eventually conquered the strategic fortress of Bangalore. However, insufficient supply lines and uncooperative weather prevented him from successfully taking Tipu's capital Seringapatam. The monsoon and other logistical problems forced Cornwallis to retreat.

4. This anxiety regarding the mutilation of the national subject was partially resolved by Cornwallis's victory over Tipu Sultan at Seringapatam some months later. However, the resolution was partial because this conflict did not conclude with a decisive military annihilation, but rather with an extraordinary diplomatic transferral of money, lands and two of Tipu's sons as hostages to British rule. That transferral generated three successive performances of patriotism in Mysore and Calcutta, each of which had a supplementary relation to its immediate precursor. On February 23, 1792, Cornwallis himself engineered the first of these when he carefully staged a spectacle outside Tipu's fortress at Seringapatam involving elephants, artillery and soldiers in full ceremonial costume, in which he publicly received Tipu's two sons, "dressed for the melancholy occasion in muslin adorned with pearls and assorted jewellry", with a gesture of paternal care. The *Gentleman's Magazine's* account of the event is symptomatic:

   > Lord Cornwallis received [Tipu's sons] in his tent; which was guarded by a battalion of Sepoys, and they were then formally delivered to his Lordship Gullam Ally Beg, the Sultan's Vackeel, as hostages for the due performance of the treaty....At length Gullum Ally, approaching Lord Cornwallis, much agitated, thus emphatically addressed his Lordship: "These children," pointing to the young princes, whom he then presented, "were this morning the sons of the Sultan, my master: their situation is changed, and they must now look up to your Lordship as their father." The tender and affectionate manner in which his Lordship received them, seemed to confirm the truth of the expression. The attendants of the young princes appeared astonished, and their countenances were highly expressive of the satisfaction they felt in the benevolence of his Lordship. (72: 760)[5]

   Teltscher argues that the representation of Cornwallis's acceptance of Tipu's sons as a scene of paternal benevolence contrasts with the popular accounts of Tipu's alleged mistreatment of British captives. After the defeat of Tipu in 1793, war between the East India Company and Mysore was now refigured as a tropological struggle between normative and errant models of paternal care. The wide circulation of visual representations of this scene, on everything from prints to tea-trays, achieved the two-fold effect of putting the prior atrocities into abeyance and of re-enforcing British fantasies of colonial rule as a form of affectionate paternalism.[6]

5. This spectacle of military paternalism outside of Seringapatam was followed by elaborate celebratory performances in Calcutta. A Gala Concert was performed using amateur musicians and singers from the ranks of the East India Company and an extraordinary number of illuminations or projected transparencies were displayed throughout the town. Pre-cinematic transparencies had been used to

powerful effect in other colonial locales, but in this case it is the screens themselves that are most important.[7] By illuminating the key offices of the East India Company, the celebrations in Calcutta took icons of the bureaucratic regulation of subject peoples and made them contiguous with Cornwallis's paternal care of Tipu's sons:

> The Government house as it ought, the swelling of "public cause of pride" surpassed in magnificence grandeur all the rest:—the symmetry and style of the whole building, was particularly favorable to the occasion, and it was seen and embraced by the ingenious contrivers on this occasion with felicitous effect, the balustrades along the wings were ranged with party coloured lights, and intervening pedestals with lamps in festoons....A transparent painting of 32 feet high by 27 completed in its contrast an admirable idea of the whole spectacle; the scene bore a figurative allusion to memorable signature of the preliminary articles; and the introduction of the hostages to Earl Cornwallis on that occasion—three oriental figures in chief were the most remarkably distinguishable, and we think with propriety of judgement in the artist: They were the Vakeel and the Princes hostages presenting to Britannia, or her genius in the usual habiliment, a scroll—she appeared seated and behind her a figure of Hercules, emblematic of the great work so completely and speedily performed: above Fame appeared with a medallion of his Lordship and in the background a perspective view of Seringapatam.[8]

The substitution of Britannia and Hercules for Cornwallis in this visualization of the hostage transaction has the curious effect of hollowing out his specific actions in favour of a fantasy of abstract national agency here projected onto the surface of Company rule. Removing him from the scene and re-locating him into an apotheosis of Fame simultaneously exemplifies Cornwallis and contains his heroism as a subset of Britain's "clement bravery."[9] And does the eruption of femininity into the scene in the form of seated Britannia reinforce the notion of benevolent rule or undermine the particular significance of paternity to this ideological construct? It is as though each subsequent allegorical gesture calls into question the self-confirming fantasy of benevolent paternalism.

6. One could argue that Cornwallis's history of defeat and victory in colonial warfare makes him a volatile emblem of patriotic paternalism. That volatility requires not only repeated reassertions of his paternality—as Teltscher demonstrates, this ideological assemblage is highly over-determined—but also supplementation by a series of more complex phantasmatic constructions which not only undo the tight ideological sutures achieved in the initial performance, but also raise questions about how the nation can be seen at this distance from the metropole. The colonial newspaper accounts devote extensive coverage to the technical achievements of the illuminations that amounts to a subtle declaration of cultural superiority of technological modernity. Throughout the newspaper coverage there is a fascination with how the illuminations transform the quotidian spaces of Calcutta into "one continuous blaze" of allegorical splendor in which the very loci of formerly precarious rule emerge as classical emblems of virtue. As the *Madras Courier* declared, "suffice it to say, that where so general a display of beauty, splendor, and magnificence were combined to render Calcutta, and its vicinity, one of the most superb Coup d'oeil's it has ever exhibited."10] This declaration of artifice is to the point because it both invests in the power of representation and recognizes its limitations.

7. As the papers literally take the reader on a walk about town something strange begins to occur. In attempting to catalogue all the transparencies, the loco-descriptive act testifies to divergent visual interpretations of Cornwallis's victory. As the papers turn their attention from the official Company buildings to the private houses of Company members, "Cornwallis" is increasingly figured forth by his coat of arms and the buildings become the surfaces on which a fantasy of pastoral peace is projected:

> Messrs Gibbon and Brown's house in the Cossitollah; the whole extent of their house on

> all sides was laid out the same style of illumination as the government house, in front before the centre Window was displayed a neatly painted transparency, of his Lordship's arms, the coat of which extended considerably beyond the supporters, and over the crest displayed the roof a superb and splendid tent—the allusion was happy, apt, and finely impressive: above the tent was the [?] [11]and George and below the star with Laurels and Palms; the lower story of the house was in a similar style, the Gateway and avenue leading thru shrubbery was converted with great skill into a luminous Vista terminated by an alcove containing a temple dedicated to peace; within which was an urn inscribed to the memory of the brave dead; and without the motto *Glorious Peace*—the perspective was so happily preserved, that nothing appeared out of proportion, and yet the object immensely distant.[12]

Like other projections of "Fame relinquishing War,"[13] this image carries out a crucial act of memorialization which simultaneously marks the dead, so that they may be forgotten, and projects the viewer forward into a state of peace that is not only precarious, but also not fully achieved until almost a decade later. Tipu would not be killed until 1799.

8. If we think of Calcutta on that night as a precursor to the image city, then the emphasis on the illusion of perspective in the description of both transparencies is resonant for it quite literally takes the present historical buildings and ruptures their very contemporaneity by giving them both spatial and historical "depth." In the case of government house, the view of Seringapatam puts observers in a position of elevated contemplation—quite literally, the lord of all they survey. In the case of Gibbon and Brown's house, the everyday residence is literally and phantasmatically transformed into a picturesque pastoral scene of the kind that Britons were well acquainted with not only in the Georgic experiments of eighteenth-century poetry, but also in picturesque visual representation. Thomson's "The Seasons" is the most apposite exemplar of this kind of deployment of the prospect as a tool for representing good governance and eliminating all manner of social resistances.[14] As Beth Fowkes Tobin demonstrates, these same Georgic strategies were vital to William Hodges's almost contemporaneous picturesque erasure of warfare in his illustrations to *Travels in India during the Years 1780, 1781, 1782 and 1783* which was published in 1793 (117-43). Significantly, the battles being veiled by Hodges's picturesque representation of captured Indian fortresses are precisely those troubling conflicts of the First Mysore War which generated so much anxiety among British observers. To employ John Barrell's resonant phrase, both Hodges's illustrations and the projections in Calcutta manipulate light to hide "the dark side of the landscape," only here it is not the rural poor who are occluded by representation but the ongoing social conflict between British imperial power and native colonial resistance (1-33).

9. We should not be surprised to see geographically displaced Britons using the representational strategies of an earlier form of patriotic identification to figure forth a rather different imperial vision. But what remains so resonant here is the very duplicity of the image, for the projection of metropolitan fantasy is literally cast on the contours of colonial space. One has the sense that one could look upon the house of Messrs Gibbon and Brown and see conflicting images of triumph and ongoing struggle, past victory and present strife, the prospect of peace modelled on England's past and the portent of continuing conflict with Tipu that inheres in the very ground on which the viewer walks. And if this overlay of contradictory representations and ideological scenes isn't complex enough, it is important to remember that perspective is understood as a technology suited not only to the representation of peace, but also to the practice of warfare itself as practised by Cornwallis. The British ability to effectively target Tipu's fortresses's with their artillery relies on precisely the same geometric abstraction of physical space as that employed in the transparencies. The very technology of war figures forth the fantasy of peace.

Mrs. Barlow's Songs, or Spectres of France

10. Oddly enough, it is the parallel acts of walking and reading, that ultimately give the image city its political purchase, but it is important to remember that this stroll does not climb up to an "eminence" but rather ends up in the theatre. Once inside the doors, the collocation of might, moderation and pre-cinematic visual wonder was similarly enacted in the Gala Concert held in the Calcutta theatre:

> Entering at the west door, the first object that rivetted the attention was a beautiful semicircular temple, of the Ionic order, dedicated to Victory, placed at the east end, whose dome reached within a foot of the ceiling. In this was placed a transparency, representing a bust of Lord Cornwallis on a pedestal, with the Goddess of Victory flying over it, with a wreath of Laurel in her hand, which she was in the act of placing on his Lordship's brows: —on the plinth of the pedestal was his Lordship's motto,
>
> *Virtus Vincit Invidiam*.
> And over the bust
> *Regna Assignata*.
>
> And on each side of this was a nich, —in one of which a figure of Fortitude, and in the other, of Clemency, was placed. Over these, and extending the whole breadth of the temple, was a transparent painting of the action of the 6th of Feb. 1792, and beneath, the following four lines:
>
> *Still pressing forward to the fight, they broke*
> *Through flames of sulpher, and a night of smoke,*
> *Till slaughter's legions fill'd the trench below,*
> *And bore their fierce avengers to the foe*.

The contiguity of the emblem of Clemency and the images of slaughter encapsulate a specific patriotic style that unites the illuminations and the musical entertainment. The projected lines are from Addison's *The Campaign,* which celebrates the victory of the Duke of Marlborough over the French at Blenheim in 1704.[15] This comparison is bolstered by other elements of the poem which represent valiant British troops breaching the defences of hillside forts not unlike those Cornwallis encountered at Bangalore, Nundydroog and Severndroog.[16] Equating Cornwallis and Marlborough is an extremely important gesture not simply because it consolidates Cornwallis's heroism, but because it suggests that Cornwallis's treaty with Tipu, like the Treaty of Utrecht eighty years earlier, will establish a balance of power in the Asian subcontinent which will permanently check French aspirations to commercial and territorial empire. This allusion is effective because Tipu was widely supported by the French and British observers generally saw war with Mysore as a subset of a larger global struggle with France. What the projection suggests is that with this victory, the British have entered a new phase of imperial domination. However, this involves a misrecognition of both the past and the future that gets played out in the musical celebration.

11. The accounts of the concert indicate that transparencies were illuminated and extinguished in order to direct audience attention to various patriotic emblems before the performance of excerpts from Handel's *Judas Maccabaeus*. Like the mobilization of the prospects in the city itself and the citation of Addison's *The Campaign*, the choice of repertoire here takes arguably the most famous example of patriotic discourse in the eighteenth century and modifies it to suit the present circumstance. Contrary to what one might expect, the members of the civilian cadre of the Company who put on the celebration decided not to perform the famous "liberty airs" or even the more direct celebration of martial victory, but rather focused on pastoral passages which drew attention to the terms of new found peace. Act I takes the audience directly to an ambivalent moment from *Judas Maccabaeus* which both looks back at momentary victory and anticipates a return to war. This return, and its attendant anxieties,

is averted by a surrogative shift to a passage from *Joshua* which focuses on the Israelite conquest of Canaan. This activation and containment of anxiety is repeated in the Second Act with even more intensity. Despite the celebration of conquest at the end of Act I, Act II opens with the overture from *Samson* which calls forth the abject and dispossessed leader of the Israelites. This invocation of national weakness is answered by a return to the closing pastoral scenes of *Judas Maccabaeus*. Thus the evening's entertainment both segmented and sutured together often divergent patriotic images, texts and oratorios into a hybrid performance that engages with and re-configures the allegorical objectives of the primary source material. The depth of that engagement is breathtaking, for it returns to the very scenes of forced conversion, circumcision and dispossession which crystallized British imperial anxiety in the 1780s.

12. *Judas Maccabaeus* was originally, and continued to be, understood as an allegory for George II's victory over the Jacobite rebellion of 1745, but as Ruth Smith has argued it is an exceedingly complex and ambivalent expression of patriotism (50-7). James Morrell's libretto is based on both books of Maccabees, but much of its larger argument is implied. In 175 BC Antiochus Epiphanes ascended to the Syrian throne and was immediately involved in expansionist campaigns against Egypt. The Jews under Syrian rule were divided into orthodox and hellenized Jews who were open to the Greek culture of their rulers. Through a series of accommodations between these hellenized Jews, represented by Jason, and their Syrian rulers, steps were taken to turn Jerusalem into a Greek city with Greek institutions. More orthodox Jews came to fear that these developments would contaminate their religion and the ensuing conflict between orthodox and reform factions within the Jewish population was interpreted by Syrian rulers as rebellion and brutally put down. Following a massacre of Jews and a profanation of the Temple, Antiochus effectively outlawed Judaism including the act of circumcision. In 2 Maccabees these events are interpreted as a warning from God not to diverge from traditional religious practice: "Now I beseech those that read this book, that they be not discouraged for these calamities but that they judge those punishments not to be for destruction, but for a chastening of our nation" (2 Macc 6:12). As Ruth Smith indicates, this passage is presented nearly verbatim early in Part I of *Judas Maccabaeus* and needs to be understood as the condition of possibility for the oratorio's patriotism (59). The period of national, ethnic and religious division constitutes that which must be overcome to secure the political liberty of the Maccabees and by extension their British counterparts. This period of chastisement precedes the action of the oratorio, which focuses instead on the Maccabees' revolt against Antiochus's attempt to enforce pagan sacrifice among them. The patriarch of the family, Mattithias, refuses the edict, flees with his sons into the mountains and upon his death establishes his sons, Simon and Judas, as the political and military leaders of a rebellion against Syrian rule.

13. The oratorio begins at this point in the story, and the first two parts track Judas's victories over the Syrian forces. Significantly, Morrell and Handel relegate much of the military action to the intervals between the parts of the oratorio and present the audience with retroactive, largely choral, celebrations of victory. The spiritual and political centre of the work occurs in the beginning of Part III when Simon recovers the Sanctuary of the Temple—i.e. the events still celebrated at Chanukah. In response to the recovery of the temple and the defeat of his general Lysias, Antiochus withdrew his repressive orders and Jews could now live in accordance with their own laws. The oratorio thus shifts its attention from the struggle for religious freedom to the pursuit of Jewish independence and concludes with a treaty which guarantees independence for the Maccabees. This structure allows Handel and Morrell to indulge in some of the most resonant celebrations of political liberty in the eighteenth century, while downplaying a whole series of reverses in the historical account of the Maccabees rebellion.

14. When excerpts of this oratorio a performed in Calcutta in 1792, the audience was confronted with a cascade of allegories each laid over the top of the other, and like any palimpsest this act of layering erases as much as it figures forth. At the centre of these layers is the counter-intuitive allegorical

connection between the Maccabees story and the Jacobite rebellion in Handel's oratorio. In order to understand the allegory, it is crucial to recognize that the Jacobite rebellion was widely understood to be part of a larger French threat to English political and religious liberty. In this allegory, the Duke of Cumberland maps onto Judas, and the alliance between Scottish Jacobites and France becomes comparable to that of the alliance between the hellenized Jews and their Syrian rulers. As Smith states,

> At first sight, it might have seemed that the analogy would have appeared paradoxical or strained to its intended audiences...; the Maccabean story of a successful rebellion in which the rebels were in the right was apparently being used to celebrate the suppression of a rebellion in which the rebels were in the wrong. But Morrell is careful not to transcribe from Maccabees the instances in which the Jewish opposition resembled the Jacobite campaign, and the parallel is not between Syrians attempting to suppress a rebellion by the native Jewish population and Britain suppressing a rebellion by the native Scottish population. Rather, in the light of the contemporary perception of the rebellion as part of France's plan to dominate Britain politically and forcibly to change its religion, Judas unifying a nation disrupted from within by hellenizers who co-opt foreign hellenizing Syrian forces is equivalent to Cumberland unifying a nation disrupted from within by Jacobites who co-opt foreign Catholic French forces. This factual analogy is given vitality by an emotional one: the purgation of hellenistic tendencies...parallels British affirmation of loyalty after the upsurge of popular anti-Hanoverian feeling in 1742-4. (61-2)

So in its original context, Judas Maccabaeus allegorizes the Jacobite rebellion in order to repudiate the larger threat of French aggression and to argue for the necessity of purging not only schism, but also forms of political reform which threaten to make incursions on traditional notions of English political liberty. As Sudipta Sen argues, this "natural liberty" was not only "enshrined in legislation that reflected the intimate connections between liberty, private property, and law," but also supported by the continuing constitutional investment in the Protestant monarchy (13). What becomes portable, therefore, in subsequent performances of the oratorio, is its ability to call forth the anxious spectre of French aggression and the supposedly dire consequences of political apostasy or reform. And it is precisely this dramatization of disaster averted that fuels the oratorio's most patriotic moments. However, the activation of these anxieties does not always result in their resolution, and their performance has the potential to resuscitate past reversals and humiliations without fully resolving them.

15. With some sense of the political allegory of *Judas Maccabaeus* we can now return to the Calcutta theatre and sketch in the remaining allegorical layers. Addison's lines on the Temple implicitly compare Cornwallis's victory over Tipu to the Duke of Marlborough's victory at the Battle of Blenheim. What links the two historical moments, aside from some obviously wishful thinking that the treaty with Tipu will be another Treaty of Utrecht, is the fact that British forces prevail against alliances between Mysore and France and Bavaria and France respectively. The inscription on the Temple globalizes the conflict in India by emphasizing French involvement in both conflicts and thus establishes the alliance needed for translating the Maccabean allegory to the third Mysore War. This is crucial because the Mysorean uprising of the early 1790s, like that of the Scottish Jacobites in the 1740s, needed to be figured not as rebellions but as French aggression carried out by proxy native forces for the allegory to operate properly.

16. The parallels being drawn between Judas's war against Syria, Marlborough's campaign against the Franco-Bavarian alliance, Cumberland's suppression of the French sponsored Jacobites, and Cornwallis's victory over Tipu Sultan all revolve around the spectre of French interference in British affairs. Impending war with France in Europe is again setting up the political and emotional condition for the Maccabean allegory to have some purchase on the audience. The Calcutta papers were full of

the news of revolutionary France and the palpable evidence of English social and cultural schism in response to the French example were as much a topic of concern in the colonies as they were in the metropole. Just as the adverse incidents which beset the Jews in Syria prior to the Maccabean revolt are interpreted as temporary punishment—or "chastening"—for hellenization, the staging of *Judas Maccabeus* in Calcutta plays out the reverses of British fortune in the first two Mysore wars not only as punishment for comparable prior examples of Indianization in which some British colonial subjects adopted the cultural and social norms of India, but also as a warning against current sympathy towards the French revolution among some British constituencies. In both the Maccabees story and the revisionist history implied by Cornwallis's reforms of the East India Company, any deviation from national and racial purity implied by openness to surrounding Syrian or Indian society is punished and then overcome. This historical comparison is crucial because it speaks directly to the current moment of social schism in Britain itself. In the face of increasingly polarized British reaction to events in France, my suspicion is that the celebrants in Calcutta are exorcizing the dangers of social and cultural apostasy by turning the defeat of Tipu into a phanttasmatic victory over France. In other words, this performance both chastens the nation by invoking past humiliation in the time of political crisis *and* projects the future triumph of the re-consolidated nation in a larger geopolitical frame.

