

Common Place: Rereading 'Nation' in the Quoting Age, 1776-1860

Anitta C. Santiago

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

2014

UMI Number: 3611470

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3611470

Published by ProQuest LLC (2014). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ABSTRACT

Common Place: Rereading 'Nation' in the Quoting Age, 1776-1860

Anitta C. Santiago

This dissertation examines quotation specifically, and intertextuality more generally, in the development of American/literary culture from the birth of the republic through the Civil War. This period, already known for its preoccupation with national unification and the development of a self-reliant national literature, was also a period of quotation, reprinting and copying. Within the analogy of literature and nation characterizing the rhetoric of the period, I translate the transtextual figure of quotation as a protean form that sheds a critical light on the nationalist project. This project follows both how texts move (transnational migration) and how they settle into place (national naturalization). Combining a theoretical mapping of how texts move and transform intertextually and a book historical mapping of how texts move and transform materially, I trace nineteenth century examples of the culture of quotation and how its literary mutability both disrupts and participates in the period's national and literary movements.

In the first chapter, I engage scholarship on republican print culture and on republican emulation to interrogate the literary roots of American nationalism in its transatlantic context. Looking at commonplace books, autobiographies, morality tales, and histories, I examine how quotation as a practice of memory impression functions in national re-membering. In the second chapter, I follow quotation in early nineteenth-century national and literary contests of space and fashioning, the movement for international copyright in the culture of reprinting and the calls for a national literature. The third chapter considers questions of appropriation, assimilation, and translation in hemispheric poetic interactions within the context of the annexation and Manifest Destiny. The last chapter examines quotation in the antebellum period where, in the absence of a unifying authority, the fragments of quotation offer a way to tell the story of the nation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Acknowledgments	iii
2. Dedication	v
3. Introduction	1
4. Chapter 1- Deep Impressions: Re-membering (Com)Patriots	
Framing Contests: Quotation in America, America in Quotation.....	11
Memory-Building: Commonplace Books and the Order of Fragments.....	20
Fit Impressions: Genre and the Impression of Memory and Morals.....	34
Discipline and Publish: National Confederation, Ambivalence Bound.....	51
Re-membering Nathan Hale: Contesting Last Words.....	62
5. Chapter 2- Make Way: Fashionable Entrée, American Space, and the Mutability of Naturalization	
From Rags to Riches, Riches to Rags: Irvings' Literary Ecology.....	78
Characters in Costume: Anglo-America and the Fashionable Nation.....	95
<i>The Dandies Are Out: Dandiacal Traditions and National and Universal Pageant...</i>	103
<i>Reforming the Dandy: Contests of Literary and National Character</i>	113
<i>The Dandy in American Character</i>	124
Fashioning Nature: The Art of the Preserve and Righting Plots.....	136
<i>Game Laws and Property Rights: Naturalizing Preservation</i>	142
<i>Engendering a Neutral Ground: The Nature of Representation</i>	151
Memorial Epigraphs: <i>Hope Leslie</i> and Resurrecting Plots.....	160

6. Chapter 3- Manifest Translating: Assimilating Power in the Hemisphere and Parallel Encounters	
Passable Verses: The Homeric Questioning of American Originality and Influence....	170
Parallel Passages: Tracing Imitations and Literary Exposé.....	177
Stealing from the Spanish: Bryant, Mexico, and Cuba.....	191
Traductor a Traductor: Bryant and Heredia, A Case Study.....	207
Longfellow's Inverted Tree, Known By Its Hemispheric Fruit.....	216
Rainy Day Men: Longfellow and Quintero, A Case Study.....	240
7. Chapter 4- Antiquarian Modernities: The Fragments of a Tradition	
Floating Fragments: Emerson and the Sources of Transcendental Originality	
<i>Broken Vessels and Dismembered Deities: Quotation as Emersonian Originality.....</i>	<i>249</i>
<i>An Other Problem: The National Failure of Quotation.....</i>	<i>257</i>
Editing Cultures: The Quotation Books of Sarah Josepha Hale and John Bartlett.....	264
<i>Sarah Hale's American Presence and Erasure.....</i>	<i>265</i>
<i>John Bartlett: A(n) (Un)familiar Authority.....</i>	<i>273</i>
Give It Up, Sub-Subs!: A Final Word on Decomposition and Recomposition.....	289
8. Epilogue.....	294
9. Bibliography.....	300

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

What nineteenth-century readers knew well was that all texts contain multiple influential presences, and I am pleased to say that this dissertation is no different. I am privileged to have had the most supportive, patient, and insightful dissertation committee imaginable. I thank my advisor Ross Posnock for being an encyclopedia of academic research, directing me to the scholarship that has most impacted my thinking, for his careful and generous reading and commenting on my drafts, and for his incredible patience, understanding, and never failing encouragement. I thank Sharon Marcus for making me a better writer (I still have much to learn from her), for her perspicacity in seeing my project more clearly than I did, for her always spot-on advice both on my scholarship and professional development, and for going out of her way to support me. I thank Lisa Gordis who has been instrumental in my formation as a scholar and a person, who first taught me to love early American literature, without whose encouragement I would not have even dreamed of graduate school, and whose confidence in my ideas slowly but surely helped me to develop my own.

My heartfelt thanks go to Meredith McGill, whose scholarship has been so influential for this dissertation in particular and my thinking more generally, for her generous feedback with which to continue to develop this project as well as to T. Austin Graham for opening my eyes to more terrain for historical inquiry in this project.

I thank Ezra Tawil, Jenny Davidson, the rest of the Eighteenth-Century Reading Group, with whom I was able to discuss the beginnings of this project, for their helpful advice and questions. I would also like to thank Gerald Cloud who helped me with my research on John Bartlett and the American publication history of silver-fork novels, as well as William Delgado at the Hispanic Society of America for his help with the *Revista de la Habana*.

I thank all the professors I have had the honor to learn from here for being models of outstanding scholarship and teaching for emulation: Amanda Claybaugh, Julie Crawford, Michael Golston, Wen Jin, Shayne Legassie, Edward Mendelson, Julie Peters, Victoria Rosner, Clifford Siskin, Maura Spiegel, Gauri Viswanathan, and Nicole Wallack.

Thank you to all the scholars whose work I have quoted or referenced in this dissertation.

Many thanks, too, to all my fellow graduate students in the department who have recommended books, commiserated and advised. I thank my classmates in Professor Marcus's article workshop for helping me to sort out my Bartlett research, and in particular, Olivia Moy and Jangwook Huh for their help and friendship. I am incredibly grateful and indebted to the consultants at the Writing Center, especially Katie McIntyre, without whom I might never have been able to pull off the final draft.

Last, but by no means least, I thank my friends and family. Thanks to my friends from Coliseum Books, especially Mike Lindgren, Ron Kolm, and Conrad Brenner, for discussions on my dissertation texts at Muldoon's and the Cloister Café. To Jennifer Ren for being a sounding board and helping me with French and German. To Father Martin Curtin and William and Mary Curtin for their spiritual and intellectual support. Thanks to everyone in the family who asked "how's it going?" and showered me with prayers and love, especially my aunt Maria, my uncle Wilfredo, my cousin Michele, my Ramoses and "Uncle Victor." To my little cousins Michael and Uriah and baby nephew Jayden for being a constant source of joy. I thank my brother Alan for allowing me to vent when I needed to and for always having ready words of wisdom or wit to keep me going, as well as my sister-in-law Tameka for her support. Most of all, I thank my mom, for *ponche de café*, for learning about dandies and listening to so many of my think-alouds, for those quotations that inspired me each day, and for being just about everything for me.

DEDICATION

To my grandmother Emilia Ramos Aguilar de Rivas who taught me *the mainest lessons*.

INTRODUCTION

In John Steinbeck's *The Winter of Our Discontent*, thirteen year-old Ellen asks her father Ethan Allen Hawley a question about "copying from books" as she and her brother write their essays for the National I Love America Contest. After instructing his daughter on the use of quotations, Ethan considers, "I guess half the writing in America is quotations, if it isn't anthologies."¹ The winner of the contest is Ethan's son Allen, whose essay turns out to be a plagiarism, composed from his father's anthologies of the great American speeches by Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln. "I don't know why we didn't catch it, but we didn't,"² says Dunscombe, a representative from the television branch come to break the news. He shows Ethan the essay and asks, "Do you recognize it?"³ Ethan does not but admits, "It sounds familiar—sounds like maybe somewhere in the last century."

This contest of nationalist writing does reveal something vaguely familiar about "the last century," about the history of the nation that we have perhaps failed to recognize. Though nationalist originality has characterized the conventional view of the nineteenth century, Steinbeck's Ethan points us to that other half of the tradition of American writing, composed of quotations and anthologies, the copying from books. Indeed, quotation was the vogue of the period, "the quoting age."⁴ Its reading public was educated in the eighteenth-century culture of

¹ John Steinbeck, *The Winter of Our Discontent* (1961, New York: Penguin Books, 1983), 168.

² Steinbeck, 305.

³ *Ibid.*, 306.

⁴ Across the Atlantic, Isabella Rushton Preston compiler of *A Handbook of Familiar Quotations* declared to her publisher on presenting her plan, "This is a quoting age—the newspapers, Reviews && teem with them." This was as true of America as it was of England, for Preston's book would be the basis of first edition of Bartlett's *Familiar Quotations*. See Michael Hancher, "Familiar Quotations," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 14.2 (2003): 32.

emulation, kept commonplace books, played quotation games as a pastime, debated quotations in periodicals, and enjoyed identifying imitations in the literature they read.

This dissertation attempts to tell a story of that half-tradition in American literature comprised of quotations. It reads this tradition alongside the period's burgeoning rhetoric of nationalist self-reliance, to interrogate the relationship between national and literary culture supposed by "national literature" and the conditions of possibility for the cultural development of the nation. It is telling that Steinbeck reveals this half-forgotten history within a national contest. These two cultures, the culture of quotation and that of nationalist originality, which ran alongside each other in the long nineteenth-century, did indeed run in contest. Quotation in my study serves to challenge the univocal tradition of nationalist originality, but, inherently ambivalent, quotation also negotiates with and participates with this tradition.

Contest and ambivalence emerge in this study as the constants of the culture of quotation's variable development. Contest is the nature of quotation, and it is a national one because the national "we" is always in quotation marks, scare quotes, or, in George L. Dillon's borrowing from James Joyce, perverted commas.⁵ Dillon's extensive discussion of "perverted commas" in "My Words of An Other" identifies the contest that occurs in quotation marks as one in which the stakes are absence or presence. Linking perverted commas to what Heidegger and Derrida have called placing words "under erasure," Dillon describes them as "usage under erasure" where "Not-Self intrud[es] into the Self's discourse, but also being made a part of it."⁶ Here Dillon refers to the use of perverted commas over the words from which one desires to

⁵ George L. Dillon, "My Words of An Other," *College English* 50, no.1 (1988). Dillon adapts Joyce's term for quotation marks generally, a play on inverted commas, to scare quotes specifically.

⁶ Dillon, 66. Marjorie Garber also links "scare quotes" to Heidegger/Derrida's "under erasure". See Marjorie Garber, *Quotation Marks*. (New York: Routledge, 2003), 11. Willis Goth Regier, on the other hand, more generically describes scare quotes as placing words "under *suspicion*" (emphasis mine). See Willis Goth Regier, *Quotology*. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), 28.

distance oneself. In the case of the national “we” the perverted commas signify the distance inherent in the usage. These perverted commas resemble more immediately what Dillon describes as the death of univocal purity.⁷ The death or loss, he says, occurs in situations of contest or dispute, “where one set of terms struggles to displace or delegitimize another.”

Edward Said similarly describes quotation in terms of displacement. He writes in *Beginnings: Intention and Method*:

Throughout the whole range of experience of writing [...] quotation is a constant reminder that writing is a form of displacement. For although quotation can take many forms, in every one the quoted passage symbolizes other writing as encroachment, as a disturbing force moving potentially to take over what is presently being written.⁸

Said’s territorial metaphor for what occurs in quotation—“displacement,” “encroachment,” and “take over”—relates to the politics of inclusion and exclusion that, as Priscilla Wald notes, have plagued “We the People” from its inception. In other words, the quotation marks around the national “we” articulate it as a place of contestation, where the entry in or exclusion from the quotation marks continually threatens to displace its meaning.

Just as the nation has been thought of in quotation marks, quotation has been often been thought of in (de)nationalized terms and it is in the context of the national that we most clearly see quotation’s ambivalence. In *Poetics of Quotation in the European Novel*, Herman Meyer refers to quotation as a “foreign body” or “alien body” entering into a “new environment,” and “permitting another world to radiate into the self-contained world of the novel.”⁹ This same quality of “foreign” and “alien” is how Mikhail Bakhtin describes the words that “put themselves

⁷ Dillon, 69.

⁸ Edward Said, *Beginnings: Intention and Method*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975), 22.

⁹ Herman Meyer, *The Poetics of Quotation in the European Novel*. Trans. Theodore and Yetta Ziolkowski (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1968), 6.

in quotation marks against the will of the speaker.”¹⁰ My interest in quotation as a tool for interrogating national literature is its potential to foreignize the concept of national literature, letting another world penetrate the self-contained world of *nation*.

In this respect, my project falls in line with the current direction of American literary studies, moving away from the national narrative and American exceptionalism towards a more transnational and comparative emphasis. In her introduction to *Through Other Continents: American Literature Across Deep Time* (2006), Wai Chee Dimock critiqued the “nation-based model [...] in literary studies.”¹¹ The tendency in the study of all literatures has been to see literature as the product of “nation and one nation alone.”¹² This is the tendency that the transnational or post-national focus has resisted. In American Studies, the resistance is particularly charged, because the study of literature in this national model has been particularly charged. The contributors of John Carlos Rowe’s *Post-Nationalist American Studies* situate their project in the Introduction to the volume as an attempt to “seek to revise the cultural nationalism and celebratory American exceptionalism that often informed the work of American Studies scholars in the Cold War Era.”¹³ This nationalist American Studies is what Djelal Kadir calls “American American Studies” in “America and Its Studies,” his introduction to the 2003 *PMLA* Special Topic issue America: The Idea, The Literature.¹⁴ Kadir’s essay follows the historical complicity of American studies and the nationalist political ideology of the moment, arguing that

¹⁰ Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, Ed. Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas, 2004).