17. This fantasy of unification, and its allegorical support, may have had particularly strong purchase because many of the audience members would have been Scots—the East India Company was composed of an inordinate number of Scottish employees. For these audience members, the entire allegorical economy is predicated on the historical ejection of forms of political affiliation perhaps not at all distant from some audience members' pasts. In very real ways, the loyal Scottish members of the Company are the normative counter-example not only to past rebels, but also to current factions opposed to the actions of the state. One of the primary objectives of the Calcutta celebration is to crystallize this counter-exemplarity in the very space where previous observers, including Cornwallis, bemoaned the openness of Company officials to Indian styles of sociability.[17]

18. In this context, the earlier British losses to Mysore with all their attendant narratives of abjection become evidence of Britain's voluntary descent into faction and apostasy in the late 1780s and early 1790s. The allegory is at its most insistent here because Tipu's forceable conversion of British soldiers to Islam is implicitly compared to Antiochus's demand that the Maccabees take up Pagan worship. As noted earlier, the anxiety produced by forced circumcision and the intense resistance to such blurring of religious and ethnic identity is felt throughout subsequent representations of conflict in Mysore ,and they mirror the Maccabees story in eerie and powerful ways. But the allegory replaces the Mysorean act of forced circumcision with Antiochus's prohibition of the act: that which is most terrifying is tropologically cancelled yet nonetheless activated. This is because, in the chain of allegories, forced Indianization in Mysore is being used to figure the openness of both Whig and more radical British constituencies to French constitutional reform, and thus the voluntary desire for reform among Britions is being recast as French desire for the absorption of British society. The entire figural economy aims to cancel past and present forms of voluntary cultural hybridization which were routinely satirized as an adoption of Eastern and/or French effeminacy by positing an external tormentor who violates the cultural, social and sexual autonomy of the patriot Briton. Thus the ostensibly prior hollowing out of masculinity from the inside is replaced by a fantasy of violation which paradoxically re-establishes the "integrity" of the patriotic subject at a future date. Put bluntly, the disturbing evidence of consensual, dare we say seditious, deviation from normative masculinity is replaced by a fantasy of being raped by the other. This ideological manipulation of what Reik in his analysis of Christian masochism refers to as "adverse incidents" not only allows the audience to re-configure past instances of abjection into prophetic signs of future imperial pleasure, but also to effectively subsume the real threat posed by Tipu or France into a masochistic fantasy where the tormented remains fully in control of the scene.[18]

19. Because the Maccabean allegory is so concerned with establishing the threat posed by an alliance between an internal other and a larger external force, the entire event is traversed by fantasies of persecution and vulnerability. The Calcutta concert picks at the wound in revealing ways. The first Act of the Calcutta performance takes a brief recitative and song from the beginning of the oratorio's second part which not only celebrates Judas's first victory's over Syrian forces, but also precedes a return to war. This return is negated by a sudden shift to a chorus from *Joshua* which focuses not on the contamination of the nation by foreign influence, but rather on the triumphant subjection of foreigners. *Joshua*, unlike *Judas Maccabaeus*, is largely about the acquisition of territory—in this case Canaan—through conquest. The surrogative effect of shifting from *Judas Maccabaeus* to *Joshua* is clarified by remembering the role of Canaan in seventeenth British theories of governmentality. In her analysis of *Joshua*, Smith argues that

> The partition of Canaan was for Harrington the origin of the Israelite 'agrarian', the ordering of society based on land ownership which in his view formed the foundation of right government....In other words, the division of Canaan by Joshua under God's direction was the birth of the Israelite nation, and since the division was based on principles of land ownership essential to the prosperity and stability of any society, it was or should be the pattern of all societies—including, for the audience of *Joshua*, their own. According to Harrington their agrarian law was the key factor which saved the Israelites from falling into typical eastern servility. (Handel's *Oratorios*, 251-2)

This hypostatization of landed property as the source of governmental and social security is precisely what underpinned Cornwallis's implementation of the Permanent Settlement following the 1792 treaty with Tipu. And the Permanent Settlement was itself as an allegorical policy—one which utilizes one form of social and economic relations to figure forth another.

20. When, in Act 2, Mrs. Elizabeth Barlow, the wife of the very man who would attempt to reconfigure Indian property relations in terms of British notions of landed property [19], and Captain Haynes sing the following lines, one is presented with the aural equivalent of what C.A. Bayly refers to as the Permanent Settlement's "massive effort in wishful thinking" (186):

> Oh! lovely peace! With plenty crown'd,
> Come spread thy blessings all around,
> Let fleecy flocks the hills adorn,
> And vallies smile with waving corn!
> Let the shrill trumpet cease
>   No other sound
>   But Nature's songsters
> Wake the cheerful morn (3.27)

In a significant alteration of Handel's oratorio, this song, originally scored for the Israelitish woman, is transformed into a duet with the counter-tenor Captain Haynes. The uneasy association betwen counter-tenor roles and castrati reactivates the castration threat at this key moment, but with a crucial difference. The audience is presented with the civilian and the military wings of the East India Company singing in concert. Would it be too much to suggest that the duet re-fashions the pastoral moment such that the military man is tamed by the implied domestic relation between male and female singer? It is precisely this sublation of the soldier into the paternal, the military into the familial/bureaucratic that informs both the treaty ceremony and many of the projections. Thus the performance supplements the complex re-orientation of Cornwallis as imperial icon such that the spectre of castration is put into abeyance by the plenitude not simply of the imperial father, but of the biopolitical imperatives of the middle classes.[20] This supplemental relation is revealing, for it

emphasizes that the fantasy of benevolent paternalism and the Permanent Settlement are ineffective in and of themselves and thus require the deep micrological regulation of domestic relations which came to pre-occupy British rule in India in the early nineteenth-century. As Sen, Collingham and others have recognized, sexual and racial deployments which the middle classes first utilized to consolidate their own power both at home and abroad became crucial norms for managing colonial populations.[21] It is precisely these deployments in the form of the singing conjugal pair which are grafted onto now obsolete figurations of pastoral peace and which re-orient the ideological import of this patriotic performance.

The American Ghost

21. However, the full depth of this re-orientation can only be fully understood when we look closely at how these pastoral lines are deployed. This happy fantasy in which India starts to look like England and the future French threat is conveniently consigned to allegorical oblivion, is haunted by an American ghost. Act 2 of the Calcutta performance opens with the overture from Handel's *Samson*. *Samson*, like many of the Israelite oratorios, offers recurrent images of national weakness and opens with its hero collapsed on the ground, dispossessed by a foreign foe. As Smith argues,

> Samson and the Israelites, no longer hero and inferiors but, at the crisis, equally powerless, wait upon God's aid, and there is no certainty that it will materialize....The nation's setbacks, its oppression by an alien race, the only partly heroic career of its hero, its absolute dependence on divine favour which cannot be claimed to be merited, and its recognition of divine agency in every success—all these aspects of this oratorio, which recur throughout the librettos of the Israelites, even when taken with the many expressions of faith, strength and confidence which also recur, do not add up to triumphalism. (Handel's *Oratorios*, 299)

Smith is highly attentive to how anxiety works in each of the Israelite oratorios and argues that their patriotism is often shadowed by fundamental moments of doubt regarding British national election. But the performance we are examining in this essay fragments these patriotic texts and stitches them together such that "adverse incidents" are located in a very specific temporal structure. For audience members familiar with Handel's music, the overture would have engaged the anxiety attending Cornwallis's previous failures in America. Read in this way the sudden return to the pastoral passages of *Judas Maccabaeus* quoted above would amount to nothing less than an attempt to bury some particularly bad memories. But why risk engaging the very nightmare of colonial defeat? As in the previous allegorical cascade, imperial setbacks are mobilized to highlight the act of overcoming them. But there is also something else at stake, which lies deep in the heart of the allegory itself and perhaps explains why everything about this performance seems so overdetermined.

22. When we consider the historical structure that allows the Maccabean allegory to function, what we encounter is a figure that cannot help but call forth the American disaster. After all the historical situation which most powerfully resembles the Maccabean story is that of the American colonies in 1776. As Dror Wahrman and others have argued, the key problem for British subjectivity posed by the American crisis is that the people most like them not only take up arms in internecine strife but form an alliance with the French.[22] If we run this through the Maccabean allegory, the Americans become the hellenized Jews, the French remain in the role of the Syrian oppressors, and the English find themselves cast as the orthodox Jews. Only in this story, no unification is effected, the orthodox Britons simply lose and are forced to re-imagine Britishness without their American brothers. In this story, Cornwallis is desolate, alone and dispossessed; a figure not unlike Samson who is in desperate need of recuperation. The nightmare of Yorktown becomes inextricably linked to the dreams fostered by the Mysorean treaty: a dream of Permanent Settlement and benevolent paternal rule, no less than a dream

of global supremacy over France.

23. Could we not argue that by 1792, this dispossessed figure has finally become politically useful, not only literally in the sense that he has a job to do in India, but also figuratively in the way he is invoked in the Gala Concert: as the chastened sign of history whose recurrent pain retroactively anticipates the pleasures of as-of-yet unrealized imperial domination. And it is the ultimate un-presentability of global supremacy either in fact or in fantasy that allows for its figural presentation in the person of Cornwallis. By invoking Lyotard's reading of Kant's famous notion of the "sign of history" I am trying to suggest that Britons at this moment of patriotic investment see human progress as a form of national election which is not susceptible to direct presentation but rather must operate through a complex temporal game in which patriotic enthusiasm—with all its recollected pain and forestalled pleasure—is itself an as-if presentation of supremacy.[23] As a "chastened" sign of history it is a perversion of the very notions Kant was attempting to explore in the late historical and political writings, but it should not come as a surprise because British patriotic discourse claims "liberty" in an altogether different fashion than Kant's analysis of the French Revolution. Throughout this phantasmatic exchange the particular term "Briton" trumps any universal notion of the human; English "liberty" overrules any abstract notion of freedom as the tendency toward the moral idea of the Absolute Good; and thus the story inexorably reverts to arrogant attributions of God's will. As Kaja Silverman states, all adverse incidents, all "sufferings and defeats of the fantasizing subject are dramatized in order to make the final victory appear all the more glorious and triumphant" (196). Imperial Britain's calamities in America and Mysore are transformed into exemplary and necessary punishments which presage a level of future supremacy only God can bestow, because it has not—and we might add, will not—come to pass. But the supposed deviations from appropriate national character—Britons' flirtations with hybrid forms of sociability whether they be understood as Indianization or Francophilia—for which the nation has been chastened or is to be chastened will become all too evident in the emergent patriotisms of the early nineteenth century. They will become the negative ground from which racialized notions of national election are activated and maintained.

Notes

1 The canonical treatment of this misadventure remains Guha.

2 What I am describing here is not that distant from the notion of "traumatic nationalism" recently articulated by Berlant (1-4). I have also explored this issue in "The State of Things." For my discussion of the Tipu plays at Astley's and Sadler's Wells see *Staging Governance*, 312-48.

3 Cornwallis became Governor-General of Bengal in 1786.

4 See Wickwire for a detailed account of the place of prior American experience in Cornwallis's correspondence on Medows' failures in Mysore in 1790.

5 This account was first published in the *Madras Courier* and reprinted in *Gentleman's Magazine*. For thorough accounts of the discursive construction of this event and its significance for popular acceptance of British policy in India see Marshall, 71-2 and Teltscher, 248-51.

6 See Forrest, 347-50 for a discussion of the pictorial representations of Cornwallis's victory.

7 See Casid.

8 *The World* (Calcutta), 28 April 1792. Except where otherwise noted all newspaper accounts are from this issue.

9 *The World* (Calcutta), 28 April 1792.

10 *Madras Courier*, 17 May 1792.

11 This word is illegible.

12 *The World* (Calcutta), 28 April 1792.

13 *The World* (Calcutta), 28 April 1792.

14 See Barrell's reading of the Lyttleton prospect in “Spring,” *English Literature in History*, 56-61.

15 See Addison, ll. 145-8.

16 See Addison ll. 131-40.

17 For evidence of Cornwallis's fear of interracial relations see Wickwire, 110. As C.A. Bayly argues, "Cornwallis moved heavily against European revenue officers involved in Indian trade and tried to create a wall of regulations to separate the Indian and European worlds” (149). See Bayly (133-62) for wide-ranging account of the consolidation of racial and social hierarchies from the Governor-Generalship of Cornwallis. Beth Fowkes Tobin, in *Picturing Imperial Power* (117-8) also argues Cornwallis's reforms were designed not only to minimize the amount of intermingling between British and Indian subject in the realms of commerce and civil administration, but also to avert miscegenation. See Collingham, 51-89 for a detailed account the segregation policies which eventually infused nineteenth-century Anglo-Indian relations. See also Sen, 119-49 for a discussion of “the decline of intimacy" promulgated during the Raj.

18 See Reik, 304 for a discussion of the manipulation of “adverse incidents” in masochistic fantasy.

19 As P.J. Marshall notes, Sir George Hilario Barlow "was very closely concerned with the devising and implementing of the permanent settlement of Bengal revenue enacted by Cornwallis in 1793. He was given responsibility for drafting the judicial regulations, known as the Cornwallis code. Barlow's correspondence with Cornwallis shows his total commitment to the principles embodied in the permanent settlement: security of property and government accountable to law. Cornwallis was generous enough to say that his ‘system' had been based on ‘adopting and patronizing your suggestions.'"

20 For an extended discussion of this biopolitical turn in imperial performance see *Staging Governance,* 260-8.

21 See Stoler, 95-136 for a similar set of arguments regarding coloniality, biopolitics and governmentality.

22 See Wahrman, Bradley, Linda Colley, *Britons*, Clark, Miller, Wilson, Gould, Pocock, *Virtue*, *Commerce and History* and *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800* (246-282).

23 See Lyotard, 161-71.

Works Cited

Addison, Joseph. “The Campaign.” London: Jacob Tonson, 1705.

Barrell, John. “Introduction.” *The Dark Side of the Landscape: The Rural Poor in English Painting 1730-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980. 1-33.

---. *English Literature in History, 1730-80: An Equal Wide Survey*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1983.

Bayly, C.A. *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World 1780-1830*. London: Longman, 1989.

Berlant, Lauren. *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1997.

Bradley, James E. *Popular Politics and the American Revolution in England: Petitions, the Crown, and Public Opinion*. Macon: U of Georgia P, 1986.

Casid, Jill H. "'His Master's Obi': Machine Magic, Colonial Violence, and Transculturation." *Visual Culture Reader* Ed. Nicholas Mirzoeff. New York: Routledge, 2002. 533-45.

Clark, Jonathan C.D. *The Language of Liberty 1660-1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1992.

---. *Captives*. New York: Pantheon, 2002.

Collingham, E. M. *Imperial Bodies: The Physical Experience of the Raj, c.1800-1947*. Cambridge: Polity P, 2001.

Forrest, Denys. *Tiger of Mysore: The Life and Death of Tipu Sultan*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1970.

Gould, Eliga H. *The Persistence of Empire: British Political Culture in the Age of the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2000.

Guha, Ranajit. *A Rule of Property for Bengal: An Essay on the Idea of Permanent Settlement*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1996.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute*. Trans. Georges Van Den Abbeele. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1988.

Madras Courier, 17 May 1792.

Marshall, P. J. "Barlow, Sir George Hilario, first baronet (1763-1846)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004.

---. "'Cornwallis Triumphant': War in India and the British Public in the late Eighteenth Century." *War, Strategy and International Politics*. Ed. Lawrence Freedman, Paul Hayes and Robert O'Neill. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992. 57-74.

Miller, Peter N. *Defining the Common Good: Empire, Religion and Philosophy in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994.

O'Quinn, Daniel. *Staging Governance: Theatrical Imperialism in London, 1770-1800*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins U P, 2005.

---."The State of Things: Olaudah Equiano and the Volatile Politics of Heterocosmic Desire." *Romantic Circles Praxis Series*. Editor Richard Shaw. January 2006. 1-39. University of Maryland. 2 April 2006. <http://www.rc.umd.edu/praxis/sexuality/oquinn/oquinn.html>.

Pocock, J. G. A. “Political thought in the English-speaking Atlantic, 1760-1790: (i) The imperial crisis.” *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 246-282.

---.*Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.

Reik, Theodor. *Masochism in Sex and Society*. Trans. Margaret H. Beigel and Gertrud M. Kurth. New York: Grove P, 1962.

Sen, Sudipta. *Distant Sovereignty: National Imperialism and the Origins of British India*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Silverman, Kaja. *Male Subjectivity at the Margins*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Smith, Ruth. *Handel’s Oratorios and Eighteenth-Century Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

---. “The Meaning of Morell’s Libretto of ‘Judas Maccabaeus.’” *Music and Letters* 79.1 (Feb. 1998): 50-71.

Teltscher, Kate. *India Inscribed: European and British Writing on India 1600-1800*. Delhi: Oxford UP, 1995.

Tobin, Beth Fowkes. *Colonizing Nature: The Tropics in British Arts and Letters, 1760-1820*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2005.

---. *Picturing Imperial Power: Colonial Subjects in Eighteenth-Century British Painting*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999.

Wahrman, Dror. “The English Problem of Identity in the American Revolution.” *The American Historical Review* 106.4 (October 2001): 1236-62.

Wickwire, Franklin and Mary. *Cornwallis: The Imperial Years*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1980.

Wilson, Kathleen. *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715-1785*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

The World (Calcutta), 28 April 1792.

Romanticism and Patriotism: Nation, Empire, Bodies, Rhetoric

Walter Scott, Politeness, and Patriotism

Andrew Lincoln, University of London

1. Scott often writes of patriotism in terms that evoke the austere virtue of classical humanist tradition. In the *Life of Napoleon*, for example, he argues that patriotism has "always been found to flourish in that state of society which is most favourable to the stern and manly virtues of self-denial, temperance, chastity, contempt of luxury, patient exertion, and elevated contemplation" (*Napoleon* 52). If patriotism implied active resistance to tyranny and oppression, and heroic self-sacrifice for the public good, it was easy to think of it as a virtue that predated the ethos of commerce, since (as many scholars have noted) the moral justification of commerce was centred on ideas of virtue associated with refinement, sociability, humanitarian sympathy, and on the personal liberty of the individual.[1] The tension between these ideas of virtue runs through the work of many writers in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, including Scott's. Patriotism is a common theme in his fiction, and yet the hero is usually destined to be separated ultimately from the stern demands of patriotic duty and to be consigned to the enjoyment of personal liberty and material prosperity. In what sense, then, can Scott himself be described as a patriotic writer, when he writes novels for a commercial market?

2. Scott's career as a novelist began in a period when the most serious threat to Britain—once the menace of Napoleon had receded—appeared to lie in internal conflict, the mutual alienation of the social orders. He responded most keenly to the evidence of division in rural areas, where the population was still rising faster than employment, and where it was still possible to imagine a rapprochement between the social orders through benevolent paternalism. I accept E.P. Thompson's view that to use the term "paternalism" in the context of eighteenth-century Britain is to evoke a "myth or ideology," rather than an actual social practice based on "face-to-face relations" between landowners and the poor. In Thompson's account the myth was sustained in an age when the power of the governing classes was located primarily in a "cultural hegemony," maintained through "postures and gestures" that worked to give structures of authority the appearance of a natural order (Thompson 23, 24, 46, 43). The widening gap between myth and "actual social practice" is a problem Scott has to address. Throughout eighteenth-century Britain the culture of paternalism was being weakened by economic, demographic and political changes. Transformations in agricultural practices led to the abandonment of direct economic relations between landowners and those who worked on their land, while long-established methods of supporting the poor had been allowed to lapse. In Scotland, the major cities were becoming increasingly aware of the problems posed by the poor displaced from the rural areas, although awareness did not necessarily result in a willingness to deal with the problems (Dwyer [1989]).

3. To a twenty-first century reader, Scott's attitude to these developments must seem inconsistent. He was in favour of abolishing the Elizabethan Statute of Artificers and Apprentices, which regulated relations between employers and workers, and was critical of the poor law. He also accepted the "legislative interference" of the Corn Laws (introduced to maintain prices) as "an imperious necessity."[2] Graham McMaster concludes that his position on such issues "makes it inconvenient to present him as a paternalist" (McMaster 82). But in this period it was hardly unusual for those who embraced the ideology of paternalism to hold such attitudes (see Perkin 182-192 and Roberts 18-21). Scott was generally distrustful of government regulation—rather more so than Coleridge and Southey, who favoured state intervention on behalf of the poor (Lawes 29 ff). His distrust may be consistent with the

laissez-faire emphasis of the new political economy. But it is rooted less in a commitment to what Adam Smith would term a "system of natural liberty," in which individual agents were free to pursue their own self-interest (Smith ii 208), than in a commitment to maintaining local dependencies by finding private solutions to social problems.[3] In his letters he suggests that the British post-war crisis was worse in England than in Scotland because Scottish landowners (including himself) still preserved paternal links with the poor, links that provided opportunities for shared cultural experiences, while in England, dependence on the "accursed poor-rates" was helping to promote discontents and "reforming mania" among the English lower classes (*Letters* V 173 [July 1818], 509-510 [October 1819]). And he compares the bad effects of employing the poor on public works in Edinburgh with the good effects of his own methods of employing the poor on his Abbotsford estate (*Letters*, IV, 446-447 [May 1817]).[4] He shares a growing concern about the effects of modernization upon the higher and middling ranks of society, who were apparently being led (as the High Tory *Blackwood's Magazine* complained) "to deride and despise a thousand of those means of communication that in the former days knit all orders of the people together" (1820, VII, 90-102). In his reactionary political work *The Visionary*, competed in May 1819, Scott evoked the impossibility of re-establishing cordial paternal relations with the poor once these have been broken.[5] He saw the country gentleman as "the natural protector and referee of the farmer and the peasant" (*Napoleon* 27), and a breakdown of this natural relation as a threat to national liberty. One of the aims of his writing is to defend his nation—Scotland-within-Britain—from this perceived threat of social disintegration; it is in relation to this aim that Scott can be thought of as a patriotic writer. I shall argue that some of the formal characteristics and thematic preoccupations of this fiction can be understood in terms of this patriotic mission.

4. Scott's paternalism conceives of an ideal relationship between landowners and land-workers, an ideal of mutual affection based on mutual kindness and shared interests. In his preface to *Memoirs of the Marchioness De La Rochejaquelein* (1827), for example, Scott finds his ideal realised in the relations between the French nobles and peasants of the Vendé—who at the time of the French revolution joined together in a vigorous campaign of patriotic resistance against the power of revolutionary Paris. This close relationship between peasant and landowner had survived in the remote region of the Vend´e, because (unlike relations throughout the rest of France) it had been not been disrupted by the spread of metropolitan manners. Scott notes with approval that such Vendéan landowners "as went occasionally to Paris, had the good sense to lay aside the manners of the metropolis, and resume their provincial simplicity, so soon as they returned" (8). Here, then, the ideal is sustained by a movement between different codes of behaviour, different conventions and manners, polite and vulgar. It is sustained, that is, by role-playing, and suggests an attitude to identity that contrasts strikingly with Wordsworthian ideas of organic consciousness.

5. Scott's historical investigations are partly driven by his paternalism, which shapes his interest in forms of cultural interaction between social orders in earlier ages. This is an interest he shares with English antiquarians such as Henry Bourne (*Antiquitates Vulgares*, 1725), John Brand (*Observations on Popular Antiquities*, 1777, an annotated edition of *Bourne's Antiquitates*), Francis Grose (*A Provincial Glossary with a collection of local proverbs and popular superstitions*, 1782), Joseph Strutt, (*Horda Angel-cynna, or A Compleat view of the Manners, Customs, Arms, Habits, etc of the People of England*, 1775-76, *Glig-Gamena Angel Deod or The Sports and Pastime of the People of England*, 1801) and Francis Douce (*Illustrations of Shakespeare and of Ancient Manners*, 1807). The interests of these writers were rather different from those of the Scottish, Irish and Welsh nationalist antiquarians who, in Katie Trumpener's account, were inspired by the patriotic resistance of the ancient bards, and "emphasised the collapse of Celtic clan structure under the pressures of Christianity and English conquest" (Trumpener 7). The English writers look back to localised popular customs once shared by high and low ranks, but which are now viewed with disdain by the enlightened and refined. While sharing that disdain, the antiquarians sometimes betray an anxiety about the social consequences of change. Francis Grose, for example, in his glossary of waning oral traditions, worries that mobility,

newspapers, and the influence of metropolitan culture are spreading political contention and scepticism among previously docile land-workers (Grose vii-viii, iii). And Joseph Strutt, in his pioneering study of popular sports and pastimes, notes that the progress of refinement produces a general decline of "manly and spirited" bodily exercises, a result of the withdrawal of the nobility from practices that came to be seen as vulgar, and the disappearance of the public spaces once devoted to such exercises, which confined them to "common drinking-houses" (Strutt xlvi). Antiquarians were often viewed critically by historians, but in exposing the traces of social division and the "softening" of masculine manners, their researches appeared to provide empirical confirmation of the more general arguments of enlightenment historians like Adam Ferguson, who warned of the threat to public virtue inherent in the development of modern commercial societies.

6. Scott's work is clearly influenced by this new antiquarian interest in the history of popular culture. Within his fictions the emergence of politeness is grounded in a history of social division and exclusion. At various points his works allude to a process in which the nobility, the clergy and the bourgeoisie withdrew from what was once a common culture. In his poetic romance, *The Lady of the Lake*, for example, the culture of the highland clan, in which high and low are united by the art of the minstrel, is compared with that of the town of Stirling, where the sporting entertainments enjoyed by the burgers of the town, are disdained as "mean" by the nobles in the time of James V (Canto V). In his novel *The Abbott*, the popular revels once licensed and encouraged by the Roman Catholic church have become, in the era of the Reformation, an insolent threat that both Catholic and Protestant authorities seek to repress (105-6). *The Fortunes of Nigel* shows how the introduction of the "Ordinary" eating house in Jacobean London provides an exclusive social space for those with "good clothes and good assurance," in contrast to unrefined pleasures of the tavern. (Chapter 12, 168). In *Guy Mannering*, some "veterans of the law" are seen to play High Jinks in a "paltry and half-ruinous" tavern in Edinburgh Old Town in the early 1780s; they are lingering representatives of a tradition about to be displaced by new buildings and new manners (203-205). As this novel indicates, the relationship between refinement and social division was revealed starkly in eighteenth-century Edinburgh, where alongside the sprawling Old Town in which higher and lower orders traditionally lived in close proximity, the elegant New Town was built, an appropriate setting for the elite clubs and improvement societies in the vanguard of modern Scottish culture. By the beginning of the nineteenth century it appeared that, across Britain, the "rage for refinement and innovation" was killing off the last remnant of traditional popular customs and activities such as morris dancing, which antiquarians had begun to record for posterity (Douce 482).[6]

7. Scott's interest in this aspect of cultural history anticipates that of modern historians. In some respects his view of this historical process resembles Habermas's account of the "retreat" of secular festivities from "public places" into aristocratic spaces "sealed off from the outside world," and the emergence of a "bourgeois public sphere" centred on new spaces such as the coffee house (Habermas 9-10, 27-35). It anticipates the so called "bi-polar" model of culture associated with Peter Burke, who claims that by 1800 the higher orders "had abandoned popular culture to the lower classes, from whom they were now separated, as never before, by profound differences in world view" (Burke 270). And Scott's view also has something in common with the views of Peter Stallybrass and Allon White who, argue that the "transformation of the sites of discourse" (in the creation of refined spaces such as the coffee house) entailed a denial of "the unruly demands of the body for pleasure and release," in the interests of the "serious, productive and rational discourse" appropriate to polite identity. In their account, polite *rational* discourse is, through refinement, "delibidinized" (Stallybrass and White 83, 97).

8. Scott shows a comparable understanding of the "changes in the interrelationship of place, body and discourse" (Stallybrass and White 83) required by the production of politeness; informed by the work of antiquarians, he shows that the withdrawal of the higher classes from a common culture involved changes in the use of space, and changes in the acceptable norms of bodily behaviour. What this history implies, is that the moderate consciousness of his heroes—restrained, detached, reasonable—has been

made possible by the historical disembedding of identity from the social, material and cultural grounds that governed individuals in earlier ages.

9. Scott's view of this process is in many respects simpler that that of his twentieth-century successors, but in at least one respect, it may be more complicated. When Stallybrass and White consider responses to the process of refinement in *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*, they focus primarily on culture within England, touching only briefly on relations between England and Ireland, and ignoring Scotland and Wales. But when the issue of refinement is considered in relation to the wider context of English hegemony, it becomes more complicated, as a number of distinguished scholars have recently reminded us.[7] While refinement produces a movement towards standardization, towards a usage defining, or identifying, polite British consciousness, the Scots inevitably existed in a complex relationship with that kind of identification. Janet Sorensen points out that the polite language we encounter in Samuel Johnson and Jane Austen was not "common" to anyone in Britain (*Grammar* 208). Nevertheless for Scots, as for Irish and Welsh, the process of linguistic standardization was inseparable from issues of national identity, national autonomy, the threat to national interests posed by the cultural dominance of England.

10. We can see how this threat influenced Scott's views if we consider the monumental editions of Dryden and Swift that he had completed by 1814, the years in which he published *Waverley*. Stallybrass and White describe both Dryden and Swift as "great champions of a classical discursive body" who work to construct a refined English identity (Stallybrass and White 105). In Scott's assessment, however, there is a fundamental difference between Dryden, whose writing is bound by English concerns, and Swift, who becomes an Irish writer. Scott's Dryden is a professional poet responding to and attempting to reform the taste of his age; he seeks to promote a heroic drama in which the language, actions and character would be "raised above the vulgar" ("Dryden" 24). But Swift, never a man of letters trying to please a select public, emerges as a great Irish patriot, who moves decisively beyond the exclusive and divisive concerns of Dryden and the fashionable English readership. He writes "in every varied form" (including ballads and prose satires supplied to hawkers), rising above party interests and addressing both high and low in order to make a whole people aware of their rights and interests in the face of the "narrow-souled, and short-sighted mercantile interest" of Britain ("Swift" 169). Where Dryden separates literature from the vulgar, Swift's relative independence from the court and metropolis allows his writing to form the grounds for social and national unity. Swift's greatness lies in his ability to unite a diverse and potentially fragmented audience by moving across cultural boundaries. As an "Irish" writer he must continue to address polite English readers and include their concerns among others. He does not abandon the polite perspective, but he moves beyond it, allowing alternative perspectives to compete with it. He is, in a sense that Stallybrass and White would not acknowledge, both polite and popular. In this respect Scott anticipates the views of Swift offered in our own age by Michael McKeon, or by Carol Fabricant, who finds Swift's work "fundamentally inimical to the ordering, idealizing Augustan mind as we have come to understand it in terms of someone like Pope" (Fabricant 17). For Scott the anarchic inclusiveness of Swift is realised most clearly in *Gulliver's Travels*:

> perhaps no work ever exhibited such general attractions to all classes. It offered personal and political satire to the readers in high life, low and coarse incident to the vulgar, marvels to the romantic, wit to the young and lively, lessons of morality and policy to the grave, and maxims of deep and bitter misanthropy to neglected age, and disappointed ambition. ("Swift" 163)

Swift offered an important precedent for Scott's own attempts to move beyond the framework of Anglo-British politeness in his writing. In Swift he found a prestigious precedent for the dynamic combination of historical, philosophical, political, sociological and literary discourses with elements drawn from commercial and traditional popular culture; the blending of realism with fantasy, literary

game-playing and subversive irony; and for the dramatic unsettling of cultural hierarchies. The discontinuous and inconsistent qualities of Swift's work that Michael McKeon and Bob Chase read as signs of "extreme skepticism" are read by Scott as a means of uniting a diverse audience, a strategy consistent with Swift's patriotism (McKeon 338-356, Chase 110).

11. Scott's own mission as a patriotic Scot was to enact conciliation, by writing as if for a unified national readership. Addressing an audience that was torn between the demythologizing heritage of the enlightenment on the one hand, and attempts to reassert traditional moral and religious principles on the other, Scott combines the economic amoralism of progressive historical discourse with the romance of disinterested personal virtue. He moves between affirmation of polite modernity and a romantic primitivism that validates those who stand beyond the norms of modern polite culture, in a condition "unfettered by system and affectation" (*Rob Roy* 410). And in attempting to reconnect the polite reader with what has been lost in the process of refinement, Scott tries to negotiate with the lost experience of the body. In Stallybrass and White's account of polite culture, the refined bourgeois consciousness that emerges in the eighteenth century constructed the non-refined as an "*other realm* inhabited by a grotesque body which it repudiated as part of its own identity"—a body characterised partly by the impure mixing of categories. In their account, champions of refinement attacked as intolerable those who "had not yet dissociated 'classical' from popular culture" but who "actively lived both" (Stallybrass and White 103, 84). In Scott's fiction, in contrast, the historical dissociation of cultures is assumed to be an accomplished fact, while the process is viewed in retrospect. This means on the one hand that educated characters who remain in touch with popular tradition may call for understanding or qualified admiration. In *Waverley*, for example, Flora McIvor derives part of her romantic glamour from being placed on the borderline between polite culture and oral Gaelic culture, which she patronises. In the realm of local tradition, the polite gentleman may justifiably become the student rather than the model of culture. On the other hand it means that when the non-refined "grotesque body" first begins to surface in Scott's work, as it does spectacularly in his second novel, *Guy Mannering*, it is it is not simply the sign of anxiety about the mixing of polite and popular culture, but the sign of a more radical anxiety about the influence of polite culture itself. The grotesque gypsy Meg Merrilees, for example, antithesis of feminine refinement and enlightened rationality ("a full six feet high," "a man's great coat over the rest of her dress," "dark elf-locks [...] like the snakes of a gorgon," wild rolling eyes indicating "something like real or affected insanity," 14), preserves the remnants of a common heritage of Scottish folk superstition, and finds a counterpart in the polite hero Guy Mannering, who has a scholarly interest in astrological beliefs. The enlightened repudiation of vulgar belief is now registered as repression of instinct (the narrative includes a long quotation from Coleridge's translation of *Wallenstein*, which suggests that while folk beliefs "live no longer in the faith of reason," the heart still needs "a language," the "old instinct" still brings back "the old names," 18-19). The grotesqueness of the gypsy may register the polite subject's anxiety about what has already been repudiated as part of polite identity, but it also enables the gypsy to assume a sublime dignity appropriate to her role in the restoration of the lost heir of Ellangowan. In the same novel the grotesque body of the Dominie or school-master acquires a complementary significance. Beyond all possibility of refinement, it corresponds to his mental condition (he cannot, in spite of his parent's ambition, be educated into a priest). In the case of this figure the anxiety of the grotesque may be related to the combination of high culture and low social origin, but the novel passes beyond raillery to assign the Dominie an apartment in the restored heir's new house, as the subject of sympathetic patronage. Having failed to achieve independence through educational opportunity, he provides an image of lower class dependence that is reassuring rather than threatening in an age of rapidly spreading literacy.

12. These cases illustrate the negotiation Scott undertakes with the legacy of refinement, in which the polite perspective is reproduced while the repudiation it implies is mitigated: the recoil from the vulgar is transformed into a movement to re-establish relations on manageable terms. Elsewhere in the novels, rather than simply rejecting unrefined passions, Scott uses the historical perspective to allow a partial—

and of course, heavily qualified—recovery of them. The historical romance, that is, offers to remedy (as reading experience) the loss it exposes as history. Following the example of the gothic romance, Scott's fiction typically thrusts the modern consciousness of the hero and reader into a world beyond the delibidinized space of rational discourse to which it is historically adapted. This was an aspect of Scott's novels that Hazlitt, among the most astute of his contemporary critics and admirers, was keen to emphasise. He responded warmly to the novels' evocation of violent passions that contrast with modern humanitarian sentiment:

> they carry us back to the feuds, the heart-burnings, the havoc, the dismay, the wrongs, and the revenge of a barbarous age and people—to the rooted prejudices and deadly animosities of sects and parties in politics and religion, and of contending chiefs and clans in war and intrigue. […] As we read, we throw aside the trammels of civilization, the flimsy veil of humanity, "Off, you lendings!" The wild beast resumes its sway in us, and as the hound starts in his sleep and rushes on the chase in its fancy the heart rouses itself in its native lair, and utters a wild cry of joy, at being restored once more to freedom and lawless unrestrained impulses ("Hating" 129).

Fiona Robertson notes how critics have traditionally "separated Scott from Gothic in terms of their relative healthiness" (Robertson 25). But for Hazlitt, apparently, the Gothic violence of the novels was by no means incompatible with a healthy influence. However, it was not simply the possibility of visceral excitement in scenes of feuding, combat, mob violence or torture that seemed rousing. The aesthetic principle that governs Scott's fictions involves a deliberate dismantling of the boundaries that usually preserve the contemplative poise of the refined subject. In his "Autobiography" Scott distinguishes between "the picturesque in action and in scenery" to define this aspect of his aesthetic: "to me the wandering over the field of Bannockburn was the source of more exquisite pleasure than gazing upon the celebrated landscape from the battlements of Stirling castle" (24). Accordingly, in his fiction he abandons the depoliticised picturesque convention of the framed and static scene that diminishes the particularity of human figures. Instead, the "picturesque in action" strives to place the observer in the position of the participant, moving through a landscape that may be peopled with historically particularised figures, up close to the action. Hazlitt registered a sense of novelty in the dynamism of Scott's descriptions ("There is a hurtling in the air, a trampling of feet upon the ground," "Spirit" 63), and he repeatedly described their effect as restorative to the enervated modern reader ("the mountain air is most bracing to our languid nerves," "Spirit" 61). In the age of the turnpike and the post-chaise, the novels seek to recreate the invigorating experience of contending with wild landscapes on foot, of pleasurable exposure to the elements, and of confronting accidents that transform scenery into sources of mortal danger (Mordaunt Mertoun, his clothes thoroughly wet, making his way through brooks and morasses across the bleak Shetland landscape, maintaining a dogged conflict with wind and rain in *The Pirate*, 28-29; Frank Osbaldistone, making his way back to Aberfoil by moonlight through a sharp frost-wind, his spirits suddenly elevated despite the danger and uncertainty of his situation, in *Rob Roy*, 383; the scholarly Jonathan Oldbuck "pressing forward with unwonted desperation to the very brink of the crag" in the coastal rescue in *The Antiquary*, 61; Arthur Phillipson "clinging to the decayed trunk of an old tree, from which, suspended between heaven and earth, he saw the fall of the crag which he had so nearly accompanied" in *Anne of Geierstein*, chapter 2). The novels also offer glimpses of a habitual bodily intimacy unknown to polite society (as in the unimproved Liddesdale of *Guy Mannering*, chapters 24-26), and of vigorous communal effort or festive enjoyment of a kind that contrasts with the routines of the urban workplace or the factory (such as the sport-as-work of the salmon-hunting of *Guy Mannering* and *Redgauntlet*, or the collective holiday pageantry of *Kenilworth*).