¹¹ Wai Chee Dimock, *Through Other Continents: American Literature Across Deep Time*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 2.

¹² Dimock, 3.

¹³ John Carlos Rowe. *Post-Nationalist American Studies*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 2.

¹⁴ Djelal Kadir, “America and Its Studies,” *PMLA* 118, no. 1 (2003): 10.

“The best hope for American studies as an area of knowledge...is for it to cease to be American and an instrument of official state policy and become, instead, an independent, international field of inquiry and teaching.”¹⁵ Separated from nationalist complicity, this internationalist American studies becomes a space for national critique.

But as Lauren Berlant argues in *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City* in response to the potential critique of her national archive: “it is precisely under transnational conditions that the nation becomes a more intense object of concern and struggle.”¹⁶ Call it transnationalism, internationalism, or cosmopolitanism, steering away from the nation has proven a bit of an endless roundabout. Bruce Robbins in his introduction to *Cosmopolitics* observes that, “Like nations, cosmopolitanisms are now plural and particular. Like nations, they are both European and non-European, and they are weak and underdeveloped as well as strong and privileged.”¹⁷ In this, he notes that cosmopolitanism increasingly colludes with the nation instead of opposing it, and if cosmopolitanism has been defined by its opposition to the nation, this raises new questions about its definition and value. Similarly, quotations, while introducing a foreign element into an otherwise self-reliant text, remains a cooperator with the text’s internal logic, simultaneously *not text* and *text*—quotation’s signature ambivalence. Robbins proposes cosmopolitanism not as a way out of the crimes of the nation into “virtuous, eligible identities,” but as a way into “a domain of contested politics,” and this is what I find, too, in quotation, that figure of contests.¹⁸

¹⁵ Kadir, 11.

¹⁶ Lauren Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997), 13.

¹⁷ Bruce Robbins, “Introduction Part I: Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism,” *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, Ed. Bruce Robbins and Pheng Cheah (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 2.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 12.

Thus, my interest in quotation is not as a way out of the nation, but as a way to understand how the nation formed in the way it did and how it might have formed otherwise, uncovering the conditions of possibility for the negotiation of national presences. Herman Meyer, in his discussion of quotation in migrational terms, asks, “Now what is the optimal integration of this alien body [quotation] into the new linguistic totality?”¹⁹ This is somewhat of a rhetorical question, the answer he imagines on the reader’s mind being “complete assimilation.” Meyers upsets this assumption, arguing that if complete assimilation was achieved, quotation would lose its “special character and its specific effect.” He, therefore concludes, “the charm of the quotation emanates from a unique tension between assimilation and dissimilation.” In its assimilation and dissimilation, quotation, like cosmopolitics, can in this way offer “an area both within and beyond the nation,” inhabited by “a multivoiced complexity.”²⁰

Quotation itself in my study is something of a multifaceted complex. Examining the culture of quotation, I take quotation as a shorthand for a variety of textual practices. My use of ‘quotation’ resembles Paul Westover’s use of the term as including, “allusion, citation, and imitation.”²¹ I am also informed by Meir Sternberg’s broader sense of quotation as “reported discourse.” This understanding of quotation adds to the literary sense of quotation as the quoting, citing, or alluding to authors an additional literary sense of a narrator’s quoting of a character or a character’s reporting the speech of another character in indirect discourse. More broadly, I follow Dillon’s definition of quotation as “words of an other” that relates to the

¹⁹ Meyer, 6.

²⁰ Robbins, 32.

²¹ Paul Westover, “How America ‘Inherited’ Literary Tourism” in *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth-Century*, Ed. Nicola J. Watson (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 184.

pragmatic sense of quotation marks in philosophy of language studies where quotation marks designate the blocking of the stereotypical meaning of the expression.²² Ultimately, my sense of quotation is enlarged by what Gérard Genette refers to as *transtextuality*: “all that sets the text in relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts.”²³ This, then, includes similitude, translation, and paratextual elements like epigraphs and extracts.

What grounds this broad definition of quotation is the historical culture of quotation. For each chapter, I explore a specific cultural formation of the engagement with quotation. Specifically, I examine the culture of emulation and the memory practices of commonplacing in the early republic, the Anglo-American cosmopolitan fashion of quotation and the debates over literary property in the early nineteenth century, translation and transamerican exchange in the 1840s and 1850s, and antiquarian research, compiling, and anthologizing in the antebellum period. Because my study considers quotation in the context of the national, the nationality of quotations is important and cross-national quotation features prominently, but I am also sensitive to how quotation, even from within the nation, always disrupts the univocal sense of the national.

My dissertation follows the trajectory of the nationalist narrative, beginning with the birth of the republic up to the Civil War. The four chapters mark quotation’s participation in four national movements: national founding, national entrée, national expansion, and national fragmentation. The first chapter, “Deep Impression: Re-membering (Com)Patriots” interrogates

²² See François Recanati, “Open quotation”. *Mind* 110, no. 439 (2001): 637-687; Daniel Gutzmann and Erik Stei, “How Quotation Marks What People Do With Words,” *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, no. 10 (2011), 2650-2663. Gutzmann and Stei, like Dillon, look at scare quotes and other uses of quotation that fall outside of the conventional Quine/Tarski definition of the proper name theory or Davidson’s demonstrative theory. Taking Recanati’s pragmatic theory of quotation one step further, they aim for a unified definition of the use of quotation marks. They identify quotation marks as “minimal pragmatic indicators” that signal that the text within the quotation marks operates differently from normal usage, i.e., the text outside quotation marks. Thus whether the quotation marks present a name, report speech, or ironize the text as in “scare quotes,” in each case, quotation marks designate an other usage.

²³ Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the second degree*, trans. Channa Newman & Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 1.

the literary roots of American nationalism in its transatlantic context of Lockean philosophy. It explores the double nature of John Locke's (1632-1704) transatlantic influence, animating both a masculinized liberalism of national self-reliance and the feminized culture of emulation, manifested in memory and pedagogical practices of the time: from commonplace books, to memoirs, to didactic novels, and history. Investigating these literary forms, I track quotation's ambivalence within the gendered literary and national contests over who and what constitutes the American/literary sphere as quotations move from *topoi* of memory to spaces of re-membering. My closing case study investigates a familiar revolutionary quotation—the last words of Nathan Hale, where forces of national contest between America and Britain and a gendered literary contest between Hannah Adams (1755-1831) and Jedidiah Morse (1761-1826) re-member the patriot's dying quotation into the emblem of American patriotism.

The second chapter, "Make Way: Fashionable Entrée, American Space, and the Mutability of Naturalization" is an investigation into the nineteenth century analogy between literary cosmopolitan space and national natural space over which quotation crosses. Taking Washington Irving (1783-1859) as a connecting point between the widely circulating Regency silver-fork novel, represented by Benjamin D'Israeli (1804-1881) and Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton (1803-1873), and the nationalist literature of James Fenimore Cooper's frontier novel (1789-1851), I trace the project of national entrée as figured through negotiations of fashioned costume and natural character. These negotiations produce versions of naturalization that test the connection between land and literature and the disconnection between character and costume, arguing that national character is always a thing fashioned. My closing case study examines the plots, clothed characters, and epigraphs in Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* (1827) within the maneuvers

of the nationalist plot and how quotation tells a counter-narrative from the body of her text, where those plotted out are given the last word.

The third chapter, “Manifest Translating: Assimilating Power in the Hemisphere and Parallel Encounters,” focuses on William Cullen Bryant (1794-1878) and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (1807-1882), as authors marked “imitative” and forgotten by the nationalist canon but recuperated in the Hispanist scholarship. I examine Bryant’s translations of José María Heredia (1803-1889) and his theory of imitation within the context of the annexation of Texas and the Mexican-American War paralleled to Longfellow’s imitation and theory of universalism in the context of “The Little Longfellow War” and his appropriation by Cuban authors in translations, especially by Jose Agustín Quintero (1829-1885) in Cuban periodicals. These parallel studies reveal the anxieties and hopes of American influence, played out in the reaches and limits of quotability and translatability. I argue that cosmopolitan literary assimilation and nationalist assimilation come to resemble each other, complicating the possibility of translation and transamerican encounter, but that paralleling provides a palimpsestic exposure of multiple presences that allows for palpable encounter. The chapter contains two case studies on Bryant’s translation of Cuban poet Heredia and the Cuban Poet José Agustín Quintero’s translation of Longfellow where translations in parallel figure that encounter.

The fourth chapter, “Antiquarian Modernities: The Fragments of a Tradition” explores the antebellum period as a time when quotation was particularly prominent, with the proliferation of quotation dictionaries, scrapbooks, and anthologies. It was a culture that was interested in tracing down fragments. I read in this culture the doubts and tensions of a nation on the brink of rupture, coming to the realization that the center cannot hold. Looking at Emerson’s “Quotation and Originality,” and anticipating his *Parnassus*, I examine the break-down of the self-reliance

rhetoric in his Transcendentalist thought as the nation moved into maturity. I move on to examine quotation books of the time and the circulating controversies around quotation, specifically the work of John Bartlett and Sarah Josepha Hale. I argue that classification and indexing become the science of an age of uncertainty and national doubt. The chapter concludes with a case study of Herman Melville's *Moby Dick*, its Extracts and bibliographic cetology, in an exploration of how Melville recovers narrative in the absence of historical continuity and syllogism.

CHAPTER 1-DEEP IMPRESSIONS: RE-MEMBERING (COM)PATRIOTS

Framing Contests: Quotation in America, America in Quotation

“I am not fond of quoting authorities from authors; because the people of America are not fond of reading such quotations.”²⁴ So begins “Thoughts on Quotations from Authors. A Fragment,” published in the August 1779 issue of *The United States Magazine; a Repository of History, Politics, and Literature*. The causality expressed reveals an important opposition between authors and readers, authority and “the people of America.” The writer continues: “What is it to them whether Tacitus or Gil Blas has said a thing, provided that it be consonant to reason.”²⁵ A portrait is being made here of the American public, irresponsive to distant or artificial authority and guided by reason. This is, indeed, revolutionary America, the America of the Enlightenment, of Lockean liberalism²⁶. The writer of “Thoughts” proceeds to imagine himself quoting and entering into a dispute with another over the book the quotation comes from. The lookers-on are the important characters in this dispute over attribution. They have not read the book and cannot decide the matter. They can only “conclude that we were both men of more reading than themselves, but whether we had half their understanding, was a question to be determined at a future day.”²⁷ The American public essentially shrugs its shoulders at this dispute, and while the book knowledge of the “men of more reading” is left uncertain, the understanding of the public is the sure standard. And so, the fragment published concludes:

²⁴ "Thoughts on Quotations from Authors. A Fragment," *The United States Magazine; a Repository of History, Politics and Literature*, Aug. 1779, 352, <http://proquest.umi.com>.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ See Michael P. Zuckert, *Launching Liberalism: On Lockean Political Philosophy* (Lawrence: University of Kansas, 2002). Zuckert provides a useful discussion of the effect of Lockean liberalism on American eighteenth-century political culture, arguing for a chicken-and-egg effect of the “American amalgam” of Lockean political thought (i.e. Lockean natural rights theory combined with Whig constitutional theory) and the American Revolution, that each caused and shaped the other.

²⁷ Ibid, 353.

“...in affairs of common equity and reason, before a plain people, all arguments are better drawn from those grounds, upon which all without reading are able to advance.”²⁸ The grounds here endorsed are sown with the language of egalitarianism—common equity, common sense, and a plain people. Quotation, on the other hand, goes hand in hand with spurious authority and class division. The implication seems to be that the American ideal cannot advance on the grounds of quotation; quotation, it would seem, is un-American.

In the following issue of September 1779 appeared “Remarks on the Magazine of August.” The remarks take the form of a correspondent’s account of a visit he received from the town’s Whig ladies who briefly discuss several of the articles in the previous issue before going on at greatest length about “Thoughts on Quotations from Authors.” They read the fragment aloud in the course of the visit and “all asserted, this is new doctrine indeed.”²⁹ Of course, it was not exactly new doctrine. Across the Atlantic, Edward Young’s *Conjectures on Original Composition* had already advanced the critique of bookish authority’s supremacy over reason in 1759.³⁰ Young placed learning below the ranks of original genius, arguing against the imitation of the classics that marked eighteenth-century learning and rhetoric not just in Britain but in America as well. The Whig ladies of the “Remarks” speak the imitative America. One interjects, “What does the man mean[...] ‘The people of America are not fond of quotations.’

²⁸ Ibid. He has previously allowed for quotation in points of law “because it is to be determined by cases and authorities...and cases and authorities are those drawn from books” (353).

²⁹ “Remarks on the Magazine of August, 1779,” *The United States Magazine; a Repository of History, Politics and Literature*, Sep. 1779, 404, <http://proquest.umi.com>.

³⁰ Edward Young, *Conjectures on Original Composition*, ed. Edith J. Morley (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1918), 15: “As too great admirers of the fathers of the church have sometimes set up their authority against the true sense of the Scripture; so too great admirers of the classical fathers have sometimes set up their authority, or example, against reason.”

He that can assert this may assert anything.”³¹ Another affirms, “We were always taught that the Guardians, Tatlers, and Spectators in English, and Rollin’s Belles Lettres in French were standards in style and polite learning, and these do very much abound in quotations.”³² The correspondent himself highlights quotation’s place in the public as “one of the parts of every schoolboy’s theme, or rhetorician’s oration, &c.”³³ If quotations are un-American, so, too, is America.

This, however, is at best another incomplete conclusion. *The United States Magazine*, edited by Hugh Henry Brackenridge and prominently featuring the poetry of Philip Freneau, was, after all, a patriotic organ publishing in the middle of the revolution, and the Whig Ladies are no less nationalist in their defense of literary culture. There is much in the Whig ladies’ speech that resembles Brackenridge’s preface to the first issue of the magazine in January 1779. Responding to the break with literary authority advocated by the writer of “Thoughts,” they assert:

“We are a plain people, &c.” Said she, it is true, but we do not therefore desire to lay aside learning and books. They are at present dear, and no wonder, as we used to have them from the hapless barbarians of England; but we can make paper, we can get printers, and we hope to see as neat volumes done here, and Bibles too, as those of the University printers of Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh or Glasgow. We are a plain people, but we do not desire to degenerate into the darkness of Gothic barbarity. We hope yet to see colleges and academies flourish, and learning and every science rise to perfection here.³⁴

³¹ “Remarks,” 405.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ “Remarks,” 405.