13. Through such experiences and spectacles, the modern, detached, moderate rationality of the narrator, and often the hero, is linked to a restored sensorial excitement, as the novel connects the reader

vicariously to a passional self momentarily free from habitual restraint (although in practice, still carefully insulated from any action that would seriously offend conventional proprieties). This strategy might be related to the development of the new, tougher ethic among the British elite during this period, fostered in the public schools and universities, through a classical curriculum celebrating physical heroism, through manly sports and fox-hunting, through the arts and the cult of military heroes (see Cannon 34-49, Colley 164-193, Mori 130-133). But this elite education is usually seen as cultivating an ethos of patriotic state service and imperialism, whereas Scott's primary concern, I would argue, is the threat of social division. On the one hand, the novels appeared to recommend the detachment and moderation fostered by enlightened rationality (while detesting Scott's Tory politics, Hazlitt thought the novels worked to counteract both "ultra-radicalism" and conservative extremism, "Spirit" 64-65). On the other hand, they seemed to compensate for the repression required by that rationality. Moderation *and* wildness, detachment *and* primitive passion: the radically opposed tendencies Hazlitt identifies help to account for his sense that Scott had thrown aside the "trammels of authorship" ("Spirit" 61).

14. While Scott presents Swift's patriotism as a matter of counteracting the policies and actions of the "narrow-souled, and short-sighted mercantile interest" of Britain ("Swift" 169), Scott's own patriotic mission can be conceived as a matter of compensating for, and counteracting, the divisive social consequences of modernisation, not only at the level of ideological difference (by enacting moderation) but also at the level of feeling. While Wordsworth recoils from the "degraded thirst after outrageous stimulation" in the modern, increasingly urban public (Wordsworth 249), Scott works to accommodate it, while harnessing it to a paternalist fantasy of harmoniously restored dependencies in rural communities. At the same time he seeks to moderate the refinement that produces the polite recoil from what is seen as vulgar. His moderate paternalism required a willingness to reach across cultural barriers, to move beyond the norms of polite culture, while maintaining the hierarchies denoted by those norms and barriers. In contrast to Coleridge, whose aesthetic ideal of organic unity has been seen as a response to political and cultural disruption (Leask 135-144), for Scott the imagined unity of the audience remained more important than the unity of the work. The ironies, inconsistencies and contradictions within his work are generated by his attempt to write as if for a unified national readership, by offering "attractions to all classes" at a time when social and political reconciliation seemed increasingly beyond reach.

Notes

1 See for example Pocock 37-50, Dwyer (1993), Sher (1985) 187-188.

2 *The Edinburgh Annual Register, 1814*, Edinburgh, 1816, pp 57, 74; *The Edinburgh Annual Register*, 1815. Edinburgh, 1817, p 67.

3 Roberts notes "a decided preference" among paternalists "for local over central government, and within the concept of local government a decided preference for private over public authorities" (Roberts 40).

4 See also *Letters* V, 114 [March 1818]; 286-287 [January 1819]; 451 [August 1819]; 486 [September 1819].

5 When the narrator finds (in his dream) distressed weavers in the West of Scotland supplied with work by a benevolent aristocrat, his expectation that a grateful peasantry will bless their benefactor is rudely dashed(II, 32).

6 Robert Malcolmson quotes Southey's "pardonable exaggeration" in *Letters from England* iii 102-103: "All persons [...] speak of old ceremonies and old festivities as things which are obsolete." Malcolmson adds that "most men of property seem to have applauded their demise as a of progress and national improvement" (89).

[7] For example, Robert Crawford, *Devolving English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992); Leith Davis, *Acts of Union: Scotland and the Literary Negotiation of the British Nation 1707-1830* (Stanford: Stanford Univ Press, 1998); Janet Sorensen, *The Grammar of Empire in Eighteenth-Century British Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Adam Potkay, *The Fate of eloquence in the Age of Hume* (Cornell: Ithaca and London, 1994); Adam Potkay, *The Passion for Happiness: Samuel Johnson and David Hume* (Ithaca and London: Cornell Univ. Press, 2000); Leith Davis, Ian Duncan, Janet Sorensen, eds., *Scotland and the Borders of Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Works Cited

Blackwood's Magazine. VII (1820).

Burke, Peter. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001.

Cannon, John. *Aristocratic Century: the peerage of eighteenth-century England*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Chase, Bob. "Walter Scott: A New Historical Paradigm." Bill Schwartz, ed. *The Expansion of England: Race, Ethnicity and Cultural History*. London: Routledge, 1996, 92-129.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation: 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Crawford, Robert. *Devolving English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Davis, Leith. *Acts of Union: Scotland and the Literary Negotiation of the British Nation 1707-1830*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

--- with Ian Duncan, Janet Sorensen, Eds. *Scotland and the Borders of Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Douce, Francis. "Dissertation III: On the Ancient English Morris Dance." *Illustrations of Shakespeare and of Ancient Manners*. 2 vols. London, 1807. II, 431-482.

Dwyer, John. "*The Caledonian Mercury* and Scottish National Culture 1763-1801." *Journal of History and Politics* VII (1989), 147-169.

---. "Enlightened Spectators and Classical Moralists: Sympathetic Relations in Eighteenth-Century Scotland." in John Dwyer and Richard B Sher, eds. *Sociability and Society*. Edinburgh: The Mercat Press, 1993. 96-118.

Fabricant, Carole. *Swift's Landscape*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

Grose, Francis. *A Provincial Glossary with a collection of local proverbs and popular superstitions*. London, 1782.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Translated by Thomas Burger with Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.

Hazlitt, William. "The Spirit of the Age." *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*. Ed. P. P. Howe 21 vols. London and Toronto: Dent, 1932. xi, 57-68.

---. "On the Pleasures of Hating." *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*. Ed. P.P. Howe 21 vols. London and Toronto: Dent, 1932. xii, 127-136.

Lawes, Kim, *Paternalism and Politics: The Revival of Paternalism in Early Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 2000.

Leask, Nigel. *The Politics of Imagination in Coleridge's Critical Thought*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1988.

Malcolmson, Robert R. *Popular Recreations in English Society,1700-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

McKeon, Michael. *The Origins of the English Novel 1600-1740*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1987.

McMaster, Graham. *Scott and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Mori, Jennifer, Britain in the Age of the French Revolution. Edinburgh: Pearson, 2000.

Perkin, Harold. *The Origins of Modern English Society 1780-1880*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Pocock, J. G. A. *Virtue, Commerce and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Potkay, Adam. *The Fate of Eloquence in the Age of Hume*. Cornell: Ithaca and London, 1994.

---. *The Passion for Happiness: Samuel Johnson and David Hume*. Ithaca and London: Cornell Univ. Press, 2000.

Roberts, David. *Paternalism in Early Victorian England*. London: Croom Helm, 1979.

Robertson, Fiona. *Legitimate Histories: Scott, Gothic, and the Authority of Fiction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Scott, Walter. *The Abbot*. Ed. Christopher Johnson. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000.

---. "Autobiography." In J. G. Lockhart, *The Life of Sir Walter Scott*. 2 vols. London and Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1892. I.

---. *The Edinburgh Annual Register, 1814*. Edinburgh: 1816.

---. *The Edinburgh Annual Register, 1815*. Edinburgh: 1817.

---. *Guy Mannering*. Ed. P. D. Garside. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.

---. *The Fortunes of Nigel*. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1890.

---. *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott*. Ed. H. J. C. Grierson. London: Constable, 1932. 12 vols.

---. "Life of John Dryden." *The Miscellaneous Prose Works of Sir Walter Scott*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Black, 1878. I, 1-107

---. *Life of Napoleon Buonaparte*. *The Miscellaneous Prose Works of Sir Walter Scott*. Edinburgh, 1835. VIII

---. "Memoirs of Jonathan Swift, D. D." *The Miscellaneous Prose Works of Sir Walter Scott*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Black, 1878. I, 109-233.

---, Ed. *Memoirs of the Marchioness De La Rochejaquelein*. Edinburgh, 1827.

---. The Pirate

---. *Rob Roy*. Ed. Ian Duncan. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

---. *The Visionary*. Ed. Peter Garside. Cardiff: University College Cardiff Press, 1984.

Sher, Richard B. *Church and University in the Scottish Enlightenment*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1985.

Smith, Adam. *The Wealth of Nations*. Ed. Edwin Cannan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Sorensen, Janet. *The Grammar of Empire in Eighteenth-Century British Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Stallybrass, Peter and White, Allon. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. London: Methuen, 1986.

Strutt, Joseph. *Glig-Gamena Angel Deod or The Sports and Pastime of the People of England*. London, 1801.

Thompson, E. P. *Customs on Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture*. New York: The New Press, 1993.

Trumpener, Katie. *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Wordsworth, William. Preface. *Lyrical Ballads*. Eds. R.L Brett and A.R. Jones. London: Methuen, 1963. 241-272

Romanticism and Patriotism: Nation, Empire, Bodies, Rhetoric

"Manlius to Peter Pindar": Satire, Patriotism, and Masculinity in the 1790s

Noah Heringman, University of Missouri-Columbia

1. In the summer of 2004, spokesmen for the Bush administration did not refer to Michael Moore as "a bloated mass, a gross, blood-bolter'd clod" who "spunge[d] on dirty whores for dirty bread" (Gifford lines 67, 124). They did not exactly call him a "scourge of society . . . polluted with vanity, cowardice, and avarice" (Albion 12), nor did they mask their ad hominem attacks behind patriotic pseudonyms such as "Manlius" or "Albion." Moore's detractors in the White House concealed neither their identities nor their actual ignorance of his work, including the new film that provoked them, *Fahrenheit 9/11*. Patriotic pseudonyms did play a significant role in conservative attacks on Moore's Georgian predecessor John Wolcot, alias Peter Pindar (1738-1819), but his detractors nonetheless tended to ground their charges on a thorough knowledge of his popular satires. From at least 1787 until well after 1800, these numerous polemicists, sometimes employed directly by the government, attacked Wolcot's patriotism by questioning his manhood. Like Moore's work in some ways, Wolcot's anti-monarchical satire brought more outrageous and yet more accurate criticism of the government before a larger public than any comparable work. His critics' retaliation could be compared to such recent works as *Michael Moore Hates America* and *Michael Moore is a Big, Fat, Stupid White Man*. As their epithets attest, Wolcot's opponents similarly emphasized his corpulent body and his deviant masculinity, made more dangerous by its challenge to a militarized culture and the exalted masculinity of a wartime leader. Moore's claim to be a patriot is especially offensive to the right, and Wolcot too presented himself as a member of the loyal opposition; but the term "patriotism" (or "unpatriotic") is more rarely applied to Wolcot because its sense has shifted along with the composition of the body politic.[1] What we might call unpatriotic in Wolcot's satire appeared instead as libel, sedition, and blasphemy, especially when he targeted the royal body of George III.

2. Wolcot, as Pindar, politicized the King's corporeal masculinity and thereby invited attack on his own. Clearly relishing the verbal combat, Wolcot set forth a grossly embodied masculinity as a condition of the genuine political agency he opposed to the bloodless, moralistic loyalism inculcated under the government of William Pitt. The difference between these two opposing forms of masculine patriotism, I will argue, corresponds to the rift between the king's two bodies exploited by Wolcot's satires. At the same time, Wolcot's poetry promoted a conflict that allowed both sides to taste the libidinal pleasures of patriotic struggle: he became the focal point of scatological and sodomitic fantasies as well as attempts to politicize sexual morality. Wolcot's many satirical antagonists used his own ribald persona more or less skillfully against him to unman or infantilize the robust social critic implied as the author of his satires. William Gifford of the *Anti-Jacobin Review* dismissed the "filthy drivel of this impotent dotard" (11) as sexual wish-fulfillment, adding more than twenty years to Wolcot's real age in an elaborate attack in verse. "Manlius," in the pages of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, took Wolcot to task as "foremost among the enemies of Royalty" and condemned the unmanly sentiments of a poet who could lampoon a monarch recently recovered from madness (1044). Ironically, however, Wolcot himself continually upbraided George for failures of manly sentiment: sometimes selling thousands of copies a day, Wolcot's lampoons gleefully ridiculed the King's stutter, his vulgar social and natural curiosity, his taste for castrati, his failings as a father, and his politically obnoxious avarice.[2] In a similar vein, Wolcot dismissed the natural history of George's favorite Sir Joseph Banks as "well suited to the idle

hour of some old maid," not fit for "men who labour . . . with a Titan mind" for the benefit of humanity (*Works* 235).

3. The political satire of Wolcot and his critics dramatizes the political charge of sexual deviance. Today's Georgians, like the *Anti-Jacobin*, seem to have claimed "the manlier virtues, such as nerv'd / Our fathers' breasts" for themselves (Canning 326). In this view, the satirist's vitiated manhood is the unmistakable symptom of his treasonous intent. At the same time, the success of Wolcot's sharp attacks on the King and the Pitt government depended in no small part on his own ability to construct highly politicized definitions of masculinity. For both sides, then, sexual deviance is political deviance. Though currently the right seems to control this equation, the right-wing bloggers' obscene conflations of Moore's personal and political manhood, his body and his work, betray a complex and unstable ideological foundation informed by the politics of the 1790s. I won't begin to speculate about the bloggers' frequent recourse to homophobic epithets and images in their attacks on Moore, but the charge of sodomy also curiously frames Wolcot's career in the prose and verse of his detractors. In March 1789 the *Times* reported, in brief, oblique installments, that a scullion from the royal kitchens had been caught in flagrante delicto with Peter Pindar in the Birdcage Walk. This charge—probably because it was spurious—lay dormant for eleven years until Gifford introduced it in the prose apparatus to his Epistle to Peter Pindar. Gifford's attack is also the most vehement and elaborate of the dozens I have read, and for some readers it sank Wolcot's reputation for good. Previous critics had tended to concentrate on other vices—Peter's obesity, his promiscuity and/or impotence, drunkenness, irreverence, and propensity to libel and falsehood. Gifford's willingness to air eleven-year-old dirty laundry may reflect a new level of investment in professional literary authority of the kind that Michael Gamer describes in his recent reading of Gifford's *Baviad*: "For Gifford . . . [the publisher John] Bell's attempts to repackage Della Cruscan verse into high cultural artifacts amounted to multiple usurpations of literary authority" (48). Wolcot's commercial success in the arena of political satire may well have been similarly threatening. In its virulence Gifford's attack on Wolcot also consolidates a decade's worth of increasing intolerance, of ever tighter strictures on patriotism and masculinity.

4. Wolcot began his career with a confident control of masculinity enabled by his robust opposition patriotism, a mode the 1790s did much to circumscribe. From 1782-87 he produced much of his best-known work: four sets of annual odes to the Royal Academicians, two satires on Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, and his first satires on George III, including the first two cantos of his mock-epic, *The Lousiad*.[3] Wolcot's masculinity in these works is prominent, yet hard to classify. Persistent attempts to dismiss him as a hireling of the Foxite Whigs were confounded by his openly declared Toryism and eventually by his rebukes to Thomas Paine and occasional anti-Gallic fervor. Neither the patriarchal model of chivalric manhood as retailed to the middle classes by Edmund Burke, nor the fraternal, unstable identity derived from the man of feeling—two possibilities outlined by Tim Fulford—seem to fit Wolcot, though at times he seems close to the virile populism of William Cobbett, identified by Fulford as the source of the anxiety that drove Coleridge back to Burke in later years (ch. 5). In his *Epistle to James Boswell*, Wolcot skewers Boswell for retailing biographical trivialities, a sign of puerile hero-worship as well as the cognitive myopia that Wolcot is quick to condemn in many of his victims, including the king and Joseph Banks. In the more carnivalesque *Bozzy and Piozzi, a Town Eclogue*, Boswell is simply a drunk and a puppy, and Wolcot identifies more explicitly with the impatient paternal authority of Johnson himself. The same manly Johnsonian independence enables him, as an art critic, to puncture the stylistic mannerisms of each year's Royal Academy pictures, yet this attitude is fractured by his own puppyish admiration of Joshua Reynolds, who is always exempted from these criticisms. In his political poetry Wolcot's eccentric masculinity takes on the important connotation of non-partisanship: "Know, I've not caught the itch of party sin. / To Fox, or Pitt, I never did belong" (*Works* 278), he instructs Thomas Warton in *Ode upon Ode* (1787).

5. Wolcot's propensity to "lose the monarch in the man," as one poetical adversary put it ("The Two

Pindars"), began with *The Lousiad*, in which the King declares war on his entire kitchen staff, ordering their heads shaved in his presence after he finds a louse on his plate. Wolcot brilliantly politicizes the model he inherits from Alexander Pope by framing the epic battle in a way that underscores the king's human needs: the resentful cooks, in a colloquy that recalls Milton's Pandemonium as much as *The Rape of the Lock*, declare: "Yes; let him know with all his wondrous state / His teeth, his stomach on our wills shall wait" (*Works* 30). The angry cooks invoke John Wilkes and America to politicize the King's human nature, but for the narrator George's masculinity is equally problematic. His uncontrollable anger over finding the louse exacerbates his stutter, the "broken language" in which he responds to the crisis (36), but also illustrates the narrow vision of a king "delighted with the world of little" (34). Even when engaging scientifically with the natural world, George's inspiration is like that of "vain Sapphos, who fancy all Parnassus in their brain" (34)—and yet his unwillingness to read dispatches except in the presence of "buxom Nanny" (29) suggests a certain virility as well. (This charge of lechery, incidentally, is one of several soon reversed upon the satirist.) "All eye, all ear, all mouth, all nose" (44), the king's unstable, imperfectly gendered body produces the unregulated appetites and the vulgar curiosity that fuel the political vices of avarice and favoritism emphasized more strongly in the topical odes of 1787-88.

6. The terms of the conflict over Wolcot's poetry were set before the French Revolution, yet the conflict was also intensified by the rise of English Anti-Jacobin sentiment in the 1790s. Two bodies of thought are thus needed to theorize the development of Wolcot's satire and the critical response: the traditional politico-theology of monarchy, on the one hand, and the representation of revolutionary change, on the other, particularly in terms of gender and aesthetics. Concerted attacks on Peter Pindar in periodical prose and pamphlet verse began soon after the *Lousiad*, informed politically by prerevolutionary, metaphysical loyalties and historically by the events of the first Regency crisis, among others. "Manlius," troubled by Wolcot's failure to respect the vulnerability of a king verily unmanned by madness, alleges that Wolcot's erstwhile pupil John Opie has fittingly depicted him in a historical painting as one of the murderers in *The Assassination of James I* (1044).[4] This insinuation was not nearly as incendiary in 1788 as it would have been four years later, after the arrest of Louis XVI, but nonetheless draws on a long tradition of imagining violence against the royal body. Louis Marin argues that "the body of the King is really present in the form of his portrait" (190), and the intensity of reaction against Wolcot suggests a strong analogy between his verbal "portraits" and the representations theorized by Marin. Developing the psychoanalytic implications of Ernst Kantorowicz's thesis in *The King's Two Bodies*, Marin reads the portrait as "the theologico-political theory of the royal body" (201), according to which the king must be "seduced by his own image" (210). Marin locates the converse of this fetishistic masochism in "the sadism of the subject who is fascinated by the body of the King," exemplified as much in Wolcot as in the caricature that Marin goes on to analyze. The caricature (a drawing by William Makepeace Thackeray) separates the king's two bodies: "it tries to make us believe that the natural body . . . is the truth of the body of signs" (211-12). The pleasure of the caricature is therefore like that of "a voyeur witnessing a sexual aggression against the King's body," which becomes feminized and "mortified by an encroaching senility" (216-17). Marin thus helps to clarify Wolcot's strategy and the reaction to it: the king's "broken language" aligns him with the material, the feminine, and the human against the spiritual, masculine, and divine. Ronald Paulson's summary of one stage of the French Revolution captures one of the reasons why it intensified the need to reclaim a divinely authorized masculinity, a need already apparent in the strictures of Manlius and others like him: "These are horrible, ugly, violent, aggressive *women* . . . of the Parisian mob who march to the royal palace and bring back the king and queen—women who in effect *are* the Revolution" (81).

7. Historical and personal factors also contributed to Wolcot's refusal to fall into line, which unsettled the increasingly polarized, militarized landscape of the 1790s. Wolcot was past fifty in 1789, and his avoidance of partisanship, even in these difficult conditions, harks back to the politics of an earlier

period. His phrase "the itch of party sin" suggests a disease transmitted by the too-close proximity of politicians to power and seems to allude to the clubbish elitism of Parliament first brought into focus by John Wilkes, Wolcot's slightly older contemporary, in the 1760s. Wolcot's own Tory affiliation seems to have been wholly ingenuous: he campaigned for the Tories in a local election in 1790 and gave the name *True Blue* to his pleasure boat (Girtin 134). But while maintaining the prescribed constitutional role of the King and Lords Wolcot also subjects a range of exploitative state institutions and private industries to a stringent critique rightly identified as socialist by Grzegorz Sinko.[5] Wolcot's non-partisan Toryism, egalitarian and fiercely secular, thus informs his separation of the king's two bodies. The incompetence of the royal physical body, as in *The Lousiad*, becomes a legitimate political issue, while the king's divine body (or "great name") provides the poet with cultural capital, as Peter observes in *Brother Peter to Brother Tom*: "The world may call me liar; but sincerely / I love him—for a partner, love him *dearly*; / Whilst his great name is on the *ferme*, I'm sure / My credit with the public is secure" (*Works* 78). At the same time, Wolcot foregrounds the appetitive body of the patriot, rejecting patriotic idealism: "Yes, beef shall grace my spit, and ale shall flow, / As long as it continues George and Co." The poet's corpulent body serves as a kind of populist credential, which can be illustrated with reference to Cobbett or Michael Moore or even William Hone, the defiant radical publisher who, though not corpulent himself, became a reverent student of carnival and popular tradition in his antiquarian work on Bartholomew Fair. Wolcot's stylized Epicureanism also links him to the carnivalesque "comic / picturesque" aesthetics that Ronald Paulson associates with Thomas Rowlandson and the political tradition of Wilkes and the Foxite Whigs.

8. But in the main Wolcot belongs with the grotesque rather than the picturesque, to borrow Paulson's vocabulary further. Paulson's account of the grotesque helps to contextualize Wolcot in the postrevolutionary setting in terms of gender as well as aesthetics—whether or not one wishes to agree categorically that "the grotesque is all in all the dominant aesthetic mode of the period" and that hence "the cartoonist Gillray's George III, John Bull, and Louis XVI all merge into the same figure" (7). Paulson makes a distinction between the "weak revolutionary imagery" of Rowlandson, Charles James Fox, Richard Brinsley Sheridan, and the Prince of Wales (115) and the stronger images of James Gillray, a distinction that also helps to underscore Wolcot's distance (despite public misperceptions) from that camp. In fact, although Wolcot is not cited, Paulson's reading of Gillray brings out the poet's influence on the younger satirist. Gillray acknowledges Wolcot most forcefully in *Ancient Music* (1787), an early satire on the King's vulgar taste for Handel and flattery—a favorite topic of Wolcot's—that draws its images and quotes a passage from *Ode upon Ode*.[6] Paulson points out that the grotesque had long been "associated with both political and artistic freedom and creativity" (175) and gives a number of reasons for its rise to prominence, culminating in the revolutionary confusion of high and low, English and French, human and animal. Paulson argues that a "physical resemblance between the French and English kings began to emerge" in Gillray's prints in the 1790s (193), a resemblance with harsh implications for the corporeality of king and commoner alike. This grotesque elision of difference (as I will suggest later) helps to account for the scatological and sodomitic references in the criticism of Wolcot. The grotesque also conflates the king's two bodies in such a way as to shift the discussion from theological to political ground. Alluding to a whole series of Gillray images, Paulson surveys the indiscriminate corporeality that makes the grotesque a revolutionary aesthetic par excellence:

> Whether eating is excessive or the opposite, the figures on both sides of the channel share the lowest common denominator of regression to orality and anality. Orality extends from cannibalism to the peculiar diet of the royal family, to both England and France devouring the globe, to the Jacobins firing the bread of liberty into the mouths of other European nations and being devoured themselves by hungry crocodiles. The scatology that distinguished the imagery of Burke's anti-Jacobin tracts becomes in Gillray's cartoons the extraordinary emphasis on both food and feces, both eating and excreting. Scatological

> references extend from Pitt as a toadstool on a royal dunghill to John Bull's guts-ache and George III sitting on the royal closestool or defecating ships onto the royal mainland, to the Napoleon who . . . tries to pass himself, in fact a horse turd, off as a golden pippin. (200)

If it is true that for Gillray "kings and subjects [become] equally alike cannibals or tyrants," the same degree of regression would not be possible in Wolcot for a number of reasons.

9. Moreover, according to other readings of Gillray, honest John Bull is distinguished much more sharply, and in fact defined against, a feminized French other. The absence of such dichotomies in Wolcot may explain why his own popular, politically ambivalent, grossly embodied image of George III did not survive as well through the 1790s. Paulson's observation that "in consistently applied caricature there are no 'heroes'" (203) applies more clearly to Wolcot than to Gillray, and helps to explain why Wolcot—to judge from the volume of printed discussion—was the more controversial figure. The revolution features consistently in Gillray's images, however disturbing, and there is a sense in which the virility of his regressive figures stands against the "women who *are* the Revolution," as feared by Burke. But for Wolcot—partly, I think, because of his age—the revolution is a much smaller piece of the English "pie" (Paulson 37), and by insisting on domestic political issues in his poems of the mid-to-late 1790s (the tax burden, restrictions on civil liberties, civil unrest) he appeared to his critics to be evading the challenge posed by the enemy. There are no heroes, then, in Wolcot, and no resolute men to stand up to the mob of women. To make matters worse, his pseudonym, Peter Pindar, deliberately courts comparison with the most robustly masculinist and hero-worshipping bard produced by the ancient world. The revolution helped to focus the anxiety already attached to the royal body as a result of George's madness in 1788. The intensified reaction to Wolcot suggests that once the king is no longer unequivocally the body of the nation, there is increased pressure on the body and the masculinity of the individual subject. The exercise of vilifying "Peter Pindar" (the pseudonym itself served his critics' rhetorical purposes) allowed anti-Jacobin commentators to superimpose the paradigm of two bodies on the body politic as a whole: the "two Pindars" allegorize a division between disciplined and vulnerable bodies, true and false patriotism, manly and unmanly sentiment. The recurring topos of Wolcot's prostituted Muse also maintains the connection between unmanly sentiment and abjected femininity. Wolcot's mode of opposition patriotism was also circumscribed, finally, by the infringement of civil liberties that he addressed in poems such as *Liberty's Last Squeak* (1795) and *1796*. Yet Wolcot was never prosecuted for libel, as Gillray was, or charged with any of the other forms of sedition so freely imputed to dissidents in the mid-1790s.[7] It may have helped that Wolcot was prepared: he anticipated being silenced by the state in various satires as early as 1787. The conceit of *Peter's Pension*, published in 1788, briefly became an uncomfortable reality in 1795 when he accepted an advance on a pension from the Treasury (Girtin 172-78); but Wolcot had second thoughts and returned the money before writing anything for the government—thus bearing out the assertion of the poem: "No, Sir, I cannot be your humble hack; / I fear your majesty would break my back" (*Works* 266).

10. At this pre-revolutionary stage even Wolcot's respectable readers remonstrated fairly gently. In 1787 the *Gentleman's Magazine*, thus far an eager, if somewhat ironic supporter of Wolcot's poetry, earnestly took issue with insinuations detrimental to George's fatherly affection in *The Progress of Curiosity, or A Royal Visit to Whitbread's Brewery*. Having lampooned the king's "*minute* curiosity" and "profound questions" concerning the art of brewing with characteristic verve, Wolcot goes on to suggest that George showed too little sensibility at the illness of his son: "Sing how a monarch, when his son was dying, / His gracious eyes and ears was edifying, / By abbey company and kettle drum" (*Works* 18). (This is one of several satires in which Wolcot develops the theme taken up by Gillray in *Ancient Music*.) Responding to this passage, the *Gentleman's* reviewer admonishes him: "Put thyself in the Stead of any Parent . . . and correct thy severities" (57.620).[8] In a similar case the magazine passes "severe censure . . . [on] Peter's unfeeling heart," turning the tables on his charge of inadequate

sensibility (58.440). At the same time, John Nichols and his reviewers dismissed the attacks in verse that were beginning to appear in 1787, suggesting that "poetry is not the most proper vehicle for exposing" Peter Pindar, and perhaps reserving the right of censure for themselves (57.20). Yet such poems began appearing in the magazine as well: "The Two Pindars," which faults Wolcot for "los[ing] the monarch in the man," inaugurates an unfavorable comparison that Wolcot's chosen pseudonym seems to court and that becomes a staple in attacks on him. The contribution of "Manlius"—a pseudonym alluding to the severely upright Roman father whose patriotism was made exemplary by Livy and anthologized in turn by William Enfield's *The Speaker* among other schoolbooks—blames Wolcot, as I mentioned, for failing to spare the king's madness and introduces two further anti-Wolcot tropes, the prostituted muse and the supposed resentment of Wolcot's former protégé, the painter John Opie. Manlius's discussion of Wolcot as assassin in Opie's *Assassination of James I* (as well as another painting) highlights Wolcot's designs on the royal body that would become even more contentious after the revolution. Paulson maintains that this revolutionary contention is always "about England; the French Revolution was only one foreign ingredient in a pie of their own making" (37). Wolcot, with his refusal to focus on the revolution, well illustrates this continuity; so too the discourse about him, from the beginning, takes the "oedipal" and "oral-anal" forms assigned by Paulson to revolutionary conflict itself (8), though certainly the discourse becomes more violent in the 1790s.

11. After the revolution, regressive violence increasingly prevailed and even the issue of classical education—initially a common idiom, even if used for satirical combat—became more volatile. Wolcot may have chosen Pindar as a namesake because of the ancient Theban's reputation for "belong[ing] . . . to no faction," or being above politics (Lattimore vii)—a more acceptable stance before the war. Later T. J. Mathias and others challenged Wolcot's pretensions to classical learning and implicitly dismissed the whole tradition of satire as patriotic opposition. Yet Mathias feels compelled to footnote both his allusions to the Theban Pindar to make clear that he means Pindar and "not that detestable writer, calling himself Peter Pindar" (*Pursuits of Literature*, pt. 3, p. 7n.). The anonymous "To the Soi-disant Peter Pindar" elaborates the comparison over several stanzas, concluding:

> *He*, true to merit, eterniz'd the names
> Of god-like heroes, in immortal strains:
> *Your* doggerel muse the brightest worth defames,
> And fouls the purest snow with *Envy*'s stains!
> The bright effusions of *his* muse sublime,
> While Taste, and Genius live, shall ne'er expire:
> *Thy* spurts of envy, thy malignant rhyme
> With infamy shall die before their Sire! (472-73)

The concluding image of this 1799 poem, suggesting premature ejaculation, aptly illustrates the sharply increased hostility and sexualized combat characteristic of the postrevolutionary satiric idiom.

12. Wolcot himself may have helped to set the tone of sexual aggression, not only by exposing the king's natural body, but also by turning his attention to the increasingly powerful Prime Minister, William Pitt. In the first of many satires addressed to Pitt, "Epistle to a Falling Minister," Wolcot first of all renders him a prude or worse: "A Joseph thou, against the sex to strive— / Dead to those charms that keep the world alive" (92). But most of his satire follows the more sinister line of presenting Pitt as a fiend from hell, comparing him to Oliver Cromwell and to Cain among other arch-demons, and accurately predicting (in a 1789 poem) Pitt's terrible assault on civil liberties. "It cannot be long an object of consideration with us whether to pity or detest the writer and publisher who can submit to the disgraceful labour of circulating such indecent reflections on the brightest character . . . the idol of the people of England," intoned the *Gentleman's Magazine* (59.250-51). This reviewer also impugned Wolcot's anger as unmanly and ungenuine. Other criticisms of Wolcot in this era preceding the *Anti-*

Jacobin, though increasing in number, also tended toward paternalistic correction or toward the burlesque rather than violent aggression. "Birch for Peter Pindar" (1788), by the prolific Pindaromastix, constructs a bizarre scenario in which the Privy Council puts Peter Pindar on trial for conspiring to kill the king through constipation, by quite literally "keep[ing] the key to his behind" (17).[9] This poem also works through several stock criticisms, depicting Wolcot as impotent and his muse as being "of easy virtue and unblushing face" (51), but it lacks the deadly earnestness of later satires such as Gifford's. Remarkably, Pindaromastix is content to let the blasphemous suggestion of Peter Pindar sodomizing the king pass without comment. Given that rumors were already circulating about Peter's disloyal association with the lowliest members of the royal household, assigning him a royal bedfellow testifies to a sexual fantasy thoroughly at odds with Pindaromastix's professed politics. When in 1800 Gifford revived the report of Wolcot's involvement with a palace scullion, he put it—by contrast—in the most strident moral terms, causing a crisis in Wolcot's career.

13. 1789's *Brother Tom to Brother Peter* (by "A Moonraker") takes the scatological approach to more outrageous lengths. According to this allegory, Wolcot's technique originated as a project proposed to the king for catching the farts of the great, a technology that predictably backfires on Wolcot when his first subject—Benjamin West, the royal favorite and frequent victim of Wolcot's Royal Academy satires—"let[s] fly," like the "daubing dog" he is, in the poet's face (25). The devil, who appears in many of these satires (cp. Gillray, *Satan in All His Glory*), then brokers a contract between Wolcot and the Prince that allows him to get his revenge on the king as a paid mouthpiece of the Foxite Whigs. Though undeniably hostile, these verses also owe much to Wolcot's own imagery and technique. The first Regency crisis at this moment helps to explain their partisan spirit (equally present in versified defenses of Peter Pindar) and the insistent comparisons between Peter and Falstaff that arise at this time and persist into the nineteenth century. This analogy is developed in a prose tract addressed to the Prince by "Albion," warning him against Wolcot and other low companions (12; cp. Gifford 39). Paulson's oedipal and regressive (oral-anal) models of contention are both already in place in these works of 1788-89, and *Brother Tom to Brother Peter* in particular suggests a political lineage for the scatological extremes that Paulson traces to Burke. If it is true that, for Gillray at least, "figures on both sides of the channel share the lowest common denominator of regression to orality and anality" (200), then the discourse around Wolcot could have provided the idiom adopted for these revolutionary representations. Richard Godfrey provides several visual analogues to Gillray's scatological approach in *The French Invasion; —or—John Bull, bombarding the Bum-Boats* (1793), also analyzed by Paulson. Godfrey suggests that Gillray must have influenced two French cartoons of 1794, one of which depicts George III's face, spewing bayonets, as the posterior of a grotesque figure. Richard Newton's "extremely daring" *Treason* (1798) shows John Bull farting in the king's face (Godfrey 112), and it is telling that Newton dedicated another of his prints to "Peter Pindar, Prince of Satyrists," all the more because Wolcot himself was never quite so extreme. The early satires against him, however, already cultivate the grotesque elision of difference and the sexual violence later intensified by revolutionary conflict. The image of Peter "keep[ing] the key to [the King's] behind," in particular, encapsulates what is remarkable in these early attacks on Wolcot, conflating as it does satire and sexual aggression, sodomy and scatology, and the two bodies of king and scullion.

14. None of these attacks denied Wolcot's innate literary ability, as later critics would. *The Gentleman's Magazine*, even as it became more hostile, preserved an atmosphere of serious literary discussion and was the first to welcome him back to the fold in 1791 when he came out against Paine and Revolutionary France. "On the Abuse of Satire," a piece of Isaac D'Israeli's *A Defence of Poetry* first published in the magazine, exhorts the laureate (Warton) to punish Wolcot with satire, since he continues to find ingenious ways of avoiding legal prosecution for libel and sedition. Wolcot himself, though, was surely pleased to note that his abuse of satire had "waken[ed] all the fires" of D'Israeli, who claims that his "patriot zeal inspires / [his] honest verse" (59.648).[10] D'Israeli, like many of Wolcot's opponents, is forced to adopt his tactics of character assassination, calling Peter the pander to

a muse who "prostitutes [her] charms—for half a crown." D'Israeli reassures Warton somewhat comically that since Peter "has made art a trade," his libelous effusions will quickly be forgotten while Warton's own encomia will "make all the King, the Husband, Father, shine!" into eternity. This last description also reinforces the increasing political sensitivity of the king's domestic masculinity. Soon enough, Wolcot took devastating aim at John Nichols and his magazine in three publications, including one of his trademark epistles, a pretended reply fathered semi-convincingly on Nichols himself, and a set of manuscript lyrics collected and indignantly introduced by this pseudo-Nichols to the ostensible shame of the bard.[11] Alongside its class snobbery and scurrilous hilarity this poem also argues that truth cannot reside in a periodical publication: "Truth," Peter declaims, "Lifts her fair head, and looks with brow sublime / On all the fading pageantries of time" (*Works* 271) and especially on a magazine full of puffery, interest, and sham learning. Here is an echo of the professionally motivated argument against periodical verse that Michael Gamer attributes to Wolcot's rival Gifford. Nichols (or his reviewer Gough) nonetheless reverses D'Israeli's charge back on Wolcot in reviewing this poem: "True satire, from Juvenal to Churchill, has had Truth for its object" (60.439). But by the time of Wolcot's anti-Paine and anti-French poems of 1791, he is content to observe that "Peter is a clever fellow, and now got on our side" (61.930), reprinting two poems in the magazine to demonstrate Peter's "improvement."[12]

15. Other critics were less conciliatory. Wolcot continued his attacks on Pitt, even as he noted with increasing bitterness and resignation the curbs on freedom of speech that inhibited his work. This persistence earned him a particularly influential enemy in 1794 in the person of T. J. Mathias. Mathias not only feels compelled to clarify his allusions to Pindar by distinguishing Peter's "depravity and malignity" from the patriotic lyricism of his ancient namesake, as I mentioned earlier; he also delivers a substantial analysis of Peter's political apostasy, though pointedly confined to a note: "he has perpetually reviled and held up to scorn every master principle by which government and society are maintained. I will not waste a verse on such a character" (pt. 1, p. 50n.). Gary Dyer notes that Mathias was widely praised for his "unequalled manliness of sentiment" (25), adding that "people recognized in Gifford and Mathias a pose of orthodoxy " (30) that eventually trumped Wolcot's anti-establishment masculinity (37).[13] At the same time, a radical publication of 1796, *The Volunteer Laureate: or Fall of Peter Pindar*, though it owes much of its superbly pointed anti-monarchical satire to Wolcot, condemns him for not being political *enough*. The liberal media, however, in sources duly referenced by Mathias and Gifford, continued to try to shelter Wolcot from the worst abuse. (The concept of "liberal media" itself is a current distortion with roots in the period, carefully tended, if not originally planted, by the *Anti-Jacobin* in 1797.) Wolcot, of course, retaliated, but seems to have played into the enemy's hands in a particularly ill-advised and weakly argued satire of 1799, *Nil admirari, or a Smile at a Bishop*. The epigraph, taken, as often, from the poem itself, sets the tone by skewering "that miserable imp Mathias." In exposing what he takes to be the Bishop of London's obscenely extravagant praise for Hannah More, Wolcot insists that good morals don't make good art, suggesting also that the Bishop's "high-toned morality" makes him an unmanly critic: "I own Miss Hannah's life is very good, / But then her verse and prose are very bad" (lines 43-44). Wolcot's honorable motive, the decline of criticism into flattery and partisanship in this time of intense ideological conflict, is compromised by spurious charges of plagiarism and infantilizing, quasi-pornographic ridicule of bluestockings—"an indecent and scurrilous attack," as the *Anti-Jacobin* Review was quick to point out, "on two of the most amiable, and exemplary, characters of the age!" ("To the Soi-Disant Peter Pindar" 472).