American self-realization is here linked with the establishment of an American print culture—the business of “making paper” and “getting printers.” While it professes a material break from England (“we *used to* have them”) that occasions the call for an autonomous American print culture, this new culture does not look much different from the old culture as it is expressed in the language of simile (“*as* neat volumes, and Bibles too, *as* those of the [British] University printers”). In a similar key, Brackenridge presents his magazine as an “attempt...to paint the graces on the front of war, and to invite the muses to our country,” nationalizing literary culture.³⁵ He argues that “man without taste, and the acquirements of genius” is “An Ouran-Outan, with the human shape, and the soul of a beast.”³⁶ This “ouran-outan” is, according to Brackenridge, what the British predicted would be the result of American independence.³⁷ Brackenridge’s “Ouran-Outan” is the Whig ladies’ “Gothic barbarity.” Just as the Whig ladies envision an American press to compete with that of England, Brackenridge tells of British soldiers browsing American pamphlets being “forced to acknowledge, not without chagrin, that the rebels, as they are pleased to call us [...] had fought them no less successfully with the pen than with the sword.”³⁸ He and the Whig Ladies share the same vision for a national self sealed with the imprint of an American press.

With this nationalist spirit, the Whig ladies do agree with the writer of the “Thoughts” in one important instance: “‘We are a plain people, &c.’ Said she, it is true, but we do not therefore

³⁵ [Hugh Henry Brackenridge], “Preface,” *The United States Magazine; a Repository of History, Politics and Literature*, Jan. 1779, 3, <http://proquest.umi.com>.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ “It was the language of our enemies at the commencement of the debate between America and what is called the mother-country, that in righteous judgment for our wickedness, it would be well to leave us to that independency which we seemed to affect, and to suffer us to sink down to so many Ouran-Outans of the wood, lost to the light of science, which from the other side of the Atlantic, had just begun to break upon us” (3).

³⁸ Ibid., 4.

desire to lay aside learning and books.” What I think is important to notice here is that the quotation from “Thoughts” is a misquotation.³⁹ The writer never said “*we are* a plain people.” In fact, when the writer of “Thoughts” refers to the “people of America” it is always in the third person. The only time he uses “we” is in reference to himself and his disputant, the “men of more reading.” This “we” of the “Remarks” inserts the “men [and women] of more reading” into the plain people of America. This inserted presence, however, is compromised by the quotation marks. W.V. Quine defines quotation as “a *hieroglyph*; it designates its object not by describing it in terms of other objects, but by picturing it.”⁴⁰ The “we” in “Remarks,” however, within quotation marks, pictures an object that isn’t there. I would like to propose reading this “we” in relation to another “we” that fictively inserted itself next to “people”: the “We the People” of the Constitution. Trish Loughran calls this “We” a “rhetorical device meant to get around the embarrassing fact that the ‘people’ were and had to be absent in order for the business of nationality to proceed.”⁴¹ This “we” comes to figure what Loughran calls “the ‘fiction’ of federalism,” or the “virtual nation.”⁴² Eric Slauter refers to “the fantasies of unanimity,”

³⁹ Indeed, the quotations from “Thoughts on Quotations from Authors” within the “Remarks” are never exactly faithful. Note that what the Whig ladies quote “the people of America are not fond of quotations” is actually “the people of America are not fond of reading such quotations.”

⁴⁰ W.V. Quine, *Mathematical Logic*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981): 26. Donald Davidson critiques the “picture theory of quotation” as expressed by Quine, Hans Reichenbach (*Elements of Symbolic Logic*), and Alonzo Church (*Introduction to Mathematical Logic*) on the grounds that none explain *how* it is that a quotation can be said to picture rather than simply to refer to itself. His demonstrative theory of quotation, he argues, resolves this problem by making the quotation marks and not the entire expression the singular term which points to the expression and can be translated as “the expression with the shape here pictured.” Applying Davidson’s demonstrative theory to the “we” of the “Remarks on the Magazine of August” produces largely the same result, where the “we” exists solely in the picture and cannot be pointed to outside of the quotation marks. See Donald Davidson, “Quotation,” *Theory and Decision* 11, no. 1 (1979).

⁴¹ Trish Loughran, *The Republic in Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. Nation Building, 1770-1870*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 25.

⁴² Loughran, 24-26. In Loughran’s reading, this fiction of federalism is not only the fiction of imagined community, as Benedict Anderson proposed, but the fiction of a material federation in print culture. She argues that contrary to the consolidation of print culture contributing to national cohesion, it instead marked national crisis, the threat to union.

promulgated with the signing of the Constitution, that suppress the reality of dissent at the Constitutional Convention and the ambiguous form of the nation.⁴³ Similarly, Priscilla Wald notes that the “We the People” of the Constitution was defined by an “endless refashioning” of competing political, legal, and literary stories.⁴⁴ Michael Warner links ‘We the People’ to “a pen name, a composite voice made articulable only in [its] written pseudonymity.”⁴⁵ The “we” of the “Remarks” also tells a story about competing virtual (fictive) representations, but this is a story in quotation marks.

The story of the national in quotation marks is a familiar one, a familiar quotation, if you will. What the exchange on quotation in *The United States Magazine* helps to frame is a less familiar story that this chapter intends to explore—the story of quotation in the eighteenth-century context of the national. First, it articulates the contest between literary and national/political culture. The dispute between the writer of “Thoughts on Quotations from Authors” and the Whig ladies of “Remarks on the Magazine of August” is rooted in the fact that, as one scholar has noted, the political revolution was not matched by a revolution in literary culture.⁴⁶ American readers, as the Whig ladies attest, were still taught European standards of reading and rhetoric. The culture of emulation in American education continued to link the nation literarily with the culture it was trying to break from politically. Yet, emulation, as William Hunting Howell notes, entails both “rivalry” and “imitation.” He defines the logic of

⁴³ Eric Slauter, *The State as a Work of Art: The Cultural Origins of the Constitution*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 8.

⁴⁴ Priscilla Wald, *Constituting Americans*. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995), 1-2.

⁴⁵ Michael Warner, *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 113.

⁴⁶ See Dennis Barone, “Before the Revolution: Formal Rhetoric in the Federal Era,” *Pennsylvania History* 54, no. 4 (1987). Barone notes that ruling models and practices of formal rhetoric survived the American Revolution from commonplace books to the practice of imitation to the teaching of classical languages.

emulation on which eighteenth-century education stood: “to become oneself by becoming more like a commonly held model—perhaps even more like the model than the model itself.”⁴⁷

Emulation, therefore, presents an alternative approach to national self-realization from the Lockean liberalism voiced by the writer of the “Thoughts.”⁴⁸

Second, this chapter explores the gender contest in these models of literary and national formation. The discourse of Lockean liberalism spoken by the writer of the “Thoughts on Quotations from Authors” has been characterized as a masculine discourse, and that the American culture of emulation was put in the mouths of Whig ladies is telling. Howell describes the “possessive individualism” he relates to Lockean liberalism as “masculine and potentially libertine.” Emulation, on the other hand, particularly the Lockean emulation of compiling commonplace books and readers, was an important part of female pedagogy and the “poetics of femininity.”⁴⁹ James E. Bishop in his exploration of the “farmer of feelings” in Crèvecoeur’s *Letters of an American Farmer* translates the national crisis as a crisis of masculinity. This crisis is outlined by the “refined” or “feminine” European culture and values, on the one hand, and the “rude” or “masculine” American ones on the other.⁵⁰ The contest of the national and literary and the contest of gender are twin frames, the double commas, in this picture of quotation.

The picture of quotation is perhaps the fullest picture we can get of an American literary culture in the eighteenth century. The tall tales and tall hopes for the success of the American press in nation-building spoken by the Whig Ladies and Brackenridge are a fiction according to

⁴⁷ William Hunting Howell, “Spirits of Emulation: Readers, Samplers, and the Republican Girl, 1787-1810,” *American Literature* 81, no. 3 (2009), 499.

⁴⁸ This Lockean liberalism, Howell notes, is linked with exceptionalism. (499)

⁴⁹ Howell, “Reader,” 499. It is important to note, that Locke is on both sides of the question. His method of commonplacing was widely popular in the eighteenth century.

⁵⁰ James E. Bishop, “A Feeling Farmer: Masculinity, Nationalism, and Nature in Crèvecoeur’s *Letters*,” *Early American Literature* 43, no. 2 (2008): 365.

Trish Loughran's seminal study *The Republic In Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. Nation Building, 1770-1870*—as much a fiction, we might say, as the Whig ladies viewed the vision of America without the authority of the press. For he—or she—who in this period can assert anything about America and the press, can indeed assert anything. Loughran's study offers examples like Matthew Carey, who boasted the successful profits and wide circulation of his *American Museum* in 1790 only to end the never profitable operation a failure two years later, and Thomas Paine whose fabricated claims about the sales success of *Common Sense* created the “myth of the bestseller.”⁵¹ Her examples draw attention to the material fragmentation of print culture to which she attributes the success of the virtual nation, the imagined community. Indeed, for all his claims of America's success with the pen, Brackenridge's *Magazine* would fold at the end of the year due to the material realities of war, depreciation of money, and a divided audience. It is precisely in this context where the practices of quotation in the culture of emulation take on great import, for these practices reveal a culture engaged in the collecting and reassembling of fragments. The story of the traveling of texts lies not only in the sales figures and press advertisements Loughran examines, but the reprinting of fragments in magazines (our original example), the collecting and engaging of fragments in commonplace books, and the reassembling of fragments in the public memory.

Quotations were the material fragments that were circulating this fractured print culture, and where, I argue, we must look for the mechanism by which this material fragmentation produced the virtual nation. The Whig ladies give a glimpse into the mechanism of quotation: “One declared she always liked the quotations best, as being some very fine thought or sublime passage, the best of the whole; it kept up her attention and made the deepest impression on her

⁵¹ Loughran, 15-16, 32-58, respectively.

memory. She would commonly retain the quotation, though she forgot all before or after it.”⁵²

Another says, “And their quotations we will remember when the dissertations are lost.”⁵³

Traditional scholarship has focused on the role of the printing press in American nation building, and though recent scholarship like Loughran’s has begun to challenge this reading by articulating the material limits of print culture, quotation allows us to navigate two models of impression, one material and one abstract, and investigate where and how they come together.

The word “impression” was tied to eighteenth-century conceptions of memory, important to the practices of the culture of emulation, from handwriting to the keeping of commonplace books to the moral instruction of readers in the schoolroom. It was, of course, also a printer’s term. In this chapter, I will examine the practices and politics of memory and “impression” in the eighteenth-century commonplace book tradition to understand the work the technology of quotation was doing in the period. I move on to view quotations as integrated fragments within generic traditions associated with memory and female pedagogy—in the memoirs/autobiography and seduction novels, novels of moral instruction—and in the history of the American revolution. These constructions with quotation, I argue, crafted the way the eighteenth-century nation remembered and would be remembered.

This chapter closes with a case study of the story of Captain Nathan Hale. Nathan Hale is remembered to this day as a heroic American patriot, and his heroism depends solely on a quotation. After all, his ignominious execution as a spy might have disqualified him from national memory had it not been for his dying words “I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country.” That Hale may never have even uttered these words only makes his story a

⁵² “Remarks,” 404-5.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 405.

more fitting case study of the re-membering. The process by which Hale's story becomes a familiar quotation is through a series of contests, national, literary, and gendered. Working through these contests, the study of quotation reveals its ambivalence in the national project, for if, as I am arguing, an eighteenth-century culture versed in the assembling of quotations found in quotation a technology for the re-membering of fragments that spoke to the project of nation-building, the product made its impression on quotation itself.⁵⁴

Memory-Building: Commonplace Books and the Order of Fragments

In 1787, Milcah Martha Moore, a Quaker gentry wife in Philadelphia, published *Miscellanies, Moral and Instructive, in Prose and Verse; Collected from Various Authors for the Use of Schools and the Improvement of Young Persons of Both Sexes*. In her Preface, Moore affirmed the "great importance" of "the right education of youth," but noted the want of good textbooks for the use of schools, inspiring her, at the encouragement of friends, to publish her own⁵⁵. At the time, she had already started a school for girls in her Montgomery country house. Moore's *Miscellanies* were based on her own education, copying "some little piece of prose or poetry" selected by her mother and sister, a practice she continued on her own into adulthood. This practice of commonplacing was a staple of eighteenth-century literacy, and though Moore complains of "the want of proper books for the use of instruction," hers was part of the eighteenth-century rise in textbooks, both imports and American imprints, including Dilworth's

⁵⁴ Here I am lifting something of the logic of Michael Warner. Warner challenges teleological and ontological histories of print like Eisenstein's *The Printing Press an Agent of Change*, where the technology is seen as mediating but unmediated force. Warner argues that "the practices of technology...are always structured, and that their meaningful structure is the dimension of culture," Warner, *Letters of the Republic*, 9-10. Keeping in mind Warner's point about the cultural shaping of technology as the flip-side of the technological shaping of culture, I translate this from the technology of print to the technology of quotation.

⁵⁵ [Milcah Martha Moore]. *Miscellanies, Moral and Instructive, in Prose and Verse; Collected from Various Authors for the Use of Schools and the Improvement of Young Persons of Both Sexes*. (Reprint, London: J. Philips, 1787), iii.

A New Guide to the English Tongue, *The New England Spelling Book*, Mary Cooper's *The Child's New Play-Thing*, and Noah Webster's *The American Spelling Book*.⁵⁶ The publication of a private collection for public purpose, the rise of the importation and production of textbooks, and the claims made in such books about the importance of children's literacy point to the increasing public value of education at the time. Indeed, published with Moore's preface was a commendation by no less a public figure than Benjamin Franklin, who said of the *Miscellanies*: "A book, containing so many well chosen sentiments, and excellent instructions, put into the hands of our children, cannot but be highly useful to the rising generations."⁵⁷ This begs the question, how were quotations useful in the eighteenth-century? How exactly were they used?

Milcah Martha Moore's commonplacing was also celebrated in the poem, "Lines by a Friend, on reading Mrs. M Moore's printed and unprinted extracts for the use of schools," published in *The Columbia Magazine* in 1788 and believed to be written by Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson, a leading woman among the Philadelphia elite and a poet who featured prominently in Moore's manuscript commonplace book.⁵⁸ Moore's labor is described in a familiar simile (left):

I spy'd an active busy Bee
Fly nimbly from her cell;
She lit' on flower, on shrub, and tree

The Prince, with Wonder, sees the stately Tow'rs,
Which late were Huts, and Shepherds' homely
Bow'rs,

⁵⁶ See E. Jennifer Monaghan, *Learning to Read and Write in Colonial America*. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005). Monaghan's study of American colonial and republican education highlights the 1750s as a moment of transition in American pedagogy with the introduction of the spelling book, a more secular text based on a new Lockean perspective on children, not as bearers of original sin but as blank slates capable of impression. See also Cathy Davidson, *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America* (Cary, NC: Oxford University Press, 1988), 55-79. Davidson considers the reader in public and private education, the eighteenth-century concern for female education, and the emulative practices of eighteenth-century women.

⁵⁷ [Moore]. *Miscellanies*, iv.

⁵⁸ Catherine La Courreye Blecki and Karin A. Wulf, *Milcah Martha Moore's Book: A Commonplace Book from Revolutionary America*. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997): 75 n. 31, 320-321.

Where balmy odours dwell.

The modest snow-drop in the shade,
And lilly of the vales;
Carnation streak'd, near which each
maid,
Her fainter charms bewails.

The rich Magnolia towering high,
The wood-bine of the bower;
Industrious back the flutter drives,
And skims it through the air.

Thus has Melissa cull'd each sweet,
From the informing page,
And brought an intellectual treat,
For youth, and hoary age.

The bee from instinct and self-love,
Her balmy store collects;
Superior aims Melissa move,
A nobler view directs [...]⁵⁹

The Gates and Streets; and hears, from ev'ry part,
The Noise and busy Concourse of the Mart.
The toiling *Tyrians* on each other call,
To ply their Labour: Some extend the Wall;
Some build the citadel; the brawny throng
Or dig, or push unwieldy Stones along.
Some for their Dwellings choose a Spot of Ground,
Which, first design'd, with Ditches they surround.
Some Laws ordain; and some attend the Choice
Of holy Senates, and elect by Voice.
Here some design a Mole, while others there
Lay deep foundations for a Theatre,
From Marble Quarries mighty Columns hew,
For Ornaments of Scenes, and future view.
Such is their Toyl, and such their busy Pains,
As exercise the Bees in flow'ry Plains;
When Winter past, and Summer scarce begun,
Invites them forth to labour in the Sun;
Some lead their Youth abroad, while some condense
Their liquid Store, and some in Cells dispenge;
Some at the Gate stand ready to receive
The Golden burthen, and their Friends relieve;
All, with united Force, combine to drive
The lazy Drones from the laborious Hive.
With envy stung, they view each other's Deeds;
The fragrant Work with Diligence proceeds.⁶⁰

I have here juxtaposed the poem on Moore's labor with the famous bee simile from Virgil's

Aeneid, describing the Tyrian labor of nation-building.⁶¹ Trusting that Fergusson penned these

⁵⁹ Ibid., 320-321.

⁶⁰ *Virgil's Aeneid*. Trans. John Dryden. (New York: Penguin, 1997): 17-18.

⁶¹ It must be noted that the bee simile was used to describe commonplacing in the Classical era as well. Seneca used such a simile: "We also, I say, ought to copy the bees, and sift whatever we have gathered from a varied course of reading, for such things are better preserved if they are kept separate; then, by applying the supervising care with which our nature has endowed us...we could so blend those several flavors into one delicious compound that, even though it betrays its origin, yet it nevertheless is clearly a different thing from that whence it come." Quoted in Earle Havens, *Commonplace Books: A History of Manuscripts and Printed Books from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001): 14. Johnathan Swift, too, used the metaphor of the bee to represent good commonplacing (whereas the spider represented the bad). See Havens, 55. Francis Daniel Pastorius,

“Lines,” we can suppose that the one is indeed alluding to the other, as Fergusson was learned in the classics and was influenced by Virgil in her naturalist poetry.⁶² The diction of John Dryden’s translation is coded into the poem. Towering Magnolias and “the wood-bine of the bower” echo Dryden’s Tyrian “Tow’rs” that once were “Shepherds’ homely Bow’rs.” The poet here, like Dryden, avoids the use of the word “honey,” rendering his “Liquid Store” as “balmy store.”⁶³

It was Virgilian practice to connect similes—and therefore, what the similes picture—through the resemblance of diction, and so the resemblance of simile and diction here suggests a connection between the labor of commonplacing and the labor of nation-building.⁶⁴ Indeed, the same year that Moore published her *Miscellanies* for the use of schools, Benjamin Rush in “Thoughts on Female Education,” his commencement address for the Young Ladies’ Academy of Philadelphia, linked female education with nation-building:

A philosopher once said, ‘let me make all the ballads of a country and I care not who makes its laws.’ He might with more propriety have said, let the ladies of a country be educated properly, and they will not only make and administer its laws, but form its manners and character.⁶⁵

In “Spirits of Emulation: Readers, Samplers, and the Republican Girl,” William Huntting Howell takes the trail of influence these words establish between female education and national character

a German immigrant to America in the late 17th century famously titled his commonplace book *The Bee Hive* and referred to it as a Paper-hive. The poet of “Lines” may have been following in this tradition of the bee, but I believe the correlation with Virgil is still there.

⁶² See Martha C. Slotten, “Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson: a Poet in ‘The Athens of North America,’” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Bibliography* 108, no. 3 (1984), 259-288. and Sarah E. Fatherly, “‘The Sweet Recourse of Reason’: Elite Women’s Education in Colonial Philadelphia,” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Bibliography* 128, no. 3 (2004), 229-256.

⁶³ Taylor Corse, *Dryden’s Aeneid: The English Virgil*. (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1991): 46. Corse attributes Dryden’s replacement of Virgil’s honey (*mella*) with periphrastic couplets to a literary illustration of Locke’s distinction between primary and secondary qualities.

⁶⁴ John N. Grant, “Dido Melissa,” *Phoenix* 23, no. 4 (1969): 380-391. Grant provides a useful exegesis of Virgil’s practice of simile, focused particularly on the simile of the bees (and ants) in the *Aeneid* and the *Georgics*.

⁶⁵ Quoted in Howell, “Spirits of Emulation,” 497.

to argue for seeing the forms of female education like the compiled schoolbook as “works of political theory” that, he asserts, “may be the primary, if forgotten, grounds of republicanism itself.”⁶⁶ Ruth Miller Elson, in her foundational study of early American schoolbooks, avers that the authors of American textbooks were conscious of their work’s importance to the republic, seeing their work as “the creation of an American nationality, the formation of ‘National Character.’”⁶⁷

While the resemblance between Melissa’s balmy store and the Tyrian towers may indeed speak to the link between commonplacing and nation-building, there is an interesting contrast in the last of the quoted stanzas of “Lines,” where Fergusson has the bee acting instinctually out of “self-love.” For Virgil, the bee simile showed the communitarian nature of Carthaginian civilization—“united Force” in Dryden’s translation. Fergusson’s bee is a solitary worker acting for and by herself. Where Fergusson’s simile departs from resemblance to Virgil/Dryden is also where she announces her subject’s departure from the simile. Her Melissa has “Superior aims” and a “nobler view.” Proceeding to describe these aims, she continues: “To draw the young by pleasing lays, / To truth and honour’s cause; / To paint religion’s peaceful ways, / And piety’s pure laws.”⁶⁸ The aims are moral education within the culture of emulation, for she concludes with an exhortation, “Let not her aims be lost [...] But grateful read the nice mark’d lines, / Where taste and judgment’s shewn; / Where virtue all harmonious shines; / And make her choice your own.”⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Ibid, 499.

⁶⁷ Ruth Miller Elson, *Guardians of Tradition: American School Books of the Nineteenth Century*. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964): 2.

⁶⁸ *Milcah Martha Moore’s Book*, 321.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

The process of reading choice fragments and making them one's own was the emulative practice of pedagogy Howell describes. He argues that the spirit of republicanism embodied in female pedagogy constructs the individual "self" by deindividuation, "the pupil who becomes more like all of the other republicans becomes herself."⁷⁰ He reads the eighteenth-century textbook *The New Pleasing Instructor: or, Young Lady's Guide to Virtue and Happiness*, believed to have been compiled by actress, playwright and novelist Susana Rowson, in its relation to her novels and plays, arguing that the practice of reading in the culture of emulation was an exercise in sympathy. Like Fergusson's injunction in the closing line of the poem, students were instructed to inhabit the ideas and sentiments of the authors they read. Good emulative readers and writers were good sympathizers, whereas bad readers and writers in the emulative system were, as Howells demonstrates from the *Instructor*, "almost always the 'interested,' the selfish, the unsympathetic, and the evil."⁷¹ The commonplace book as textbook reader compiled those best quotations, "intellectual treat[s]," which were, as Howell remarks, those that were most reproducible, and the fit reader was the one who could sympathetically "remake (or paraphrase or inhabit)" them, and in the process become reproducible herself.⁷²

This reciprocal emulation where individuals are object and products of sympathy represents an alternative political vision to the kind of nation-building that we see in the *Aeneid* simile, which points to another important contrast in Fergusson's rendering. While Fergusson preserves the towers and bowers of Dryden's translation, the towers in the *Aeneid* replace the bowers. Fergusson instead has "towering Magnolias" coexisting with the "wood-bine of the

⁷⁰ Howell, "Readers," 498-9.

⁷¹ Ibid, 507.

⁷² Ibid., 503.

bower.” She suggests Virgilian nation-building but effaces the actual building, leaving the natural landscape untouched by the walls and stones of construction. In this Fergusson’s vision may relate to the alternative vision of nation building Howell locates in Rowson’s female pedagogy. The Tyrian towers may have been for Fergusson emblems of centralization, “the distant institutions of high Federalist patriarchy,” which Rowson’s sympathetic female emulation resists.⁷³ While the “united Force” of Carthage was ruled by its female queen Dido, within the *Aeneid* the description of the building of Carthage is also made to resemble its destruction after Dido’s fatal subjection to Aeneas who abandons her to pursue his own mission of patriarchal nation-building.

Thus, the same mnemonics that connect female commonplacing to female nation-building also connect it to the memory of the potentially destructive influence of patriarchy. Fergusson, therefore, has to picture Moore’s commonplacing as different, despite its resemblance to the Virgilian simile. She states the distinction as self-lessness, disinterest—a new politics of sympathy in place of the “individualistic striving for Enlightenment abstractions of ‘liberty,’ ‘justice,’ or ‘self-sufficiency.’”⁷⁴ Thus while the *Aeneid*’s description ends “with envy stung, they view each other’s deeds,” Fergusson’s concluding plea for sympathy might remember for us her friend and admirer Benjamin Rush’s description of the *Young Ladies’ Academy of Philadelphia* in “Thoughts Upon Female Education”: “Here emulation may be excited without jealousy,—ambition without envy,—and competition without strife.”⁷⁵

⁷³ Ibid., 508.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 508-9.

⁷⁵ Benjamin Rush, “Thoughts upon Female Education, According to the Present State of Society, Manners, and Government in the United States of America,” in *Classics in the Education of Girls and Women*, ed. Shirley Nelson Kersey (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1981), 178. Partially quoted in Howell, “Readers,” 499.

Fergusson is not alone in seeing commonplacing and nation-building as comparable projects in contest. Susan Stabile's study *Memory's Daughter: The Material Culture of Remembrance in Eighteenth-Century America* is built on this relationship.⁷⁶ She frames her study with the Second National Bank, built where Deborah Norris Logan's home used to be. Deborah Norris Logan lived two doors away from the state house in the years of the early republic and in the early nineteenth-century published letters between William Penn and her husband's grandfather, becoming the first woman to enter the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. While the men were involved in the project of demolishing domestic spaces to build national ones, Stabile contends, women were involved in the project of re-membering their domestic homes through material artifacts, from diaries, commonplace books, and shellwork to dressing tables, miniatures, and tombstones.

Remembering, as Stabile notes, has often been seen as an architectural project. She explains: "Because the mind was considered a clearinghouse for ideas, and because rhetorical topoi ('places in the mind' in Greek) were imagined as material objects housed in the mind, commonplaces were portrayed by ancients and moderns alike as *sedes*, 'dwelling places' or 'local habitations' [...]."⁷⁷ Consequently, composition was also viewed as architectural construction. In Erasmus's method of *loci communes in copia* ("plentiful accumulations"), the process of oration was one of "collect[ing] materials from the various places stored in the memory or in the notebook and then skillfully integrat[ing] them together into a coherent whole."⁷⁸ Commonplaces, then, were the building blocks of literary composition.

⁷⁶ Susan M. Stabile, *Memory's Daughters: The Material Culture of Remembrance in Eighteenth-Century America*. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004).

⁷⁷ Stabile, *Memory's Daughters*, 23.

⁷⁸ Lucia Dacome, "Noting the Mind: Commonplace Books and the Pursuit of the Self in Eighteenth-Century Britain," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64, no. 4 (2004): 610.

By the eighteenth century, these mnemonic architectural places were no longer simply the sites of learning, or mental improvement, but self-improvement. John Locke's 'A New Method of a Common-Place-Book' set what would be the standard for eighteenth-century commonplace books. Between 1770 and 1820 there were at least ten distinct editions of commonplace books following Locke's method circulating in Britain and America.⁷⁹ By Locke's logic, more generally, commonplace books as aids to memory were seventeenth and eighteenth century forms of self-help, as Lucia Dacome argues in "Noting the Mind: Commonplace Books and the Pursuit of the Self in Eighteenth Century Britain." Dacome situates Locke's 'New Method' in debates over self-identity.