16. As often, Wolcot published the eponymous main piece in a slim quarto followed by a number of more strictly humorous afterpieces (to borrow an analogy from the theater), among which "An Ode to the Blue-Stocking-Club" and "An Ode to Some Robin Red-Breasts in a Country Cathedral" (an attack on church music) drew particularly angry replies. These shorter poems allowed some critics to take on Wolcot's sexual license and religious irreverence without addressing the more serious context provided

by the longer poem: the sophisticated anticlerical satire of the latter, for example, gives way to a facetious comparison in the "Ode to Some Robin-Redbreasts" between the choir of robins and the venal pomp of "Bishop, Dean, and bawling Boys" (*Nil admirari* p. 56). *Nil admirari* itself takes its title from the sixth epistle of the first book of Horace, adapted by Wolcot to implicate Bishop Porteus' admiration of More (lines 105-06). Howard Weinbrot notes that Wolcot adapts Horace by "turn[ing] away from the modest disclaimer of the world's attractions and towards his own more vigorous attack" (199), and thus compounding (for some readers) the literary offense. This elaborate 300-line adaptation, addressed to the Bishop, argues convincingly in places that posterity will revalue many of the literary judgments of the day as obscured by "clouds of prejudice" and the "varnish" of flattery, but undercuts the argument with images as frivolous as any in the shorter poems: "And lo, this varnish with thy daubing brush / Smear'd o'er Miss Hannah must by time be roasted, / The nymph in all her nakedness will blush, / And courtly Porteus, for a flatterer posted" (125-28). By imagining Hannah More naked Wolcot advances a largely distinct line of satirical attack on the partisan criticism of the age (his ideological view of which, though applied unfairly to More, still holds true as a whole): his own heterosexually charged masculinity rides triumphant (as he imagines) over the flattering prudes who control the reviews. More again unfairly bears the brunt of this indictment of male critics of Jacobinism and sexual morality, as Peter, in the words of his own Miltonesque "argument," "severely reprimandeth her uncharitableness toward the frail ones of her own sex" (see lines 153-68). His reprimand not only eroticizes the relation between More and Porteus but uses allegory to inject a charge of plagiarism: "Some years ago I saw a female race; / The prize a shift—a Holland shift, I ween: / Ten damsels, nearly all in naked grace, / Rush'd for the precious prize along the green" (193-96). The winner of this race, notes Peter, cheated the others by accepting help from her lover, who carried her part of the way on a mule, just as Porteus supposedly supplied his prose to More: "Did no kind swain his hand to Hannah yield— / No bishop's hand to help a heavy rear, / And bear the nymph triumphant o'er the field?" (210-12). To complete the outrage, Wolcot then adapts images familiar in the 1790s from representations of the September Massacres to a caustic declaration of his "love for bishops" (253). Porteus and his kind are, at any rate, more loveable than their medieval counterparts who persecuted heretics and nonbelievers: "Grill'd, roasted, carbonaded, fricaseed, / Men, women, children, for the slightest things; / Burnt, strangled, glorying in the horrid deed; / Nay, starv'd and flogg'd God's great vicegerents, Kings!" (265-68). The volume concludes with a parody of a disinterested review of the preceding verse, but Wolcot points the moral to be sure we don't miss it: the reviewers of this acrimonious time are his real targets in this satire, "despicable Pimps, hired to debauch the Public Taste" (p. 64).

17. At this point even William Cobbett took up the cry against Wolcot, and many less unlikely defenders also came to the aid of Religion and Virtue as personified by Bishop Porteus and More. Cobbett, then in the United States, collected and reprinted the anti-Wolcot verses and numerous diatribes in prose from the *Anti-Jacobin Review* as an appendix to Richard Polwhele's *The Unsex'd Females*, a poem that makes no mention of Wolcot but must have seemed to Cobbett to make a marketable combination.[14] Certainly *Nil admirari* is no less misogynistic than *The Unsex'd Females*, but Wolcot's eroticism unmasks the damsel in distress as a sex object, an ideological move that accounts for much of the outcry against him. This reaction seems to support Tim Fulford's contention that "chivalric manhood did not die; it was relocated to the middle classes" (9). Fulford's study traces Coleridge's long struggle to revise Burke's view of "chivalry, beauty, and sublimity" (11), and his anxiety over his lack of public influence. Ironically in this context, Coleridge's most widely quoted remark on Wolcot excoriates him for publishing scurrilous remarks on Mary Robinson in a 1783 poem. Writing to Robinson's daughter in 1801, Coleridge admonishes her to omit the mention of Robinson's long friendship with Wolcot in the preface to a posthumous volume of her poems: "my flesh creeps at his name!" (qtd. in Girtin 221). Wolcot himself reprimanded Gifford for insulting Robinson, to which Gifford replied, ostensibly addressing Robinson, that she would do better to rely for protection on a "broken reed" (qtd. in Clark 107). William Hazlitt, not to be outdone, reiterated the defense of Robinson against Gifford: "His attacks on Mrs. Robinson were unmanly" (125). Wolcot's treatment of More provoked commensurably

greater outrage, and the critics of *Nil admirari* coded their chivalry in more strictly Burkean, and political, terms: "Yet Walcot becks the dire banditti on, / And smiles complacent o'er his country's tomb" (*Peter Not Infallible* 25).

18. William Gifford proved to be the greatest knight of them all in his chastisement of the dragon Peter Pindar. He not only exposed Wolcot's inmost vices and defended his victims but defeated him in hand-to-hand combat. It was so much the worse for the now 62-year-old Wolcot that he was the aggressor, attempting to chastise Gifford for the brutal slanders of his *Epistle to Peter Pindar* and particularly for his allusion to the 1788-89 Birdcage Walk affair in a postscript to the second edition. Wolcot thus gave him the opportunity to make good his claim in the poem that he was "Prepared each threat to baffle or to spurn, / Each blow with ten-fold vigour to return," a vindication Gifford noted eagerly for his readers in his third edition (37) (in which he also quoted the full text of the 1789 *Times* account for good measure). Their combat was itself the subject of much dispute and of numerous verse satires, including Alexander Geddes's *Bardomachia*, but the most widely credited account suggests that Gifford beat Wolcot bloody with his own stick. This success flattered Gifford's literary ambitions, and the third edition of his epistle, published soon after the combat, swelled to forty pages of prose superadded to the 172-line poem. Gifford's prose apparatus conveniently quotes at length or paraphrases all the recent invective against Wolcot in the *Anti-Jacobin Review* and elsewhere, consolidating the improbable catalogue of vices imputed to Wolcot and rehearsing the more meager criticisms of his verse. These criticisms take Wolcot's satirical tactic of "comparing great things with small" in deadly and ludicrous earnest as threatening to the state: "we allude to his observation, in one of his libellous productions, (we forget which) that Kings, like candles, are better for snuffing, i.e. taking off their heads" (Cobbett 64; cp. Gifford 51n.). Gifford gleefully summarizes more seditious passages and all the charges of vulgarity, sodomy, drunkenness, whoring, impotence, cowardice, bribe-taking, cruelty, and blasphemy, all supported by improbable "authentic" anecdotes from the poet's "friends" and presented with "manly confidence" (42): "I have rescued Dignity, and Worth, and Talents, and Virtue, and Religion, from the malignant attacks of their bitterest foe" (53). The volume and tone of Gifford's compendium attest to a level of hysteria now associated with orthodox masculinity that exceeds even the intensity of conflict during the first Regency crisis—one possible explanation for his digging up the *Times* account of Wolcot's intercourse with a royal scullion in the Birdcage Walk.

19. The old sodomy charge performs a labor of sexual aggression that is difficult to accommodate in Gifford's own poetic idiom. Gifford's satire contains nothing comparable even to the mild innuendo quoted earlier from "To the Soi-Disant Peter Pindar": "Thy spurts of envy, thy malignant rhyme, / With infamy shall die before their Sire" (473). Gifford's scorn, like his use of the cane, carries its libidinal content as a subtext, in a manner that the paradox "hysterical masculinity" may help to elucidate. His intense emotion refuses embodiment, subsisting on a plane of moral outrage that Wolcot himself associates with prudery and repression. Put another way, Gifford's punishing masculinity rises above the ribald homosocial combat of earlier times, leaving behind the natural body to inhabit the beleaguered divine body of royalty and of the kingdom. He sublimates his own sadistic pleasure by means of a threefold strategy. First, Gifford's impoverished stock of metaphors keeps his victim anchored firmly in the sphere of the savage and subhuman (dog, snake, toad, Mohawk, sot, profligate, dotard), in a grotesque conflation of human and animal bodies. Second, he keeps the focus on his victim's grotesquely debased desires, admitting none of his own, but also observes a certain decorum: Peter Pindar is "a prodigy of drunkenness and lust" (line 98) with an added measure of sacrilege, deviating in recognizable ways from recognizable norms.[15] Finally, Gifford hints at and then introduces the *Times* articles as supporting evidence, as neutral facts that on the one hand prove his superior objectivity but on the other hand cannot implicate his own imagination because derived from an external source—in fact, the charge is more obscene than anything fancied in the verse. The journalistic record (if taken as fact) answers Wolcot's grotesque and blasphemous conflation of the king's two bodies by exposing the truth of his desire, his own corrupted masculinity.

20. Gifford's "documentation" of his charges is complicated by the legal status of sodomy allegations, on the one hand, and by the currency of sodomy in political rhetoric, on the other. These are large issues, and here I hope only to sketch in the immediate context of the *Times* articles that would have made even sympathetic readers of Gifford aware of the rhetorical nature of these charges, before moving briefly to an analogous image by Gillray, *The Hopes of the Party* (1791), as an illustration of the continued currency of sodomy as an image of sedition.[16] Given the absence of any corroborating evidence in the biographical record, it makes sense to classify the insinuations of the *Times* with other spurious charges of sodomy. David Garrick successfully rebuffed the charge of William Kenrick's satirical verses, *Love in the Suds* (1772), that he had engaged in illicit relations with the playwright Isaac Bickerstaffe, who had fled the country on the basis of a newspaper report on his relations with a soldier (McCormick 162). Samuel Foote won his case in court against his former coachman who had him indicted for assault "with Intent to Commit Buggery" in 1776 (qtd. in Goldsmith 99). Netta Goldsmith points out that in Foote's case *The Public Ledger*, whose editor Foote had mocked, originally published this charge and continued to maintain it even after his legal victory, contributing in her view to Foote's death by a stroke in 1777 (104). Goldsmith cites Jeremy Bentham's manuscript essay on "Paederasty" (c. 1785) for evidence that sodomy allegations, given the legal status of the crime, were very difficult to refute and therefore an easy avenue for blackmail (97). It may be true that Bentham would have been exiled if he had published this essay (21), but a similar argument was made in print by one of Wolcot's staunchest defenders in 1800. In March 1789, following a number of sarcastic references to Wolcot's disloyalty in the preceding months, the *Times* announced that "there is now a Kitchen Rat at Buckingham-House, that was caught about twelve months since, in a trap with Peter Pindar, in the Bird-Cage Walk," threatening serious consequences "if this same Rat and Peter Pindar continue their disloyal and ******** intercourse" (3/19/89, 2d). Two more allusions to this affair continue to develop a larger account of how Wolcot obtained his information about the royal family and who paid him (a "fallen print," perhaps the *Morning Chronicle*) to write it up.[17] In his *Admonitory Epistle to William Gifford*, Thomas Dutton took Gifford severely to task for reviving these allegations against Wolcot. As editor of the *Dramatic Censor*, Dutton would have remembered the spurious charges against Garrick and Foote. Even more important, Dutton remembered and was willing to remind the public that in its earliest years the *Times* routinely engaged in this sort of political blackmail against perceived enemies of the state: "What shall we say to the man, who brings forward such an accusation, knowing it to be false! knowing, that the very newspaper, on which he rests his charge, has been prosecuted for dealing in this very species of libel! knowing, as he must, that the fabricator of the report (now dead, the late Mr. Finney, a name notorious for profligacy . . .) was in the habit of making this charge an engine of extortion," further cases of which Dutton goes on to specify ("Manners and Morals" 99).

21. These accusations, then, at least in the prerevolutionary context, would have appeared no more serious than Kenrick's *Love in the Suds*. Even Kenrick invokes a satirical tradition more respectable than periodical prose by alluding to Charles Churchill's *The Rosciad* in one of his subtitles, "Being the Lamentation of Roscius for the Loss of his Nyky." As Howard Weinbrot demonstrates, the charge of sodomy incorporated into homosocial satirical combat has its roots in a political tradition epitomized in Pope's *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*. By depicting John, Baron Hervey as "Sporus, the male whore of Nero" (190), Pope charges that "protection of the satirist is replaced" in the court of George II "by hostility to the satirist, especially if he opposes the sexual deviance that is an emblem of political deviance. The poem . . . becomes an effort to stop the sodomizing of Britain" (190). By a "devolution of satiric kinds" the charge of sodomy becomes a vehicle of merely personal satire in Garrick's *Fribbleriad* (1761) and of grotesquely overblown Juvenalian indignation in Churchill's *The Times* (1764), Weinbrot argues
(195). Wolcot, by contrast, remains more fully in touch with social reality, but he abandons the Horatian aspirations still present in Pope: sodomy drops out of the picture in Wolcot because "he is most at home strutting and raging among ruins" (202), resigned to a political climate in which there is no longer any point in attacking vice at all. Weinbrot does not discuss Wolcot's reception, but his

argument about Churchill helps to illuminate the merely personal, politically non-substantive charges (including sodomy) leveled by his critics. In fact, Churchill is cited in at least two attacks on Wolcot: the *Gentleman's Magazine* review quoted above and the anonymous *Poetical Epistle to John Wolcot* (1790), which takes its epigraph from Churchill's *Epistle to William Hogarth*.

22. Some of Wolcot's critics, however, did see themselves as setting out to "stop the sodomizing of Britain," and in the context of the Revolution the charge of sodomy—of sodomizing the king especially—takes on a kind of political weight unaccounted for by Weinbrot's model. Even the frivolous charge of Finney in the *Times* (if Dutton is right about his authorship) insinuates violence against the king by a fairly transparent substitution of a servant's body (the "Kitchen Rat") for the sovereign's natural body. In the postrevolutionary context the image haunts the public imagination, attested by the renewed currency of this charge prompted by Gifford and also in graphic satire. Thomas Dermody ("Mauritius Moonshine") is one partisan who takes up Gifford's case, alluding darkly in *The Battle of the Bards* to "such odious hints as his [Wolcot's] own manhood stain" (qtd. in Clark 110). Newton's *Treason* and the French cartoons cited earlier, which bring the king and the anus into dangerous proximity, are also relevant here. But the most striking visual image of this kind is Gillray's *The Hopes of the Party*, prior to July 14th (1791; Fig. 1), which has no apparent connection to Wolcot. Gillray puts John Horne Tooke in the position of royal sodomizer. Godfrey is the only commentator I have found who addresses this rather obvious representation directly: "The position of Tooke, who spreads the King's legs and thrusts his own body between them, is outrageously suggestive" (93). The image projects the execution of George III, organized by Tooke, Fox, Joseph Priestley, Sheridan, and Sir Cecil Wray. Tooke stands at left; Fox, at center, holds the axe over George's hapless neck; and the other three cluster at right offering consolation to the king as Sheridan holds his head in place on the block.[18] Pitt and Queen Charlotte dangle suggestively from the lamps above the Crown & Anchor sign. As Godfrey points out, "it is an extraordinary and gross satire, which would not have been possible to publish after the guillotining of Louis XVI in 1793." For Paulson, however, this image is part of an unfolding grotesque narrative, and he argues that later images of Louis XVI, including "even Gillray's print of the execution of Louis XVI in 1793, should be compared with the earlier mock execution he projects of George III" (193). The king too has a speech bubble reading "What! What! What! what's the matter now?" Godfrey suggests that George's "bewildered innocence" takes "some of the sting . . . out of the design," but it seems likely that Gillray's audience would have remembered Wolcot's persistent mockery of the king's explosive speech and other idiosyncrasies dating from 1785 up to the present. They might well have taken Gillray's image as continuing Wolcot's grotesque narrative, a narrative that forcibly separated the king's two bodies for dubious political ends. Gillray's admirers—those not shocked or outraged by the image—would surely have identified with the tradition of grossly embodied masculine patriotism developed by Wolcot and maintained against mounting criticism through and beyond the contentious moment of *The Hopes of the Party*. Loyalist readers of the print, on the other hand, were probably more than willing to associate the veteran dissident Tooke (born 1736) with another grizzled profligate known for his designs on the backside of the divine national body: Peter Pindar.

23. Wolcot himself recovered sufficiently from the assaults of Gifford, Dermody, and others to answer much of their abuse in *Out at Last* (1801), in which he was supported by a convenient accident of history: the fall of Pitt. His subtitle, "The Fallen Minister," triumphantly echoes his "Epistle to a Falling Minister" of eleven years before. Wolcot's patriotism gains new force from his renewed ability to ventriloquize "Old England's genius," which thus addresses Pitt in the poem: "Harpoon'd at last, thou flound'ring porpoise— / Thou who hast swallowed all my rights, / Gobbling the mightiest just like the mites— / Devouring like a sprat my habeas corpus. / Thou, who didst bind my sons in chains, / . . . For fear their wrath might kindle riot" (lines 73-84). Only after celebrating the nation's liberty does Wolcot turn to his more narrowly literary concerns, condemning Pitt's gagging of the Muse, exposing Gifford and Mathias as the prime minister's hirelings (204n.), and reserving for Gifford the particular fate of being hanged in a note—taking his cue archly from Mathias's attack on him (127n.). Wolcot's account

of Gifford as a hypocrite, parvenu, sycophant, seducer, and pander to his aristocratic patron is no more truthful than Gifford's attacks on him, but it includes some substantive criticism of Gifford's verse and above all it is playful and ironic. Wolcot's note brilliantly parodies all the earnest strategies of character assassination practiced by Gifford and the *Anti-Jacobin Review*. The poem then concludes with a procession of the people taking their revenge on their erstwhile oppressor: authors, printers, shoemakers led by Thomas Hardy, washerwomen, politicians, even cats and dogs are finally free to speak their minds. At this point, alluding again to Pitt's apparently asexual nature, Wolcot enlists the women of England in the cause of his own unrepenant, libertine, eccentric masculinity:

> And, see! the girls around thee throng
> "Art thou the wight, thus stretch'd along,
> An enemy well known to wives and misses?
> Art thou the man who dost not care
> For oglings, squeezes of the fair;
> Nay, makest up wry mouths at woman's kisses?"
> Then shall the nymphs apply their birchen rods,
> And baste thee worse than Peter Pindar's Odes.

24. Apart from occasional references to this apparently deviant sexuality and to Pitt's drunkenness, Wolcot does not expose the Prime Minister's natural body as avidly as the king's. The commoner Pitt lacks the "body of signs," the divine body that gives Wolcot's satires on the king their semiotic energy. But on some level Marin's definition of caricature—an image presenting "the natural body" as "the truth of the body of signs"—extends to all caricature and especially visual caricature. Thus Gillray seizes on Pitt's rail-thin figure to create some of his most memorable political satires, such as *Sin, Death, and the Devil* (1792) and *Presages of the Millennium* (1795). By way of contrast, *A Sphere Projecting against a Plane* (1793), which features Pitt "projecting" against the rotund Mrs. Hobart, illustrates the comparatively depoliticized humor of the corpulent body in Gillray. Although Gifford calls Wolcot "a bloated mass," Wolcot's corpulence in and of itself pales as a political vice next to his insistent embodiment both of the king and of his own national sentiment. Pat Rogers (182) and Denise Gigante (ch. 8) have both suggested, in very different contexts, that fat becomes politicized, and takes on a peculiar moral stigma, only with the advent of the Regency and the growing waistline of "great George" IV. If the royal body is no longer sacred, caricatures like Thackeray's (in his sketch of Louis XIV and his verbal sketch of George IV as Jos Sedley in *Vanity Fair*) become permissible as liberal discourse. Wolcot's earlier satires contributed to this revolutionary process. Yet the grotesque, libidinal, broadly transgressive masculine contest between Wolcot and his antagonists carried older forms of patriotism forward into the polarized debate over the French Revolution. Wolcot's insistence on the appetitive natural body as the seat of political agency has deep roots in English popular tradition. The subject's desiring body, as James I recognized in *A Counterblast to Tobacco* (1616), is at odds with the divine body of the sovereign, or with his divinely authorized demand for laboring and fighting subjects. By the time of George III, even the king's defenders were presenting him in a role that seems to compromise the doctrine of the king's two bodies, namely as a paragon of domestic masculinity. Wolcot's critics, then, were not championing the king's divine body so much as domestic masculinity and war culture. Among Michael Moore's critics, too, the profanely embodied masculinity that is supposedly repressed in political discourse returns as a fascination with the transgression that has shadowed patriotism as a word and a practice since at least the eighteenth century.