In his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Locke founded self-identity in the memory. Critics of Locke, however, found the memory too shaky a foundation for the self. Indeed, we find reason not to trust the foundation from Locke himself, who evacuates the architectural notion of memory of any material ground. He writes:

This is *memory*, which is as it were the storehouse of our *ideas*. For the narrow mind of man, not being capable of having many *ideas* under view and consideration at once, it was necessary to have a repository, to lay up those *ideas*, which at another time it might have use of. But our *ideas* being nothing, but actual perceptions in the mind, which cease to be anything, when there is no perception of them, this laying up of our *ideas* in the repository of the memory, signifies no more but this, that the mind has a power, in many cases, to revive perceptions, which it has once had, with this additional perception annexed to them, that it has had them before. And in this sense it is, that our *ideas* are said to be in our memories, when indeed, they are actually nowhere, but only there is an ability in the mind, when it will, to revive them again [...]⁸⁰

⁷⁹ Havens, 58.

⁸⁰ John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Kenneth P. Winkler (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1996), 60.

Locke here references the typical vocabulary of the architecture of memory (“the storehouse” and “repository”) but translates them not as spaces but as “ability.” Ideas become “nothing, but actual perceptions” and the places of memory are actually “nowhere.” The fragility of memory was further dramatized by the burgeoning multitude of books. The practice of commonplacing, according to Dacome, “instantiated a special relationship between the accumulation of knowledge and the organization of space”—not the architectural spaces of memory, this time, but the literal space of the page.⁸¹ As the memory loses material, the self is less realized. In devising a blueprint for ordering the page, packing in the most content in the commonplace book while facilitating the speed of retrieval, Locke’s ‘New Method’ structurally supported the foundational problem of his *Essay*.⁸² The memory itself was unstable, but the commonplace book could order it. And in this way, so Dacome argues, method on the page was a means to improving the self.

Locke’s ‘New Method’ in emptying the spatial organization of memory onto the page brings us closer to another old metaphor for memory: wax. “[W]ax,” Stabile writes, “is the viscous stuff of memory.” Memory was depicted in the classical era as the impression on a wax tablet or seal.⁸³ Having translated the space of memory onto the page, Locke reciprocally translates the space of the page onto memory. He translates “perception” as an act of impression: “Perception is only when the mind receives the impression, transmitted by the conduits of the nerves until it reached the blank sheet.”⁸⁴ The blank sheet, in Locke’s rendering, can take on new materiality depending on the impression. Discussing the fading of memory, he

⁸¹ Dacome, 604.

⁸² Ibid., 606.

⁸³ Stabile, *Memory’s Daughters*, 95.

⁸⁴ Quoted in Stabile, *Memory’s Daughters*, 95.

states: “in some it retains the characters drawn on it like marble, in others, like freestone, and in others little better than sand.”⁸⁵ Whose memory retains deep impressions builds his/her house on rock, and whose memory retains only faint impressions builds it on sand. How does one make a lasting impression? Locke answers, “Constantly repeated ideas can scarce be lost.”⁸⁶ Reproducible ideas “fix themselves best in the memory.” Thus the material acts of commonplacing, copying, and reprinting were the mechanisms for building memory into a solid foundation for the realization of the self.⁸⁷

Memory’s architectural project moved from metaphor to metonymy, and in this view, Locke’s commonplacing project seems to contrast with the commonplacing project depicted in Fergusson’s “Lines by a Friend,” a contrast that reveals a gender contest in these models of memory building. While Locke’s method depicts a metonymic remembering and designs a method of impression by which paper memory can have the fixity of marble, Fergusson remembers a metaphor and erases the stone tower. In this respect, Fergusson’s poem resembles Stabile’s reading of female memory-building, deconstructing the national edifice and remembering an original local space, a domestic interior where writing practices forged sympathetic correspondences between women.⁸⁸

To understand the stakes of the deconstruction of the national edifice, it is important to consider how male memory building constructed the edifice. In *On the Sources of Patriarchal*

⁸⁵ Locke, *Essay*, 61.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Stabile shows that Locke was not the only one who advanced this notion of how imprinting gave memory greater substance. Marius D’Assigny connects legibility to the “deep impression” on the memory. In Descartes’s notion of “corporeal memory” paper as metaphor for memory takes on actual flesh, its grooves resembling the grooves of the brain. Stabile, *Memory’s Daughters*, 98.

⁸⁸ The term “original,” since Edward Young’s *Conjectures on Original Composition*, was associated with the natural/botanical while “imitation” was associated with the mechanical. See Samuel L. Macey, *The Dynamics of Progress: Time, Method, Measure*. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010), 56-57.

Rage, Kenneth Lockridge explores the outbursts of excerpted misogyny that William Byrd and Thomas Jefferson copy into their commonplace books.⁸⁹ Like Stabile, Lockridge connects Jefferson's commonplacing to an architectural project, the building of Monticello. He notes that Jefferson's outbursts of misogyny in quotations lamenting that men need women to reproduce all occur in the period of Jefferson's father's death and before his majority—when the Jefferson estate was under the rule of his mother and when, consequently, he came to increasingly resent powerful women. Jefferson's re-membering project of Monticello publicly expresses “the aristocrat as enlightened and democratic intellectual.”⁹⁰ It suppresses that it housed women, as Jefferson had only daughters. Lockridge concludes that “Confining women to the home was the subtle and perverse misogyny of the new, democratic age.”⁹¹

The problem, I would argue, with reading women's memory-building as necessarily counter-national is that, mindful of the contrasts between these gendered models of memory-building, it forgets the resemblance. The national and the local need not be read solely in contrast. In the case of *Milcah Martha Moore's Book*, they can't. Within the context of the revolutionary period, the local is fused with the national. “The female Patriots. Address'd to the Daughters of Liberty in America” (1768) by Hannah Griffitts, for example, fashions a local response as a form of national participation:

Since the Men from a Party, or fear of a Frown,
Are kept by a Sugar-Plumb, quietly down.
Supinely asleep, & depriv'd of their Sight
Are strip'd of their Freedom, & rob'd of their Right.
If the Sons (so degenerate) the Blessing despise,
Let the Daughters of Liberty, nobly arise,

⁸⁹ Kenneth Lockridge, *On the Sources of Patriarchal Rage*. (New York: New York University Press, 1992).

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 71.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 113.

And tho' we've no Voice, but a negative here.
The use of the Taxables, let us forbear [...]
Stand firmly resolved & bid Grenville to see
That rather than Freedom, we'll part with our Tea.⁹²

In the vacuum of male political power in response to Grenville's taxes, Griffiths constructs a female political agency in the space where the local and the national meet, the "use of Taxables," specifically tea. Similarly, in poem 81 "Wrote on the last Day of Feby. 1775. Beware the Ides of March" Griffiths infuses the local with the national, or vice versa: "Had Ceasar took this useful Hint / E're to the senate House he enter'd, / Longer he might have liv'd to think / Nor midst his cruel Murd'ers ventur'd. / Ladies this wiser Caution take, Trust not yr. Tea to Marcus Brutus."⁹³ Susanna Wright styled a "give me liberty or give me death" exclamation as "Tea I must have, or I shall dye."⁹⁴ Citing T.H. Breen's situating of the revolutionary period in a "consumer revolution" at once local and global, Loughran argues that domestic products became "a legible sign of self-identity."⁹⁵ Read within the conflation of domestic and (inter)national relations, female commonplacing in the Revolutionary period starts to resemble Locke's commonplacing in its metonymic local, domestic construction of a nationalist platform.

Not only do the national and the local meet but the masculine and the feminine potentially meet as well in the commonplacing. Lockridge notes that in the private commonplace memory-building of patriarchy "women are the antithesis of ordering male power in general, and represent disordered chaos." While Locke's method was appreciated precisely for its method, it was also appreciated for its miscellaneous arrangement. Isaac Watts praised

⁹² *Moore's Book*, 172.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 246.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 247.

⁹⁵ Loughran, 59.

Locke's method for "using no learned Method at all."⁹⁶ "On the face of it," Dacome writes, "things may have looked messy. Yet, the promise that lay behind the employment of the new method was that miscellaneous as they might have been, collections could be brought together under the same ordering pattern."⁹⁷ Then, does male memory-building look feminine or does feminine memory-building turn out to be masculine? Does the nation-building look like commonplacing or does commonplacing look like nation-building? Does the one ever erase the other?

Writing on Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson and Benjamin Franklin together, Stabile gives us another space to consider: the salon.⁹⁸ In her portrait of Franklin and Fergusson's participation in salon culture and correspondence, the salon is a space that unites men and women, public and domestic, letters (print and written) and conversation. Montesquieu called salons "a kind of republic whose members always actively aid one another. It is a new state within a state."⁹⁹ As a state whose center was a woman, perhaps the salon re-members the "united Force" of Carthage. Stabile writes, "Supplanting personal desires with civic disinterestedness, moreover, heterosocial salons promoted a shared sense of benevolence and politeness among men and women alike."¹⁰⁰ The population of the salons was not the busy bees acting from instinct and self-love but the Melissas working toward a "nobler view." Stabile concludes that salon conversation and the letters circulated between their habitués that Dena Goodman calls the "life

⁹⁶ Dacome, 614.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Susan Stabile, "Salons and Power in the Era of Revolution: From Literary Coteries to Epistolary Enlightenment," in *Benjamin Franklin and Women*, ed. Larry Tise (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998).

⁹⁹ Quoted in Stabile, "Salons," 139.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 141.

blood” of the salon were “sociable institutions where Enlightenment rhetoric on women and enlightened discourse by women succinctly converged.”¹⁰¹ The salon, then, may be the model for the (trans)national/domestic space that female commonplacing aimed to build.

Fit Impressions: Genre and the Impression of Memory and Morals

Thus far we have looked at quotation as a mechanism of eighteenth-century memory and moral instruction in commonplace books where quotations exist as collected fragments. How does quotation work or fit into a context, a genre? Genre is a kind of discipline. As a discipline, its mechanism compares to the practice of emulation. Anis Bawarshi has proposed understanding genre as a function like the Foucauldian author-function, its rules and conventions both regulative and constitutive. Genres dictate the way we reproduce and receive social actions. Bawarshi notes that genres “carry with them social motives—socially sanctioned ways of ‘appropriately’ recognizing and behaving within certain situations—that we as social actors internalize as intentions and then enact rhetorically as social practices.”¹⁰² The internalization and rhetorical enactment of social conventions was also part of the mechanism of commonplacing. The genre-function in Bawarshi’s discussion also connected the American republic to Europe even as it attempted to break away. Bawarshi notes that even within the “unique circumstances” of George Washington’s first State of the Union address, Washington shapes his address on the King’s Speech, as it was the generic tradition that socialized him and shaped his understanding of his rhetorical position.¹⁰³ But quotations, we have seen, are also spaces of contestation. Do they submit to the rules and conventions of genre?

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 147.

¹⁰² Anis Bawarshi, “The Genre Function,” *College English* 62, no. 3 (2000): 341.

¹⁰³ Bawarshi, 341-42.

In 1789 William Hill Brown and Olaudah Equiano published within two very standard genres, the novel and memoir, respectively, but both announce themselves as being atypical within their genres. William Hill Brown writes in his Preface to *The Power of Sympathy*:

Novels have ever met with ready reception into the Libraries of Ladies, but this species of writing hath not been received with universal approbation: Futility is not the only charge brought against it. [...]

In Novels which *expose* no particular Vice, and which *recommend* no particular Virtue, the fair Reader, though she may find amusement, must finish them without being impressed with any particular idea: So that if they are harmless, they are not beneficial.¹⁰⁴

If the run-of-the-mill novel has been harmlessly amusing but not “beneficial” Brown announces that his novel has avoided this charge. In his novel, “the dangerous Consequences of Seduction are exposed, and the Advantages of Female Education set forth and recommended” (PS 7).

To be sure, Brown’s prefatorial positioning of his novel as atypical was typical of the time. In the face of rampant censure of novel-reading, novelists had to distance their productions from the genre in one way or another. When they did not completely eschew the genre designation altogether, they had to, in the words of Cathy Davidson, “redefine the genre tautologically as all those things it was presumed not to be—moral, truthful, educational, and so forth.”¹⁰⁵ In redefining the genre, novel writers’ prefatory defenses generally convey two considerations: who their readership is and how to address that readership.¹⁰⁶ Dedicating his novel to “the Young Ladies of United Columbia,” Brown positions his novel as a moral educator. By doing this, Davidson notes, he “accepts the standards by which novels have been

¹⁰⁴ William Hill Brown, *The Power of Sympathy*. (New York: Penguin, 1996), 7. Hereafter cited parenthetically (PS).

¹⁰⁵ Cathy N. Davidson, *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in North America*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 40.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 51.

generally judged but deflects those standards from his particular fiction.”¹⁰⁷ Brown’s acceptance of the critical standards and charges against the novel signals that his audience is not primarily “the Ladies” with whom it finds “ready reception” but the men who need convincing that the novel is not “the cause of female depravity.”¹⁰⁸ Leonard Tennenhouse has argued, in fact, that the claim that seduction novels appealed primarily to women is “off the mark” and contends that the seduction novel was primarily concerned with “altering relations between men.”¹⁰⁹ Tennenhouse positions this concern with a different redefinition of the genre, a national redefinition as British sentimentalism takes on a particularly American character.

Equiano notes that his memoir is not the run-of-the-mill either. Describing the genre reader he writes:

People generally think those memoirs only worthy to be read or remembered which abound in great or striking events; those in short, which in a high degree excite either admiration or pity; all others are consigned to contempt or oblivion. It is, therefore, I confess, not a little hazardous, in a private and obscure individual, and a stranger, too, thus to solicit the indulgent attention of the public, especially when I own I offer here the history of neither a saint, a hero, nor a tyrant.¹¹⁰

Being “a private and obscure individual, and a strange, too” rather than saint, tyrant, or hero, Equiano does not fit the character type of the memoirist, he claims. Today Equiano’s generic dissonance is not that he is a stranger, but that he isn’t. Since Vincent Carretta’s biography *Equiano, the African: Biography of a Self-Made Man* brought forth the possibility that Equiano was not born in Africa and kidnapped into a slave trade but a slave born in South Carolina, the

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 50.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 46.

¹⁰⁹ Leonard Tennenhouse, *The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and the British Diaspora, 1750-1850* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 52.

¹¹⁰ Olaudah Equiano, *The Interesting Narrative and Other Writings*. (New York: Penguin, 1995), 31. Hereafter cited parenthetically (IN).

genre of the *Interesting Narrative* as credible memoir or history (with special consideration for the status it held as providing the only account of the Middle Passage by a survivor), has been thrown into question.¹¹¹ Cathy Davidson, responding to the debate over Equiano's authenticity or mendacity, proposes redefining the *Interesting Narrative*'s genre, placing Equiano along with William Hill Brown as first American novelists.¹¹² Nevertheless, she holds off on this generic reassignment, though, with a question of genre—how we read documents—understanding Equiano's narrative within the conventions of the eighteenth-century genre and why it is a more interesting document than the baptismal and naval record that place Equiano's birth in Carolina.

Both Carretta and Davidson, discussing Equiano's positioning within his genre, note the word "interesting." For Carretta, the term speaks to Equiano's double-consciousness as both African and British, a narrative interesting because if his audience could empathize, but interesting too as a "curiosity" in Equiano's difference from his readers. Indeed, Equiano, in redefining his genre, redefines the status of his life as fit for a memoir by repositioning himself. He continues, "I believe there are a few events in my life which have not happened to many; it is true the incidents of it are numerous, and did I consider myself an European, I might say my sufferings were great [...]." It is precisely Equiano's uniqueness as a "stranger" that makes the events of his life great, his sufferings able to excite pity, but all on the condition that Equiano *could* consider himself a European. His position between stranger and European and his ability to navigate in-betweenness gives his memoir purchase. For Davidson, *interesting* must be read within eighteenth-century generic terms that meant "borrowing from other sources where

¹¹¹ See Vincent Carretta, *Equiano, The African: Biography of a Self-Made Man* (New York: Penguin Books, 2006). Carretta first delivered the argument in "Olaudah Equiano or Gustavus Vassa? New Light on an Eighteenth-Century Question of Identity" *Slavery and Abolition* 20.3 (1999): 96-105.

¹¹² See Cathy N. Davidson, "Olaudah Equiano, Written by Himself," *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 40, no. 1/2, (Fall 2006-Spring 2007): 18-51. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40267683>

appropriate...shaping the narrative, exaggerating to make the effect more ‘interesting.’”¹¹³ This generic interesting is an intertextual interest, navigating the textual in-betweenness of quotation text and pre-text, of form and substance, and of narrative and event.

I am interested in how the question of audience within which Carretta reads interesting speaks to the question of intertextual construction within which Davidson reads interesting. Without positioning Equiano as an American novelist, we can place Equiano and Brown within a tradition of writers in contestation with their genres. When the genre is contested, it must be redefined by considerations of audience and how to address them. Audience is precisely the source of generic contest, gendered and national. I am arguing that Equiano and Brown, entering these genres under contestation, find in quotation a way to address their audience, to navigate their generic in-betweenness, so as to fit themselves within the genre, redefined by toeing the line. In clearing his novel from the charge of futility for exposing no vice or recommending no virtue, Brown says, “Of the Letters before us it is necessary to remark that this error on each side has been avoided.” “Error”—maybe still bearing some connotation of wandering—“on each side” being avoided suggests that this specimen is treading a fine line between vice and virtue. Indeed, Brown’s novel, while it claims to recommend virtue, was itself promoted by a connection to vice, scandal.¹¹⁴ Equiano himself treads the fine line between stranger and European to expose the vice of slavery and recommend the virtue of Christian faith.

The controversy today over Equiano’s own generic position further complicates the tight-rope act. If we take the evidence Carretta found of Equiano’s Carolina birth to be true, then we must take his memories of Africa as a fabrication by which Equiano meant to give his memoir

¹¹³ Davidson, “Olaudah Equiano,” 40.

¹¹⁴ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 85.

purchase. Equiano, thus, performs the stranger from Africa for his readers, granting his readers the indulgence of this foreign curiosity, experiencing Africa through the first-hand account of an African. His citations and footnotes, however, are doing the opposite, as we see Equiano getting his own account from non-Africans, from whites. Carretta explains the fact that Equiano's discussion of Africa contains "by far the most footnotes than any other chapter" as resulting from Equiano's awareness of reader skepticism in the authority of a child's memory. He describes Equiano in a precarious balancing act, trying to generically situate his text as a combination of "the intimacy of memoir writing with the authority of history writing."¹¹⁵ But if there is no authority in Equiano's own account and the reader must experience Africa from the accounts of other white historians, where is the purchase of the stranger's first-hand account? Equiano's generic in-betweenness tangles on his citations.

Carretta's claim that Equiano styled himself an African is true whether or not Equiano was born in Essaka, as he claims in *The Interesting Narrative*, or Carolina, a styling that does not have to do with lying but with quoting. Meir Sternberg notes that quotation, in bringing together two discourse events, the quoting and quoted, is an act of representation, "a mimesis of discourse."¹¹⁶ In his use of quotation, reported speech, Equiano enters into representations of both strangeness and Englishness. The examination of Equiano's quotations has frequently observed his styling of familiarity and alienation. When Carretta considers Equiano's quotations, he reads them as part of Equiano's representation of himself in identification with his audience. Through "citing, quoting, and appropriating the Bible as well as works by Homer, Sir John Dentham, John Milton, Alexander Pope, Thomas Day, William Cowper, and many other

¹¹⁵ Carretta, 305.

¹¹⁶ Meir Sternberg, "Proteus in Quotation Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse," *Poetics Today* 3, no. 2 (1982): 107.

literary and religious writers” Equiano familiarizes himself to his audience.¹¹⁷ Carretta also notes how Equiano uses quotation as a subtle form of resistance: “By quoting lines spoken in *Paradise Lost* by Beelzebub, one of Satan’s followers, Equiano appropriates a voice of alienation and resistance from within the very culture he is demonstrating that he has assimilated.”¹¹⁸ This alienation in the language of assimilation relates to the “familiarized exoticism” John Bugg finds in Equiano’s use of Othello to promote *The Interesting Narrative* in his book tour. The Othello allusions in Equiano’s memoir and quotations in the promotion of his memoir present the “stranger” in a familiar context. Bugg also notes the dynamic interplay of identification and resistance: “Establishing a Shakespearean framework for his alterity, Equiano courted the curious on his book tour, all the while foiling those who insisted that theories of racial inferiority justified the slave trade.”¹¹⁹

The resistance Equiano employs at the same time that he assimilates or familiarizes himself in quotation has to do with the technology of quotation. Sternberg argues that while quotation is a mimetic representation, this representation is complicated by its structural form, its contextualizing within a new text. “However accurate the wording of the quotation,” he writes, “and however pure the quoter’s motives, tearing a piece of discourse from its original habitat and recontextualizing it within a new network of relations cannot but interfere with its effect.”¹²⁰

This interference, Sternberg argues, constitutes a perspectival interference that creates within the

¹¹⁷ Carretta, 327.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ John Bugg, “The Other Interesting Narrative: Olaudah Equiano’s Public Book Tour,” *PMLA* 121 (2006): 1436.

¹²⁰ Sternberg, 108. Heinrich Plett also describes quotation in terms of interference, the discrepancy between quotation text and pre-text. See Heinrich Plett, “Intertextualities,” in *Intertextuality*, Ed. Heinrich Plett (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 11.

quotation a “perspectival montage,” rendering the quotation “essentially ambiguous.”¹²¹ In this way, the mimetic project of quotation is simultaneously mimesis and diegesis, sympathetic identification and unsympathetic distance. These elements: representational bond, structural framing, the interference of structural subordination, and the perspectival montage that renders ambiguity or multivalence, are what Sternberg calls the universals of quotation.

Quotation as a mimetic project recuperates that other sense of “interesting” in Carretta’s etymology: sympathetic identification. We remember that in the eighteenth-century emulative culture, the act of reproduction was an act of sympathizing. Reproduction and sympathy, in direct proportion, render the depth of impression. The “interested,” incapable of sympathy were bad emulators and bad models for emulation, incapable of impression. But Equiano does not present himself as interested, but interesting. He offers himself as a model for sympathetic identification, but what he models for his reader is sympathetic identification itself. In showing his own sympathetic identification, his own impressibility, he means to fit his reader for an other sympathetic identification, an other impressibility.¹²²

In this regard, Equiano uses his inhabiting of the stranger not merely or even primarily as curiosity but also for sympathetic identification. While Carretta and Bugg see in Equiano’s citations of the European the familiarizing of the alien that produces the alienating of the familiar, his citation of the stranger constitutes another familiarizing of the alien through the alienating of the familiar. In chapter 5, sandwiched between two moments of quoting Milton, Equiano cites instances in the life of the slave that culminate in a moment where Equiano quotes a slave. He tells the tale of a “poor Creole negro I knew well” who tells Equiano his story:

¹²¹ Sternberg, 109.

¹²² Bugg similarly observes that Equiano “is teaching his readers how to receive his voice,” (1429).

One day he said to me, very movingly, “Sometimes when a white man take away my fish I go to my master, and he get me my right; and when my master by strength, take away my fishes, what must me do? I can’t go to any body to be righted”; then, said the poor man, looking up above, “I must look up to God Mighty in the top for the right.” This artless tale moved me much, and I could not help feeling the just cause Moses had in redressing his brother against the Egyptian. I exhorted the man to look up still to the God on the top, since there was no redress below. Though I little thought then that I myself should more than once experience such imposition, and need the same exhortation hereafter, in my own transactions in the islands, and that even this poor man and I should some time after suffer together in the same manner, as shall be related hereafter.

In this instance of quoting the stranger, we get mimesis that is simultaneously diegesis. Equiano inhabits the slave’s speech, and the force of it is the disjuncture with his own. Though Equiano is also talking to a black slave, his alienating of what we might expect should be for Equiano familiar highlights his identification, not with the slave, but with his audience. Even in his response to the slave, parroting the slave’s own speech, he renders it more familiar English, “look up to God Mighty *in* the top” transformed into “look up still to the God *on* the top.”

Equiano’s alienation from the slave is meant to seem strange to the reader, bringing the reader into Equiano’s own double consciousness, that we recognize him as both slave and European. His mimetic sympathy with Europe interferes with his sympathy with slave—his sense of difference from the slave is so strong that he is wrongly feels himself invulnerable to the same misfortune. At the same time, his mimetic sympathy with the slave interferes with his sympathy with Europe. This is articulated through the Biblical allusion to Moses, the Egyptian Hebrew who defends the Hebrew struck by the Egyptian. At the same time, the reader’s mimetic sympathy with Equiano, reading him as “one of us sympathizing with one of them” is interfered with by the reader’s diegetical relationship to Equiano, “he is not one of us; he is sympathizing with one of his own.”

What this accomplishes is the alienation of sympathy with one's own and the familiarizing of sympathy with an other. The fact, however, that one's own is not one's own and the other is not the other is necessary interference quotation provides for the accomplishment of sympathy. Equiano does come to really inhabit the situation of the slave as he finds himself subject to the same persecutions. That Equiano, too, finds himself constantly in this same situation, without any kind of right, seems to be even more pitiable and tragic. But why? The reader first relates to Equiano as a witness to the slave, but it is when Equiano himself undergoes the same suffering that he brings the European, who has been able to *relate* to him so well, to now *identify* and to *literarily* feel the plight of the African slave. But the reader only accomplishes this sympathy with an other through Equiano's own sympathetic identification of an other, itself constituted by his inhabiting of stranger-identification.

Inhabiting Equiano's experience in his finely tread representative doubleness, the fit reader is impressed with his impressions. The discipline of Equiano's writing is simultaneously the disciplining of his readers' reading. He writes:

If any incident in this little work should appear uninteresting and trifling to most readers, I can only say, as my excuse for mentioning it, that almost every event of my life made an impression on my mind, and influenced my conduct. I early accustomed myself to look at the hand of God in the minutest occurrence and to learn from it a lesson of morality and religion; and in this light every circumstance I have related was to me of some importance. After all, what makes any event important, unless by its observation we become better and wiser, and learn "to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before God!" To those who are possessed of this spirit, there is scarcely any book or incident so trifling that does not afford some profit, while to others the experience of ages seems of no use. (*IN* 236)

Equiano excuses the breaking of genre convention, the potentially "uninteresting or trifling," through the mechanism of quotation. Quotation as, in Sternberg's term, "mimesis-in-context" renders the "unsympathetic" sympathetic through the contextual interference by which mimesis

happens simultaneously with diegesis in the perspectival montage. Equiano's talent for quotation, for mimetic reproduction of and sympathetic identification with others makes him so impressible, and he uses its mechanism to make his impression on the readers who have learned by his example to be impressible as well. Through the technology of quotation Equiano comes to embody the perspectival montage, impressing his reader with his own double-consciousness, redefining his genre through the rendering of a fit audience that has learned an other sympathy.

The rendering of impression on its readers is a challenge novels face as well, according to William Hill Brown. The fair reader finishes the novel, amused but "without being impressed with any particular idea" (*PS* 7). Brown embodies for us the fair reader of his Note in the figure of Miss Bourn, who does "not remember a single word, when I lay down the book." (*PS* 21). To this Mr. Holmes replies, "This confirms what I say of Novels...just calculated to kill time—to attract the attention of the reader for an hour, but leave not one idea on the mind"—leave no impression. Mr. Worthy, using an analogy between novels and humans, states "general satire against any particular class, or order of men, may be viewed in the same light as a satire against the species—it is the same with books—If there are corrupt or mortified members, it is hardly fair to destroy the whole body." In other words, we must draw a line.

Brown had already articulated treading a line in his note: novels that expose vice and recommend virtue may leave a favorable impression. This requires, however, treading the fine line between vice and virtue. Cathy Davidson challenges Brown's claim that his novel treads the line, avoiding "error" on either side. It seems he steps all over the place. The novel, after all was promoted as "drawn from a late unhappy suicide" of which it promised to give an account.¹²³ The reference is to Fanny Aphrop's suicide by poisoning after being seduced by her

¹²³ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 90.

brother-in-law, a prominent patriot Perez Morton. This recent scandal is what Brown's publisher Isaiah Thomas took up as the selling point in the novel, presenting it as "Founded in Truth" and including a frontispiece depiction, "The Story of Ophelia," with all the markers of the Apthrop suicide. Davidson notes that the "seemliness" of author's intention and the "[steamiiness]" of publisher's prefatory and promotional material reveal the ambivalence of the form.