Notes

I would like to thank Joshua Gonsalves, Brad Prager, and Orrin Wang for insightful comments and bibliographical suggestions on an earlier draft of this essay.

1 According to the *OED*, in the late seventeenth century "patriot" was "applied to one who supported the rights of the country against the King and court. . . . Hence the name itself fell into discredit in the earlier half of the 18th c., being used, according to Dr. Johnson, ‘ironically for a factious disturber of the government'" (II.2099). Many examples from the 1790s bear out this point: caustic references to John Wilkes as a "patriot" in the *Times* (3/19/1788); Gillray's *Patriotic Regeneration* (1795), envisioning a Jacobin Parliament with Fox as Robespierre; and pieces in the first *Anti-Jacobin* (1797-98) such as the letter of "A Batchelor." Ironically, Wolcot may have been closer to the nonpartisan Toryism of Henry, Viscount Bolingbroke in *The Idea of a Patriot King* (1738) than was George III, whose patriotism very much involved partisan politics and royal prerogative.

2 This is a selective list. Although there is only one numerical estimate of Wolcot’s sales, ample anecdotal evidence suggests that it is at least not wildly exaggerated: "According to Cyrus Redding [a relative] in what is possibly an exaggeration, at the height of this period of his fame between twenty and thirty thousand copies of his work were sold in a single day" (Girtin 113).

3 Wolcot was a wide-ranging man of letters who worked in many other forms besides the satires that concern me here, beginning with the sentimental *Elegy* for William Boscawen that launched his London career (1768; 1779). He produced occasional satires in his native Cornwall and in Jamaica before coming to London in 1781. After the success of his Royal Academy odes he also published, over the next thirty years, art criticism (as well as a volume of aquatints of his own landscapes); dramatic prologues, epilogues, and criticism; opera librettos and translations; reviews in the *Monthly Review* (1793-96); a blank verse tragedy, *The Fall of Portugal*; and a wide variety of other verse, including beast fables, romantic tales, and significant contributions (along with Robert Burns) to George Thomson’s *A Select Collection of Scottish Airs*. His serious verse is reminiscent of James Thomson in diction and sentiment.

4 Tom Girtin points out that Wolcot may have suggested this role for himself and that Opie in any case included himself in this picture as well as the "fiercer" of the two assassins (111). As in so many cases the political signification is much more equivocal than in Manlius’s strict ideological reading (and is complicated further by the biographical facts of Wolcot’s relationship with Opie).

5 Wolcot’s most political poems in this sense include *A Commiserating Epistle to Lord Lonsdale* (1791) and *Resignation; An Ode to the Journeymen Shoemakers* (1794).

6 Many other prints bear witness to Wolcot’s influence. *Affability* (1795) takes up the King’s habit of engaging laborers in conversation, as lampooned extensively by Wolcot. *Satan in All His Glory, or Peter Pindar Crouching to the Devil* (1792) is particularly important for its portrait of the man himself and for its Oedipal misreading of the poem referenced in the image, the "Conciliatory Ode" to Lord Lonsdale (see further M. Dorothy George 951-52).

7 When Wolcot sued his publisher in 1801, Lord Eldon refused to grant the injunction he was seeking on the grounds that his works were "libellous publications" (qtd. in Girtin 219). But he was never prosecuted in his own right. Gillray, according to Paulson, was "drawn into the arms of the Tories . . . by a blasphemy prosecution arising from a 1796 print showing Fox and Sheridan as Magi" (184), and agreed to produce propagandistic images in return for a pension.

8 As it turned out, Peter’s severity would grow much worse before he mended, though the increasingly harsh reviews in this magazine, as well as other criticisms through the early 90s purporting to speak for the king and the nation, maintain the aggrieved paternal tone used by the king himself (for example) in his proclamations to the rebellious colonies in 1775.

9 Wolcot alludes to a meeting of the Privy Council concerning himself as early as 1787 in *Ode upon Ode*:

"No! Free as air the Muse shall spread her wing, / Of whom, and when, and what she pleases sing: / Though privy councils, jealous of her note, / Prescribed, of late, a halter for her throat" (*Works* 278). The OCLC database identifies Pindaromastix as Joseph Reed, also a possible collaborator of William Kenrick on *Love in the Suds* and hence—assuming both attributions are correct—a veteran fabricator of sodomy charges.

10 Johnson's definition notwithstanding (see note 1), "patriot" occurs here and in a few other anti-Wolcot texts in its straightforward sense, which may have experienced a resurgence by the 1790s. Canning, in *New Morality*, uses the word numerous times in both its straightforward and ironic senses.

11 Nichols actually had printed at least one early manuscript poem of Wolcot's submitted by a correspondent (*Gentleman's Magazine* 58.733).

12 Nichols excerpted a significant portion of "The Remonstrance" in this review and printed "The Magpie and the Robin," one of Wolcot's characteristic beast fables, in full in the poetry section of this issue. From this point the magazine is noticeably conciliatory toward Wolcot: "Peter, under affliction, improveth" (62.155).

13 Dyer's superb calendar of satirical publications between 1789 and 1832 provided me with crucial references for this article. He is also one of several critics to highlight Wolcot's influence on Lord Byron (3).

14 Cobbett must have forgotten his earlier partisanship by 1816, because in that year he incorporated a defense of Wolcot against Gifford in a criticism of the latter, by that time editor of the *Quarterly Review*, in his P*olitical Register* (qtd. in Clark 109). Wolcot had in fact been an early patron of Polwhele's and Polwhele never repudiated him (see further Girtin 210).

15 Wolcot's actual career in vice must have paled by comparison to the excesses of which he was accused in print. But in what seems a curious instance of life imitating art, Wolcot was tried for criminal conversation with his landlady and acquitted in June 1807, when he was 69. The enraged (or opportunistic) husband charged that Wolcot pretended to serve his wife as an acting coach. The couple's servants provided (ultimately ineffective) testimony that might well have been drawn from the body of satire on Wolcot. See further Girtin 226-223.

16 Previous discussion of Wolcot's real sexual proclivities has been limited to pointing out that although he remained unmarried, his close relationships with much younger male protégés (Opie most famously)"Though they "would in the twentieth century be regarded with some reserve" (Girtin 60) "were attended by "no contemporary breath of scandal" (67).

17 The numerous and tantalizing references to Peter Pindar in the *Times* beginning in 1787 deserve much more extensive treatment than I can give them here.

18 Priestley considerately advises the king not to trouble himself about a future state. Priestley also features more centrally in another Gillray print published the same week, which brings out the blasphemy in *The Hopes of the Party*. In *A Birmingham Toast*, Priestley gives the toast "The K[ing's] Head, here!" while holding up an empty communion dish.

Works Cited

"Albion." *Four Pleasant Epistles, Written for the Entertainment and Gratification of Four Unpleasant Characters*. London : Printed for W. Priest, 1789.

"A Batchelor." "Letter to the Anti-Jacobin." *The Anti-Jacobin, or, Weekly Examiner*. 4th ed. Vol. 1. London:

Printed for J. Wright, 1799. 258-61.

Canning, George. *Satires, Songs, and Odes on Various Subjects*. In *The Works of Peter Pindar*. London: Jones and Co., 1823. 319-30.

Clark, Roy Benjamin. *William Gifford: Tory Satirist, Critic, and Editor*. New York: Columbia UP, 1930.

[Cobbett, William, ed.] *The Unsex'd Females; A Poem . . . to which is added, A Sketch of the Private and Public Character of P. Pindar*. New York: Re-published by William Cobbett, 1800.

The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1971.

[D'Israeli, Isaac]. "On the Abuse of Satire." *Gentleman's Magazine* 59 (1789): 648-49.

[Dutton, Thomas.] *Admonitory Epistle to William Gifford*. *The Dramatic Censor* 27 (July 1800): 33-59.

---. "Manners and Morals." *The Dramatic Censor* 28 (August 1800): 98-100.

Fulford, Tim. *Romanticism and Masculinity: Gender, Politics, and Poetics in the Writings of Burke, Coleridge, Cobbett, Wordsworth, De Quincey and Hazlitt*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1999.

Gamer, Michael. "' Bell's Poetics': *The Baviad*, the Della Cruscans, and the Book of *The World*." In *The Satiric Eye: Forms of Satire in the Romantic Period*, ed. Steven E. Jones. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 31-53.

George, M. Dorothy. *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires Preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*. Vol. 6. London: British Museum, 1978.

Gigante, Denise. *Taste: A Literary History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2005.

[Gifford, William.] *Epistle to Peter Pindar*. 3rd ed. London: J. Wright, 1800.

Girtin, Tom. *Doctor with Two Aunts: A Biography of Peter Pindar*. London: Hutchinson, 1959.

Godfrey, Richard. *James Gillray: The Art of Caricature*. London: Tate Gallery, 2001.

Goldsmith, Netta Murray. *The Worst of Crimes: Homosexuality and the Law in Eighteenth-Century London*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.

Hazlitt, William. *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt*. Ed. P. P. Howe. Vol. 11. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1930-34.

Lattimore, Richmond, trans. *The Odes of Pindar*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1947.

McCormick, Ian, ed. *Secret Sexualities: A Sourcebook of 17th and 18th Century Writing*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

"Manlius to Peter Pindar; with Stanzas on seeing his Portrait." *Gentleman's Magazine* 58 (1788): 1044.

Marin, Louis. *Food for Thought*. 1986. Trans. Mette Hjort. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1989.

[Mathias, Thomas James.] *The Pursuits of Literature*. *A Satirical Poem in Four Dialogues, with Notes*. 1794. 2nd ed. London: Printed for J. Owen, 1796-97.

"A Moonraker." *Brother Tom to Brother Peter, or, Peter Paid in His Own Pence: with the Articles of Partnership between the Devil and Peter Pindar*. London: Sold by J. Parsons, 1789.

Paulson, Ronald. *Representations of Revolution (1789-1820)*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1983.

Peter Not Infallible! A Poem; Addressed to Peter Pindar, Esq. Cambridge: Printed by M. Watson, 1800.

"Pindaromastix" [Joseph Reed]. *Birch for Peter Pindar, Esq*. *A burlesque poem*. London: Printed for G. G. and J. Robinson, 1788.

A Poetical Epistle to John Wolcot, Commonly Known by the Appellation of Peter Pindar. London: Printed for George Riebau, 1790.

Rev. of *A Benevolent Epistle to Sylvanus Urban*. *Gentleman's Magazine* 60 (1790): 439.

Rev. of *Brother Peter to Brother Tom*. *Gentleman's Magazine* 58 (1788): 440.

Rev. of *Epistle to a Falling Minister*. *Gentleman's Magazine* 59 (1789): 250-51.

Rev. of *More Money*. *Gentleman's Magazine* 62 (1792): 155.

Rev. of *The Remonstrance*. *Gentleman's Magazine* 61 (1791): 930-31.

Rev. of *The Progress of Curiosity*. *Gentleman's Magazine* 57 (1787): 620.

Rogers, Pat. "Fat Is a Fictional Issue: The Novel and the Rise of Weight-Watching." In *Literature and Medicine during the Eighteenth Century* , ed. Marie Mulvey Roberts and Roy Porter, 168-87. London: Routledge, 1993.

Sinko, Grzegorz. *John Wolcot and His School: A Chapter from the History of English Satire*. Wroclaw: Place Wroclawskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego, 1962.

"The Times." *Times* [London] 19 Mar. 1789: 2d.

"To the Soi-Disant ‘Peter Pindar'" [by "Pythias"]. *Anti-Jacobin Review* 2 (December 1799): 472-73.

"The Two Pindars, or, A Hint to Apollo" [by G. B. R.]. *Gentleman's Magazine* 57 (1787): 818.

The Volunteer Laureate: or Fall of Peter Pindar [by "Archilochus, Jun."]. London and New York: Re-Printed by Mott & Lyon, for Charles Smith, 1796.

Weinbrot, Howard. *Eighteenth-Century Satire: Essays on Text and Context from Dryden to Peter Pindar*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

Wolcot, John ["Peter Pindar"]. *Nil admirari; or, A Smile at a Bishop*. London : Printed by W. and C. Spilsbury for West and Hughes, 1799.

---. *Out at Last*. *Or, The Fallen Minister*. London: Printed by W. and C. Spilsbury for West and Hughes, 1801.

---. *The Works of Peter Pindar, Esq*. London: Jones and Co., 1823.

Romanticism and Patriotism: Nation, Empire, Bodies, Rhetoric

Patriot Acts: The Political Language of Heinrich von Kleist

Jan Mieszkowski, Reed College

1. Near the close of the *Philosophy of Right*, Hegel declares, "Patriotism is frequently understood to mean . . . a willingness to perform *extraordinary* sacrifices and actions. But in essence, it is that disposition which, in the normal conditions and circumstances of life, habitually knows that the community is the substantial basis and end" (288-89). It is safe to say that contemporary discussions of patriotism in the United States share nothing of Hegel's phlegmatic tone. Since September of 2001, loyalty to country has been celebrated and condemned in equally vociferous tones. On the one hand, it is argued that a refusal to affirm one's devotion to the community by being prepared to protect it with force amounts to the abandonment of the most basic of social duties. On the other hand, it is maintained that the desire to fortify "ourselves" against "them" reveals only the pernicious triumph of xenophobia and the military industrial complex. In this charged landscape, "I love my country" alternately means, "I am someone who is willing to fulfill the minimal obligations of citizenship," and, "I am a pathetic pawn of state or corporate interests."

2. For a political theorist, the level of vitriol may be new, but the terms of the disputes are not. The belief that patriotism is essentially a form of nationalism and thus an obstacle to a cosmopolitan or internationalist ethos has routinely been debated since the eighteenth century. The question of whether liberal conceptions of personal freedom are inherently at odds with communitarian ideals is a similarly traditional topos of inquiry. From this perspective, our contemporary polemics—vicious though they may be—are merely one moment in a longstanding discussion about the intersecting dialectics of the public and private and the general and the particular.

3. If there is nonetheless something peculiarly unsettling about loving the *terra patria*, it may lie in the suggestion that politics is partly grounded in affects rather than rights and principles. Patriotism reminds us that a subjective, even whimsical element plagues an arena in which we hope that due process and the rigor of formal systems will hold sway. A politics of affect is threatening because it highlights forces that do not readily permit of quantification, forces that garner their authority from the singularity of their expression rather than from the degree to which they can be communicated or compared with one another. More specifically, it could be argued that the unease inspired by patriotism is a factor of the specific affect it privileges, namely, love. As the Ciceronian model of republicanism made explicit, the goal in adoring one's civic order is to assume a posture vis-à-vis the state like that of a dutiful child to a parent.[1] This would appear to indicate that patriotism is just one form of celebrating the patriarchy, or more bluntly: Loving your country is a semi-covert way of indulging your infantile narcissism and its aggressive impulses. Cast in this light, one does not have to be of the opinion that the United States is governed by a plutocracy to want to avoid grounding the relationship between individuals and their rulers in a murky notion of *amor*.

4. Given the anxieties patriotism invokes on the Left and the Right alike, one cannot help but notice that there is a widespread reluctance to give up on the concept—even, and perhaps especially, if preserving it necessitates re-crafting the term so that we can speak of a cosmopolitan or global patriot rather than a national one. Like its obverse, hate, love can be a troubling commodity for policymakers, but it proves to be extremely useful when it can be harnessed for specific ends. The question, then, is whether modern political theory offers us a model with which to understand these affective dynamics. In

proposing to explore these issues by looking at German writers from the turn of the nineteenth century, I may appear to be making an odd choice. Germany is not typically held up as an example of a country that has come to terms with the problem of patriotism in a salutary fashion. Even if one looks to the Enlightenment as a moment when the concept of the European nation-state was being forged—hence, as a point in time at which certain progressive possibilities may not yet have been foreclosed on—the study may feel more like the investigation of the aetiology of a disease than an excavation of laudable principles that have hithertofore been neglected.

5. These concerns notwithstanding, my argument in this essay is that the Continental thinkers who follow Immanuel Kant offer some crucial alternatives to the familiar liberal positions on citizenship, the individual, and the state. To appreciate this dimension of their work, we will have to break with some of the most well established clichés of European intellectual history. A dynamic of autonomous subjectivity is customarily presumed to have absolute priority in the tradition that runs from Fichte through Friedrich Schlegel and Novalis (Friedrich von Hardenberg) to Schelling and Hegel. In considering the individual's relationship to the state, however, these authors elaborate ethical and political dynamics that are not simply based on a model of a rational, active self—whether it is the self understood as the source of absolute authority, as monarchial sovereignty might have it, or the self viewed as the bearer of interests and responsibilities, as the liberal paradigm would maintain. For example, in their analysis of the polity Schlegel and Novalis are first and foremost concerned not with figures of self-positing (self-creation and self-destruction), but with the potentially more fundamental notion of self-affection. The elementary event whereby the mind impacts itself before there is, properly speaking, anything to impact is described in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, where Kant writes of a form of intuition, "the mode in which the mind is affected through its own activity . . . and so is affected by itself (87).[2] Kant's reflexive "to affect oneself" (*sich affizieren*) comes from the Latin *afficere*: "to affect," "to act upon," "to excite." Neither active nor passive, neither a model of self-positing nor self-reflection, self-affection—the mind's capacity to "touch" itself—is the posture that facilitates all other mental activities even as it is indifferent to them.

6. In an overtly paradoxical fashion, the state of mind Kant describes exists only insofar as it corresponds with itself before it is there; it is a subjective mode of being that emerges only to the extent that it constantly handles itself as a determined entity that it has not already become. Only in virtue of this self-misrecognition—this mistaken touching of the self by a self, "itself," that is not yet there to touch or be touched—is there a self at all. Governed by a movement that is anything but self-contained or self-grounding, such a being never presents itself to itself as something it can know as its own creation, which means that self-relation is no longer the distinguishing characteristic of the subject. This radically calls into question any effort to base political morphology in the reflexive praxis of an individual agent—a point that has enormous implications for the Romantic reception of Rousseau's theory of the general will, the modern understanding of the body politic, and the very notion of political *representation* as such.[3]

7. What does it mean, then, to be a patriot in an intellectual climate in which the figure of the self-determining individual is no longer the principal avatar of political agency? What implications does the concept of self-affection have for a theory of citizenship and for our ideas about being a member of a community, that is, what are the measures of loyalty or responsibility if self-rule is no longer the standard of subjective praxis? Perhaps most importantly, how does the Kantian dynamic of self-affection come to be understood as an explicitly linguistic problem? To explore these questions, I want to turn to a play that is primarily known for its celebration of the pleasures of hating and killing one's enemies. *Die Hermannsschlacht, The Battle of Hermann*, was written in 1808 by Heinrich von Kleist, who, like his contemporaries, spent his career laboring in the long shadow of Kant's first *Critique*. Biographically speaking, Kleist stands out among the intellectuals of his day for his vigorous patriotism. Coming from a long line of Prussian nobility and military officers, he served in the wars

against the French revolutionary army in the 1790s, ultimately quitting when he decided that his courageous endeavors against the foes of the Fatherland were being cheapened by the King's decision to hire mercenaries with no real partisan convictions.[4] During the first decade of the nineteenth century, Kleist was no longer a combatant, but in his personal correspondence, he constantly bemoaned the evils of Napoleon and the French threat to Prussian autonomy, and he spent some time as a prisoner of war, probably because he had been caught spying on the enemy. [5]

8. Where his literary productions were concerned, Kleist maintained that two of his plays were especially patriotic in intent and design: *The Battle of Hermann* and *Prince Friedrich von Homburg*. At first glance, this common thematic ground would seem to be the only similarity between these works. If *Prince Friedrich* is dreamy, bloodless, and overtly self-parodic, *The Battle of Hermann* has struck many as a crude, not to mention extremely violent, piece of propaganda. For most of the twentieth century, its jingoistic dimension was thought to overwhelm any moral or aesthetic content it might have, an assessment typified by Walter Müller-Seidel's claim that it is only with great reservation that one can even grant the text a place (presumably "last" place) among Kleist's other poetic works (53). Indeed, *Hermann* has been dismissed as ill-conceived or immature with such regularity that one could be forgiven for supposing that Kleist had written it as a schoolboy, whereas in fact it was composed around the same time as *Penthesilea*, usually regarded as his dramatic masterpiece.[6]

9. *The Battle of Hermann* is based on Tacitus's account of the victory of the Germanic tribes and their leader Hermann over the Roman general Quintilius Varus in 9 A. D., an event that at least temporarily halted the Roman conquest of Northern Europe. In the course of five acts, we are presented with a variety of negotiations, intrigues, and battlefield clashes between the invaders and the various German rulers, some of whom have allied themselves with the Romans, some against them, and some somewhere in-between. In the culmination of the military action, the forces of Hermann and his fellow chieftain Marbod ambush the enemy and defeat them. The Roman General is killed by a one-time German ally, and Hermann is hailed as the savior of Germania.

10. In the course of the drama, the patriotic fervor of the German people is fanned through a host of devious and sometimes grizzly tactics. At one point, Hermann has some soldiers dress as Romans and plunder their own land in order to enrage the inhabitants against the invaders; in another scene, the corpse of a German maid who has been raped by Romans and then murdered by her father is chopped into enough pieces so that a part of the body can be sent to each of the German tribes. Both of these acts exemplify the broader structure of a play in which efforts to confirm the boundaries between us and them, between friend and foe, inevitably introduce duplicitous signifying logics that no one controls.

11. Following Kleist's own suggestions, *The Battle of Hermann* is typically treated as a thinly-veiled allegory of the Europe of 1809: the Romans stand in for the French aggressors, while Hermann and his allies represent the Prussians, or possibly the Austrians, who at the time were preparing for an invasion of France.[7] In these terms, Kleist was hardly innovative. A number of eighteenth-century German literary works present the quasi-historical figure of Hermann as a rallying point for contemporary partisan passions. At the same time, one should not underestimate the uniquely programmatic pretensions of Kleist's play. Wolf Kittler has heralded it as a primer on guerrilla warfare, a kind of counterpart before the fact to Carl von Clausewitz's famous treatise on conventional combat ("Concept" 508-510). Indeed, Kittler has even gone so far as to argue that the drama expresses Kleist's heart-felt desire to incite insurrection among the German people (*Geburt* 342).

12. The ideological stakes of such an ambition are anything but self-evident. Accordingly, as is typical for almost all of Kleist's works, suggestions abound as to the real target of the attacks the play invites or effects. Among other things, *Hermann* has been described as a critique of Christian morality, of the

incompatibility of aristocratic and bourgeois social theory, and, perhaps most conventionally, of Enlightenment subjectivity. It is the central role of violence in the text, however, that has inspired the greatest interpretive anxieties. In a positive vein, Seán Allan has written that "*Die Hermannsschlacht* explores the nature of the acts of violent retribution committed in the struggle to overthrow the oppressive regime of a colonial power" (235). Against this affirmation of the value of armed resistance, Georg Lukács famously accused Kleist of emotional anarchy, identifying his œuvre as a forerunner to the aesthetics of National Socialism because Kleist's anti-humanism—unlike that of, for instance, Karl Marx—never goes beyond the level of mere revolt (7: 217ff.) Taking these same concerns in the opposite direction, it can be argued that *The Battle of Hermann* is as much a warning about the politics of "strong" leadership as it is a celebration of an indigenous people's self-assertion in the face of imperialist aggression. With Kleist's much-vaunted antipathy for Napoleon as a background, the story of Hermann can thus be read as a prime example of why a polity based in the cult status of an individual is fated to endure chaos and disaster. After all, at the close of the play, having just been denounced as a tyrant by a countryman he has casually sent for execution, the German leader uses his final speech to paint a graphic picture of a bellicose future, suggesting that if a *Pax Germanica* is to replace the *Pax Romana*, it will be no more faithful to the title of peace than its predecessor.

13. Yet what are the real stakes of this nationalist war, a war that at the end of *The Battle of Hermann*, as at the end of *Prince Friedrich von Homburg*, seems more perpetual than winnable? From its opening scenes, *The Battle of Hermann* depicts a struggle over the possibility, or impossibility, of a figure such as Hermann functioning as a truly historical agent. Unsurprisingly, this battle over Hermann is largely fought by Hermann himself, but it is not waged in the terms one might expect. In an early discussion with the other German rulers who are trying to recruit him to the resistance, Hermann gives voice to a number of curious positions. With great eloquence, he insists that he strives not to win but to be defeated by the Roman Emperor, that he aims to lose everything, and that he must stand alone, bound with no one but God, staking everything to forfeit it all in death as Germany goes up in flames. Needless to say, Hermann's compatriots are confused, but they are soon somehow reassured of his support. By the close of their conversation, Hermann is talking about his progeny marching on Rome, and his fellow chieftains have switched from calling him incomprehensible to deciding that he stands with them in their struggle against the Romans. Most interpretations of this scene and its relationship to the ensuing story treat Hermann's various quirky declarations as part of a program of persuasion and reverse-psychological brinkmanship with which he intends to put himself, his associates, and the German populace in the best position to achieve liberation. Once this figure of Hermann the Machiavellian Magician is introduced, it can be used to explain his or any other character's behavior—however odd or out of place. Deferring to Hermann's omnipotence considerably simplifies the task of working through the plot of the later acts, since at any given moment it is hard to decide whether a particular combatant is being operationally shrewd or if he or she is simply getting lucky. A clever ruse may be a serendipitous blunder or vice versa, and it is not obvious that any of the characters are terribly concerned with telling the difference.[8]

14. Our approach to the text changes somewhat once we realize that the fact that Hermann does go on to lead his people to victory does not in any respect contradict his opening statement that he aims only to lose. To the contrary, it is precisely because this strange stance is Hermann's position throughout that he is able to do something worthy of the name "patriotic." Following Hermann's own hints when he mocks his fellow German leaders because their conception of freedom amounts to protecting their property from alien marauders rather than exercising autonomy, it is tempting to argue that Hermann strives to embody a Kantian ideal of freedom—a pure spontaneity of agency that corresponds with nothing, not even itself. When Hermann avers that in this struggle he must stand alone, allied with no one, he is merely spelling out the basic requirements of genuine independence. A truly free, and thus admirable, demonstration of one's commitment to one's people or nation must take the form of an act that eludes any calculus, standard, or guide that would pre-exist it as its cause or condition of

possibility. Such an act must therefore appear as a kind of misstep, a mis-act; indeed, it can scarcely be recognizable as an act at all, or it is at risk of being treated as the effect of something other than itself. What this play calls "history," then, is an activity that explodes any continuum between a present, a past that would make the present possible, and a future that the present proleptically (and later retrospectively) grounds. Hermann strives to be defeated because he strives to realize a praxis that is not an inevitable consequence of what is, has been, or might conceivably be the case. He strives to do something that will tear itself free of any smooth modulation from potentiality to actuality. As a result, Hermann's actions must be as impossible as they are possible, as liable to be worthless as vital, as likely to be missed opportunities as well-chosen maneuvers. If this bizarre historical agency cannot be realized, then there can be no difference between what happens and what could happen, and all events will be equally inevitable or random. In other words, without Hermann's embrace of pure loss, there is no possibility of a divide between what might take place and what does take place, no one can take credit for having said or done anything truly on their own, and there is certainly no way to envision something that could genuinely be called an act of resistance.

15. Ironically, then, a play that ostensibly offers an ancient insurrection as a model for modern insurrection begins by rejecting the authority of repetition as the quintessential historical force. Whatever Hermann represents—the will of the people, the future of his tribe, the last hope for Germany—he can play his role only insofar as he stands outside of any continuum of possibility and actuality that would seamlessly shape the future on the basis of the resources of the past. In fact, something very similar happens in *Prince Friedrich von Homburg*, the text Kleist designated as his other patriotic drama. There, the eponymous Prince Friedrich cannot be heralded as a true soldier until he has become so fearful and abject that he is said to have fallen out of an historical logic in which his actions could constitute the fame of a hero, articulating the present with the future. Only at the point at which it is impossible to view the Prince as an agent of the Fatherland—the point at which his behavior is literally an impossibility—can he become a real patriot. In Kleist, we might say, one fights not in order that Germany may rise again, but rather to show that Germany may rise again only insofar as we prove that there is no way for Germany to rise again.

16. The movement of such a patriotic agency is not the self-positing or self-negating of an absolute subject, but the self-affecting discourse of a language that no individual hero can call his own. Strife in *The Battle of Hermann* does not fundamentally take the form of a clash between peoples, cultures, or ideals. It is manifested rather in the exercise of a familiar yet unique utterance, an interjection that emerges at the limits of grammar and reference: the word *heil*, as in "*Heil* Caesar," or perhaps in this case, "*Heil* the conqueror of Caesar." At the end of the play, the Romans defeated, Hermann speaks to his ally: "*Heil* Marbod, my magnanimous friend! / And if Germania hears my voice: / *Heil* its overlord and king" (l. 2569-2571).[9] For better or worse, Marbod responds in kind: "*Heil*, I call you Hermann, the savior of Germania. / And when [Germania] hears my voice: / *Heil* its overlord and king" (l.2578-2580). To some degree, the expostulation *heil* is obviously a hailing; but it is hardly an unequivocal one. More than a mere address to or announcement of the appearance of an individual, it is a performative utterance: "You are our ruler, our leader, our savior, because you are the one to whom we say '*heil*.'" *Heil* is also a kind of command. It orders you to be greeted, and to be greeted as the one worthy of, or in need of, greeting: "Be *the* Hermann, be he who is the King of Germania, a country that should be there to hear us say that you are to be its ruler." In this sense, *heil* is a demand to be heard, a demand to be recognized as a voice that can speak a political language, a language that can call leaders and lands into existence.

17. Somewhere among these many orders and entreaties, we can begin to detect an element of uncertainty, as if the various stipulations of *heil* are not or cannot always be met to perfection. The grammar of the interjection *heil* hovers between the indicative and the subjunctive: *Heil dem König* says, "Long Live the King!" or "God Save the King!" It does not say: "The King *will* live a long life," or "God *will* save

the King." Moreover, *Heil dem König* is not primarily directed to the object it ostensibly names as the target of its "greeting." On the contrary, with "Long Live (or God Save) the King!" God or fate is being asked to preserve the monarch as he or she makes an entrance, while the sovereign's role in the situation remains decidedly uncertain. In other words, "Heil Hermann" may be uttered "to" or "in the presence of" someone named Hermann, but it can never be entirely to, for, or about him. Whatever proper noun or title we insert after *heil*, the word inexorably reasserts its relative independence vis-à-vis the declarations that enlist its services. In this sense, the utterance *heil* is as much an attempt at a salutation, acclamation, or blessing of itself as of anything else. *Heil heil*, we might say, *heil* the power of *heil* to signify, posit, or demand. Underscoring the repetition that *heil* seems to require, the Grimm Brothers note that in the eighteenth century the word appears in a number of overtly redundant expressions, including *Heil und Segen* ("Bless you, bless you") and *Heil und Glück* ("Good luck, good luck"). The curious relation of *heil* to its own iterability is very much in evidence at the end of Kleist's other patriotic play, when the impossibly abject Prince Friedrich is welcomed back into Prussian respectability in a bizarre ceremony that culminates with the Colonel's declaration: "*Heil*, *Heil* the Prince of Homburg" (l. 1854).[10] The accolade is ordinary, and certainly respectful, but it remains incomplete until the accompanying officers add: "*Heil*, *heil*, *heil*!" (1855). Order is restored and everyone goes off to fight (in this case, the Swedes rather than the Romans), but all of this can happen only because it has supposedly been shown that it is possible to say *heil* to *heil*. Patriotism takes place, then, not when the characters salute the King or the Fatherland, but when they salute the language of salute, or rather, when they yield to language's own salute to itself. What *heil* first and foremost attempts to acclaim is the power of language to acclaim. *Heil* is the affirmation language seeks to offer language; it is language's greeting to itself as that which should be able to greet, confirm, or at least give voice to the hope that something will be the case—for instance, that Hermann, or Marbod, will be the King of Germania.[11]

18. The problem is that the very need to say *heil* seems to contravene its stated intent. Like the English *hail* (as in "Hail to the Chief"), the German interjection comes from the Old Norse word for *whole* ("complete"), a meaning that is obvious in modern German in which the adjective *heil* means "undamaged" and the verb *heilen* is "to heal."[12] Yet precisely because it is neither simply prescriptive nor descriptive, neither purely constative nor performative, *heil* risks rendering the "whole" incomplete by revealing that, as with the exchange between Hermann and Marbod, the ruler is not the ruler unless he is hailed, confirmed or better, *called out*—challenged to show that he can dare to rule with reference and deference to the authority of *heil*. For aspiring politicians, the lesson could not be clearer: The only safe answer to *heil* is *heil*. No other utterance can "perform" the operation expressed with *heil*; no other utterance can refer to what *heil* does; and most importantly, no other utterance can pretend to get along without it.

19. To return to the Kantian terms with which we began, *heil* is linguistic self-affection. It heralds not a discourse of positing and reflection, but a movement of obedience to a language whose very condition of possibility does not yet exist. All language is affected by *heil*, which is also to say that all language must seek to assert its radical independence from *heil*, i.e., all language must aim to fulfill the impossible task of being "whole" without it. For Kleist, the name for the effort to effect a discourse that could be based on something other than a dynamic of self-affection is "patriotism." In this way, *The Battle of Hermann* shows us that real devotion to the community rests not on our capacity to serve our government or to acknowledge the primacy of the public over the private, but on our ability to intervene in the acts by which language seeks to correspond with a form, structure, or law that is, strictly speaking, inconceivable. It is from this perspective that we can begin to reread the liberal tradition and its understanding of citizenship, focusing less on clashes between individual and state interests and more on the forms of linguistic violence that give shape to subjective praxis.

Notes

1 On Roman notions of the *patria*, see Kantorowicz (243-247).

2 Kant writes about "[d]ie Form der Anschauung, welche, da sie nichts vorstellt, außer so fern etwas im Gemüte gesetzt wird, nichts anders sein kann, als die Art, wie das Gemüte durch eigene Tätigkeit, nämlich dieses Setzen ihrer Vorstellung, mithin durch sich selbst affiziert wird" (*Kritik* 92).

3 In Schlegel, the consequences of this transformation are perhaps most evident in the notion of political representation as a melancholic fiction of surrogacy that he develops in his "Essay on the Concept of Republicanism." The extent to which Kantian self-affection invites an explicit consideration of political affect is even clearer in Novalis's "Faith and Love," where *Liebe* names the condition of possibility and impossibility of a relationship between a monarch and his or her subjects.

4 See in particular Kleist's note to his friend Adolfine von Werdeck in November of 1801 (2: 700).

5 In one typical letter, Kleist marvels that nobody has put a bullet in the head of the "evil world spirit," Napoleon (1: 761). Unsurprisingly, discussions of Kleist's personal history and his remarks in his private correspondence have led to a wide range of contradictory conclusions about his positions on militarism, nationalism, and patriotism. These issues become more complicated if we ask whether his literary texts and his life are in some sense "consistent" on these points. For one of the most far-reaching considerations of these issues, see Wolf Kittler, *Die Geburt des Partisanen aus dem Geist der Poesie*.

6 In his *In Pursuit of Power: Heinrich von Kleist's Machiavellian Protagonists,* William C. Reeve offers a detailed overview of the critical reception of the play. Working against the tendency among commentators to highlight the differences between *Hermann* and the later *Prince Friedrich*, Reeve has also argued that the former text is a crucial forerunner to the latter. (see "*Die Hermannsschlacht:* A Prelude to *Prinze Friedrich von Homburg*.")

7 "We are the people subjugated by the Romans. The plundering of Europe in order to enrich France is anticipated," wrote Kleist to his sister Ulrike on October 24, 1806, ten days after the Prussian army was crushed in the battle of Jena and Auerstädt (2:771).

8 For an excellent analysis of the rhetorical structure of the play and the difficulties that arise in trying to take any given character "at his or her word," see Jan Plug, "The Borders of a Lip: Kleist, language, and politics."

9 Citations from the play (*Sämtliche Werke* 1:533-628-709) are referenced by line number. All translations are my own.

10 Citations from *Prince Friedrich von Homburg* (*Sämtliche Werke* 1:629-709) are referenced by line number. All translations are my own.

11 More than half a century after the fall of Nazi Germany, it is still impossible to discuss the German word *heil* without immediately conjuring up thoughts of the infamous *Hitergruß*. It could be argued that the structure of this salute, whereby "Heil Hitler" is supplemented with a movement of the arm and hand, aims to mime the iterability internal to any utterance of *heil*. This may be an effort to stabilize the dynamics we have been describing, an attempt to reconfirm the authority of the verbal utterance by complimenting it with a physical manifestation of "tribute." From the perspective of Walter Benjamin's reading of Bertolt Brecht's Epic Theater as a Theater of *Gestus*, one could take this notorious Nazi greeting as an opportunity to explore the political significance of the body as an explicitly linguistic problematic. On the asesthetics and poetics of

gesture, see Nägele, esp. 151-158.

12 In German, *heilen* means to heal or to cure, not "to hail," as in English. ("To hail" is *zujubeln, bejubeln, or zurufen*.) The German adjective *heil* means "unhurt," "uninjured," "undamaged"; *wieder heil werden* is "to get better"; *heil nach Hause* is "to get home safe and sound"; and *heil machen* is "to make better" (*reparieren*). The noun *Heil* means "well-being," "good," or "salvation."

Works Cited

Allan, Sen. "Violence and Revenge in the Works of Kleist." *A Companion to the Works of Heinrich von Kleist*. Ed. Bernd Fischer. Rochester: Camden House, 2003.

Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1965-.

Hegel, G. W. F. *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. Ed. Allen W. Wood. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. Werner S. Pluhar. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1996.

---. *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. *Werkausgabe* III. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988.

Kantorowicz, Ernest. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Kittler, Wolf. *Die Geburt des Partisanen aus dem Geist der Poesie: Heinrich von Kleist und die Strategie der Befreiungskriege*. Freiburg: Rombach, 1987.

---. " *Die Hermannsschlacht* and the Concept of Guerrilla Warfare." *A New History of German Literature*. Ed. David E. Wellbery. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004. 505-511.

Kleist, Heinrich von. *Sämtliche Werke und Briefe*. Ed. Helmut Sembdner. Munich: DTV, 1987.

Lukcs, Georg. *Werke*. Berlin: Luchterhand, 1964.

Müller-Seidel, Walter. *Versehen und Erkennen*. *Eine Studie über Heinrich von Kleist*. Kln: Bhlau, 1961.

Nägele, Rainer. *Theater, Theory, Speculation: Walter Benjamin and the Scenes of Modernity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Novalis (Friedrich von Hardenberg). "Faith and Love." *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*. Ed. Frederick C. Beiser. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 33-49.

Plug, Jan. "The Borders of a Lip: Kleist, Language, and Politics." *Studies in Romanticism* 36: 3 (1997): 391-425.

Reeve, William C. " *Die Hermannsschlacht* : A Prelude to *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*." *The Germanic Review* 63: 3 (Summer 1988): 121-132.

---. *In Pursuit of Power: Heinrich von Kleist's Machiavellian Protagonists*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Schlegel, Friedrich. "Essay on the Concept of Republicanism occasioned by the Kantian Tract 'Perpetual

Peace.'" *The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*. Ed. Frederick C. Beiser. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 93-112.