She frames this ambivalence through a dispute between two pseudonymous reviewers Civil Spy and Antonia in the *Massachusetts Centinel* and the *Herald of Freedom*.¹²⁴ Civil Spy, a male reader, was disappointed that the novel did not deliver as advertised. The Apthrop/Morton scandal is fictionalized as the seduction of Ophelia by Martin. The reviewer also protested that the prominent scandal of the novel, the story of Harrington and Harriot, had no known corollary. Thus, contrary to its billing, Brown's novel was founded on no truth. Antonia rebukes the reviewer for "prefer[ing] the whole salacious story which is not in the text to the Moral Truth which is."¹²⁵ In the end, Davidson concludes that the two did not read the same text because their expectations had been conditioned in different ways. One was expecting "a story of ostensibly true scandal" and the other was prepared for a "didactic novel," or a novel that looks like a didactic essay.

Returning to Brown's Preface, we see his project is fraught with failure on every side. If the typical novel meets with "ready reception into the Libraries of the Ladies" but falls short of "universal approbation" so does Brown's. Antonia has received it. The Civil Spy does not approve. The novel speaks to women, but it does not speak to men. Or maybe it's telling the men something they don't want to hear. Civil Spy is right that the novel doesn't live up to its

¹²⁴ Ibid., 95-97.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 97.

billing. The frontispiece is the story of Ophelia, but the Apthorp/Morton scandal forms but a vignette in a series of stories on seduction we get at second hand. The main suicide in the novel is actually that of a man. The novel centers on the story of Harrington and Harriet, a story of the consequences at the remove of a generation. Henry Harrington at the beginning of the epistolary novel recounts to his friend Worthy his feelings for Harriot. Due to Harriot's status, having no parents from whom to request her hand, Harrington cannot marry her, for, as he says, "I am not so much of a republican as formally to wed any person of this class" (PS 11). Harrington, therefore, decides to seduce her but has a change of heart. His problem is that his father does not approve of marriage at his age, so against Worthy's advice, he pursues the relationship without consulting his father. Ultimately, by the time he is to wed Harriot, still without his father's knowledge, word gets out, and he learns that Harriot is the offspring of his father's seduction of Maria Fawcett; Harrington cannot marry Harriot because she is his sister. Harriot dies of the distress and Harrington commits suicide after her death. The image of the dead woman at the beginning of the novel has a sex change by the end.

Men are indeed at the heart of the matter in this novel. As Davidson notes, the bulk of Harrington's letters are to Worthy to whom he addresses 26 letters, not to Harriet to whom he addresses only two. Harrington's letters take up over five times the space of the novel than Harriet's. In the other stories of seduction told within the novel, men are frequently the victim. In the Ophelia/Morton story, Ophelia's father Shepherd is the most affected, and the story does not end with the death of Ophelia but continues with Shepherd's sorrow, unable to get justice on Martin. This is followed by the story of Fidelia, in chaste love with Henry. She is kidnapped by Williams, and at the loss of his love, Henry kills himself. Fidelia is rescued, but on hearing of Henry's suicide, she goes insane. It is her father, however, who is "doubly burdened" and

deplores the crime of seduction because: “They have taken away my staff in my old age” (PS 52). There are dead and insane women, but the story this novel seems to really want to tell are the men, suicidal, frustrated, castrated, and alone. Tennenhouse claims that in the seduction novel “Women in these American stories are the unvarnished medium for carrying on a relationship among men.”¹²⁶ I would like to propose that the fair reader is similarly a medium for Brown to carry on a conversation with men, but a medium in more ways than one. That Brown addresses men by talking to the fair reader suggests that men need to address women for their own good. Equiano had to walk the tight rope to enter his genre by addressing an other; Brown has to walk it to address his fellows.

If Brown is telling a story of seduction where men are the victims, who or what is seducing the men? There may be a clue in Harrington’s suicide note, found next to the *Sorrows of Werter*. Harrington says in one of his final letters to Worthy:

Our imagination dresses up a phantom to impose on our reason: As *Pygmalion* loved the work of his own hand—so do we fall in love with the offspring of our brain. But our work illudes our embrace—we find no substance in it—and then fall a weeping and complaining of disappointment. Miserable reasoners are we all.¹²⁷

Harrington here tells the story of seduction with “the offspring of our brain”—books. As Richard Bell observes, commenting on a historical suicide inspired by *Werter*, “Fiction...could be fatal.”¹²⁸ *Werter*’s influence that had already claimed lives in Europe had reached America in the 1780. As Bell recounts, a gentleman-soldier, rejected by his love, styled his suicide on *Werter* in 1785. This began a trend that would continue into the beginning of the nineteenth

¹²⁶ Tennenhouse, 48.

¹²⁷ Ibid, 95.

¹²⁸ Richard Bell, “In *Werter*’s Thrall: Suicide and the Power of Sentimental Reading in Early National America,” *Early American Literature* 46, no. 1 (2011), 93.

century. The influence of reading posed problems for a reading public instructed in reading through the culture of emulation, the sympathetic identification through the imitation and reproduction of texts. While the case was made for the education of women to shield them from the influence of seduction, teaching them to discriminate, there was a seduction that effected men and women alike: the education of reading.

This is indeed the vice that Brown's novel exposes. While sexual seduction happens in the novel at a remove, either of generation or second-hand account the reader is never let into the pleasures of seduction. The seducing pleasure in Brown's novel is the pleasure of the reader, the pleasure in identifying the literary allusions and quotations, the pleasure of reading.

Harrington's letters to Harriot are coded in literary allusions (to Orpheus and Eurydice and to *Don Quixote*). Worthy speaks to the Yorick of Sterne's *Sentimental Journey* in which the reader plainly sees Hamlet speaking to the skull of Yorick, an American "quoting" of Shakespeare, and in a similar allusion to Shakespeare, we are given the story of a young *Ophelia* who, after being scorned by lover and father, kills herself. Harrington is revealed to be Harriot's lover to Mrs. Holmes and from there to his father through the exchange of a poem.

There is another mode of intertextuality in the book, the other genre Davidson finds in Brown's novel: the didactic essay. This genre, blended in the novel, takes the form of a conversation on reading. This embedding of the didactic essay in the novel as quotations from the characters inserts a metacommentary on the reading of the novel, and this is exactly what the novel needs. The conversation takes place in the country retreat in Belleview where Worthy, the widowed Mrs. Holmes, her father-in law Mr. Holmes, and Mrs. And Miss Bourn engage in a discussion on books, that focuses particularly on instructing Miss Bourn in her reading. Mrs.

Holmes recounts the conversation in a letter to Worthy's fiancée and Harrington's sister Mayra, for her own instruction in reading.

Miss Bourn, the representative of the fair reader in Brown's preface, is an avid reader of novels but finds that they leave no impression. Mr. Holmes replies, "This confirms what I say of Novels...just calculated to kill time—to attract the attention of the reader for an hour, but leave not one idea on the mind"—leave no impression. Worthy defends the novel. He says, "To *dip* into *any book* burthens the mind with unnecessary lumber, and may rather be called a disadvantage, than a benefit—The record of memory is so scrawled and blotted with imperfect ideas, that not one legible character can be traced" (PS 21). We recognize here the Lockean discourse of memory. The novel, like any book, needs to be read well to make an impression, and reading well, for Worthy, requires "method and regularity." This idea of method and regularity in reading is expressed also by Mr. Holmes, who, if a bit bungling, is nevertheless a *worthy* conversant, repeating several times about a "a medium to be observed." This medium is the method for walking the line: moderation in reading, discerning the useful from the entertaining, knowing when to pick a book up and when to put it down. "By immoderate reading," Holmes says, "we hoard up opinions and become insensibly attached to them; this miserly conduct sinks us to affectation, and disgustful pedantry. Conversation only can remedy this dangerous evil, strengthen the judgment, and make reading really useful" (PS 26). In the problem of reading run mad, the pleasure of the book for the book itself, the antidote is conversation.

Female education in the novel is advocated for the purpose of conversation. Mrs. Holmes instructs Mayra on the importance of a woman's mind over a woman's looks, "When you are no longer surrounded with a flattering circle of young men, and the world shall cease to call you

beautiful, your company will be courted by men of sense, who know the value of your conversation”(PS 34). Worthy indeed proves this point: “I am very happy at present enjoying the sweets of Bellevue with our excellent friend Mrs. Holmes. To dwell in this delightful retreat, and to be blest with the conversation of this amiable woman, cannot be called solitude” (PS 19). If, as Tennenhouse argues, Worthy becomes representative of the new American man of feeling *worthy* of emulation, it must be noted that unlike Harrington who communicates mostly with him, Worthy communicates mostly with women, Mayra and Mrs. Holmes. When Harrington sends Worthy a fury of suicidal letters, when he finally does respond after six or eight letters, he advises Harrington to get out more, to have conversation: “mingle in the concerns of your acquaintances” (97). Cathy Davidson feels that Worthy’s neglect of Harrington’s situation and failure to help him makes Worthy less worthy of emulation. But maybe Worthy knew he couldn’t help Harrington, that he needed the conversation of a woman.

Harrington as a man who talks mostly to other men and to his books dies, and the masculine line of father Harrington, the seducer, ends. The Harrington name only becomes worthy through a woman, Mayra’s marriage to Worthy. The sexual seduction and reading seduction only find their cure through the conversation of men and women. Mrs. Holmes, recommending a book to Mayra speaks the language of emulation, advises her to read Noah Webster’s Grammatical Institute, “I cannot but think Mr. Webster intended his valuable book for the benefit of his countrywomen...to inspire the female mind with a thirst for emulation, and a desire to virtue” (57). Along with emulation, though, is method, direction, conversation. Mrs. Holmes writes: “It is very agreeable to read with one, who points out the beauties of the author as we proceed. Such an one is *Worthy*” (57). It is important to read, but to read with someone else, to have a conversation, one between men and women.

Though the picture of emulation the didactic essay offers shows women in need of reading direction from men, the novel of the seduction of reading to which men fall victim tells too that men need a woman's education in reading. Antonia, after all, knew how to read the novel. Civil Spy, Davidson tells us, in his response to Antonia had only "a pervasive sarcasm that speaks this critic's certainty of his privileged position in the discourse simply by virtue of his being a man."¹²⁹ Brown's failure, in the end, proves his point. Men, without the conversation of women, are seduced by their own isolated reading, and end, as with all seduction, in disappointment. The blend of the didactic essay in the novel puts the method of reading in quotation marks, in the mouths of others in conversation, so that the novel both exposes the vice of the seduction of men and the advantages of the female education of men.

Discipline and Publish: National Confederation, Ambivalence Bound

In the context of genres in contestation, quotation, we have seen, mediates the redefinition of audience, facilitating its address through the sympathetic identification or conversation with an other. This form of mediation works on the quotation's ambivalence, the perspectival montage, its ability to render the univocal equivocal. How does this character of quotation work within the context of the nation? Loughran notes a sympathetic identification between man and woman in *The Power of Sympathy* that speaks to national federation. Viewing the narrative shifts in the novel as emblematic of the inability of singular perspective to take it all in, she locates in a moment of sympathetic identification between Harrington and a slave woman in South Carolina a vision of national federation. Harrington hears a slave woman's story, recounting how she shields her child from the whip with her body and "rendered thanks to the best of beings that I was allowed to suffer for him," an allusion to the Acts of the Apostles where

¹²⁹ Davidson, *Revolution and the Word*, 97.

the apostles rejoice to suffer for the Christ, the “him” left ambiguous as to whether she refers to her child or to God. Harrington is moved by these words and praises the slave woman for her heroic sympathy. Loughran compares this moment of sympathy with Harriot’s sympathy with Ophelia, a sympathy in sameness that ends in pain. Harrington’s sympathy with the slave woman’s quotation leaves him with “feelings of exquisite delight” and the anticipation of a day without slavery. Sympathetic identification with difference, gender, racial, and regional speaks to the engine of federation, the promise of national union without slavery and without regionalism. The single perspective cannot imagine national union, but quotation provides the perspectival montage.

Harrington’s moment of identification, however, is a moment. Can quotation sustain the moment? The question is of rendering not just an momentary impression, but a deep impression, and this returns us back to the culture of emulation. Quotations, to sustain the impression, have to be imitated, reproduced. Franklin’s *Autobiography* opens on the prospect of rendering a deep impression. A good printer, he describes his life in printer’s terms: “I should have no objection to a repetition of the same life from its beginning, only asking the advantages authors have in a second edition to correct some faults in the first,” referring to mistakes in life throughout the *Autobiography* as *errata*.¹³⁰ Franklin draws special attention to the fact of his narrative’s imprinting. He states that the next best thing to repeating one’s life over is to recollect “and to make that recollection as durable as possible by putting it down in writing.” Continuing that the impulse to talk about one’s past is common to old men, the exception in his case is that he avoids it “being tiresome to others” as the reader can choose to read or not to read it as he/she wills.

¹³⁰ Benjamin Franklin, *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin* (1867, Mineola, NY: Dover Press, rpt. 1996), 1. Hereafter cited parenthetically (*ABF*).

From the outset he presents the account of his life for the purpose that posterity might find it “fit to be imitated.”

The examples of imitation are numerous, beginning with Franklin’s copying of the *Spectator*. He writes, “I thought the writing excellent and wished, if possible, to imitate it.” Franklin’s “imitation” is a complex method. First deriving “special hints” from the *Spectator* and putting it aside for some days, he would return, using the hints to rewrite the sentences without reference to the original.¹³¹ Returning to the original, he would check for faults. Finding himself wanting in variety of vocabulary and attributing this to lack of practice writing verse—“since the continual occasion for words of the same import, but of different length, to suit the measure, or of different sound for the rhyme, would have laid me under a constant necessity of searching for variety” (*ABF* 11)—he converts the sentences to verse and “when I had pretty much forgotten the prose” turned them back, afterwards again comparing with the original. Here again he checks his faults but also finds that “in certain particulars of small import, I had been lucky enough to improve the method or language” of the original (*ABF* 12). This methodical account comes at the beginning of a catalogue of Franklin’s reading, where we again see examples of Franklin putting his reading into practice, or method—reproductive reading—from taking on a vegetable diet to using the Socratic method for disputation.¹³²

Lest we should find Franklin entirely singular in this talent for imitation, Franklin later recounts a kind of book club in his youth, a precursor perhaps to the Junto, he and his three friends reading to each other and discussing the reading. They decide to bring in their own composition to be critiqued by the others. “As language and expression were what we had in

¹³¹ See Barone, . As Barone states, Franklin is neither the first nor the last to develop such a method.

¹³² See Dacome, pp. for a description of eighteenth century mania for method.

view, we excluded all consideration of invention by agreeing that the task should be a version of the eighteenth Psalm” (ABF 29). They replace invention with imitation. One friend, James Ralph, brings Franklin in a ruse whereby he would present Ralph’s composition as his own to test another friend Charles Osborne, given to criticizing Ralph. Osborne reveals his bias by praising Franklin’s composition, “But who would have imagin’d [...]that Franklin had been capable of such a performance, such painting, such force, such fire! He has even improv’d the original!” (ABF 29). Osborne’s work only comes to fame through his denial of authorship.

Franklin seems to learn something of this trick that continues to motivate a denial of authorship, of original invention. Franklin endorses preacher Hemphill even after it is revealed that his sermons were rip-offs taken from sermons printed in magazines. “I rather approv’d his giving us good sermons composed by others than bad ones of his own manufacture” (ABF 77). So little seems Franklin’s care for invention that he does not patent the stove he proposes in his pamphlet *Account of the new-invented Pennsylvania fireplaces* and does not dispute the ironmonger in London who rips off the idea from his pamphlet and patents it. This unconcern for title as original author or inventor is also revealed in the anonymous publication of his pamphlets:

In the introduction to these proposals, I stated their publication, not as an act of mine, but of some publick-spirited gentlemen, avoiding as much as I could, according to my usual rule, the presenting myself to the publick as the author of any scheme for their benefit. (ABF 92)

This trick Franklin plays on the public is learned from his friend Ralph. He not only draws attention away from himself, from any public backlash, positive or negative, toward him, but gives the public the illusion that the scheme, far from being singular, is plural, public—the idea that public benefit should be proposed and enacted by public authorship, a democratic principle.

This masking of the singular with the plural is perhaps the entire tenor of the autobiography and the value of imitation. Franklin is a very singular gentleman, but in his insistence on method and imitation, he convinces the reader that this singularity is reproducible, reproducible through the very act of methodical and regulated reading. His proverbs, his rules (note “my usual rule” above), quotations taken as motto, his logbook of Virtues all suggest to the reader the type of singularity, paradoxical as it sounds. Masking the singular author does indeed render the public adoption. Franklin mentions the case of George Whitefield whose enemies use his printed sermons against him. Franklin seems to contradict his earlier claim that print is means of durability when in reference to Whitefield he writes, “I am of the opinion if he had never written any thing he would have left behind him a much more numerous and important sect, and his reputation might in that case have been still growing even after his death” (*ABF* 85). Franklin explains that had his sermons not been printed, his errors, spoken, could have been explained away or denied and “his proselytes would be left at liberty to feign for him as great a variety of excellences as their enthusiastic admiration might wish him to have possessed.” Print renders a durable impression, but only in the commonplace of the people, not the signature of the author.

A related case of putting doctrine to print, nevertheless shows us what happens in the commonplace printing where the people come up against the durability of the impression.

Discussion the anti-war principle of the Quakers, Franklin writes:

These embarrassments that the Quakers suffer’d from having established and published it as one of their principles that no kind of war was lawful, and which, being once published, they could not afterwards, however they might change their minds, easily get rid of, reminds me of what I think a more prudent conduct in another set among us, that of the Dunkers. (*ABF* 91)

The durability of publishing, he states denies the ability to change one's mind, to amend or edit. The Dunkers labor under false accusations of their principles and practices. When Franklin advises one of its founders Michael Welfare to clear the confusion by publishing "the articles of their belief, and the rules of their discipline" Welfare replies that though they have thought about, they are reluctant for fear that

if we should once print our confession of faith, we should feel ourselves as if bound and confin'd by it, and perhaps be unwilling to receive further improvement, and our successors still more so, as conceiving what we their elders and founders have done, to be something sacred, never to departed from. (ABF 91)

The fear of print *binding* is a legitimate one, especially within Franklin's narrative where the print "fit for imitation" through imitation fits the reader, makes us fit. Imitation produces the lasting impression needed to fit the reader for confederation, but that lasting impression leaves the reader "bound and confin'd."

Susanna Rowson find the bound reader an answer to the problem of genre in the seduction novel. We remember that like Worthy, Brown couldn't bring seduced males to converse with women. He couldn't get *his* readers to talk as he wanted. The novel, it would seem, still couldn't make the didactic essay speak the right words for his audience. Could a different genre have helped? In her seduction novel *Charlotte Temple*, Rowson gives a different blend of genres. Like Equiano and Brown, Rowson treads a fine line in her genre. In a similar move to Brown, Rowson makes the case for her novel amid the "variety of works ushered into the world under that name"¹³³ and her case is virtue. She treads Brown's fine line between vice and virtue in writing on seduction, stating "that I have wrote not a line that conveys a wrong idea to the head or a corrupt wish to the heart," seeking the happiness, through proper education, of

¹³³ Susanne Rowson, *Charlotte Temple* (1794, New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 5. Hereafter cited parenthetically (CT).

“that sex whose morals and conduct have so powerful an influence on mankind in general.” Like Equiano, she walks the line between censure and praise, only in Rowson’s formulation “praise” becomes “applause”: “I shall rest satisfied in the purity of my own intentions, and if I merit not applause, I feel that I dread not censure” (CT 6). She returns to this applause in the final sentence of the preface:

I shall feel a much higher gratification in the reflecting on this trifling performance, than could possibly result from the applause which might attend the most elegant finished piece of literature whose tendency might deprave the heart or mislead the understanding. (CT 6)

Since when do novels however receive applause? Here, however, she refers to her work not as a novel but as “a trifling performance.”

Rowson, herself an actress, seems to be thinking not of a novel but of a play. Indeed, earlier in her preface she refers to the old lady who gave her “the circumstances on which I have founded this novel” (5): “though she concealed the real names of the *characters*, and likewise the place where the unfortunate *scenes* were *acted*” (5). This “tale of truth”’s original circumstances take the characterization of a play. And referring to her first hearing of the account, Rowson calls it a “recital.” A playwright herself, why not make this tale of truth into a play? Throughout her novel she employs features more common to the play than the novel, most notably, frequent apostrophes. She draws attention to this after a long apostrophe in the middle of her account when Charlotte’s parents plan a birthday celebration while Charlotte herself is contemplating a meeting with the rake Montraville: “Ye giddy flutterers in the fantastic round of dissipation, who eagerly seek pleasure in the lofty dome, rich treat, and midnight revel—tell me, ye thoughtless daughters of folly...” (CT 34). She continues with a personification of Virtues as virgin handmaids, and continuing to address her “dear friends” she finally is about to come to: “I confess I have rambled strangely from my story: but what of that?” (CT 35). Here she gives a

brief biographical detail and personal credo. The narrator has become a character in a dramatic aside.

Yet it is in these departures from the forms of her genre that we see why Rowson chose her genre. It was only in the novel that Rowson could script her reader. The reader intrudes into Rowson's novel as a censor. We find "sober matrons" who literally censor the novels before they give them to their daughters, whom Rowson as narrator must appeal to and convince that her novel makes the cut as virtuous reading. We find the men "who, in a work of this kind, love to cavil at every trifling omission" questioning Charlotte's personal finances (*CT* 106), to whom Rowson must give an accounting and beg permission to continue: "I hope, Sir, your prejudices are now removed in regard to the probability of my story? Oh they are. Well then, with your leave, I will proceed".

The dramatic feature of her novel is a dialogue with the audience, the reader, and as a novel, she can script the reader's part. Her read even comes at the end to rebel against her moral, citing Mrs. Crayton as an example that vice, "covered by art and hypocrisy" can succeed (99). Mrs. Crayton, after all, was Mademoiselle La Rue, the Parisienne teacher at Charlotte's school who encouraged and facilitated Montraville's seduction of Charlotte. At this point in the story, she has seduced Colonel Crayton, a man of wealth and rank, and become his wife. The reader who interjects at this moment is not only very specifically scripted in quotation marks, but is even visible: "Methinks I see a sarcastic smile sit on your competence." The reader is present in a way only possible in drama but scripted in such a way only possible in the novel. And while Rowson's narration seems always persecuted by these censoring readers trying to judge her text, it is Rowson who in rendering her readers in quotation marks on the page, controls the way her text is read, binding her readers to the script.

Binding is what Eliza Wharton seeks to resist in Hannah Webster Foster's epistolary seduction novel *The Coquette*. The story is based on Eliza Whitman of Connecticut, who William Hill Brown describes as "a great reader of novels and romances, [who] having imbibed her ideas of the *characters of men*, from those fallacious sources, became vain and coquettish" (PS 23). Eliza Whitman, after rejecting several offers of marriage, succumbs to a seducer who impregnates her. He schemes to buy her a husband for her to pass the child as his own, but the procured husband bails and Eliza flees. She eventually gives birth to a stillborn child and dies shortly after. While Brown casts Eliza Whitman's story as the seductive influence of reading, Foster puts her Eliza Wharton under a different press.

Eliza Wharton equates marriage with boundness and chains. In Eliza's first letter to her friend Miss Freeman she reports the death of her betrothed Mr. Haly. His fate "happily fixed" leaves Eliza a free woman, and though she hopes his death would "make a suitable and abiding impression upon my mind" by the next letter she asserts that "my heart was untouched; and when that is unaffected, other sentiments and passions make but a transient impression."¹³⁴ To Mrs. Richman, in whose residence she stays, she says: "A melancholy event has lately extricated me from those shackles, which parental authority had imposed upon my mind. Let me enjoy that freedom which I so highly prize" (C 113). To Mrs. Richman's response—the phantom that leads to disappointment of which Rowson also spoke to the daughters of folly—she thinks to herself, "But I despise those contracted ideas which confine virtue to a cell" (C 114). To Miss Freeman she subsequently writes in her description of the Richmans, "Should it ever by my fate to wear thy hymenial chain, may I be thus united!" (C 114). While she appreciates the Richman's marriage as a nice union forged by the hymenial chain, her coquettishness is her enjoyment of

¹³⁴ Hannah Webster Foster, *The Coquette*. (New York: Penguin, 1996), 105, 109. Hereafter cited parenthetically (C).

freedom. The complete opposite of the fixed Mr. Haly is the Protean, Morphean Major Sanford who charms Wharton's ear with his "rhetoric" (C 132). The rival suitor Boyer, Major Sanford himself, quoting Alexander Pope, describes as "Fix'd like a plant" (C 198).

If this seduction novel treats of breaking away from the hymenial chain, from fixity, there is a greater chain at work here: the chain of society and the confederated whole. Indeed, Eliza objects to Mr. Boyer's dependent situation as a clergyman to which her mother responds, "Are we not all links in the great chain of society, some more, some less important; but each upheld by others throughout the confederated whole?" (C 136). In Jefferson's *Autobiography*, we get a picture of that nation's struggle against and with binding, breaking free from one chain and trying to form a confederation. Before the break with Britain, he writes of the colonies "Our minds were circumscribed within narrow limits, by an habitual belief that it was our duty to be subordinate to the mother country in all matters of government, to direct all our labors in subservience to her interests"¹³⁵ With "falling from the parent stem," the nation struggles to come into a confederation, unity in the position of various colonies with respect to declaring independence from Britain, over issues of slavery and over representation in Congress.

There's an ambivalent question with binding, on the one hand the republican spirit of freedom that rebels against it and the national need for confederation that requires it. The nation emerges as an Eliza, freed from an early binding and experimenting new forms of federation. From here we can understand the seduction writers' aims to "fit" their readers. A fit reading public and regulated genre, work to make an impression, a type that binds sorely needed by a nation that has lost its original binding. Leonard Tennenhouse argues that American seduction novels negotiated question of patrilineage as "the rules for exchanging women...constituted

¹³⁵ Thomas Jefferson, *The Autobiography of Thomas Jefferson* (1821, Mineola, NY: Dover, 2005), 3. Hereafter cited parenthetically (ATJ).

kinship relations between men.”¹³⁶ The seduction novel in his reading becomes a diasporic form; in renegotiating the basis of civil society (i.e. family union) the seduction novel is the particular form for a diasporic nation longing for its reconstitution. He finds the seduction novel revising and reconstituting forms of Englishness.

Narratives of seduction,” he writes, “or in many cases, rape—are peculiarly good at rationalizing the inherent contradiction between a progressive political agenda and a conservative cultural one. If Anglo-Americans imagined their culture as a woman[...] then the perpetuity of that identity would depend on her remaining faithful to her origins. Seduction would threaten that bond, and rape would declare it had been forcibly broken [...] The American seduction novel...produced a break in the heroine’s lineage in order to consider how one could remain English despite that break.”¹³⁷

The types that bind, thus work for and against the nation’s break, its freedom, because as this chapter has intended to show, quotation is the binding agent. And quotation is singularly ambivalent.

We can see this ambivalence between the two men who claim Eliza Wharton’s heart. The Rev. J. Boyer, “fixed like a plant” resembles Haly, the original husband, fixity. He speaks the reconnection to the parent stem. He makes a proposal of sorts in a letter to Eliza, subsumed in quotation from the British poet James Thompson: “An elegant sufficiency, / Content, retirement, rural quiet, friendship, / Books, ease and alternate labor, useful life; / Progressive virtue, and approving heaven; / These are the matchless joys of virtuous love” (qtd in *C* 137). Eliza understands the ambivalence of the types that bind. She responds, “Your extract from a favorite poet is charmingly descriptive; but is it not difficult to ascertain what we can pronounce ‘an elegant sufficiency?’” (*C* 141). The rake Major Sanford, after all, whose aversion to shackles in matching Eliza Wharton’s might cast his libertinism as a version of republicanism, also quotes

¹³⁶ Tennenhouse, 45.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 64.

English poets; his “fix’d like a plant” is a quotation from Edward Young. Major Sanford’s ambivalence in quotation figures his general ambivalence: “I am a mere Proteus, and can assume any shape that will best answer my purpose.” Indeed, by the end, Major Sanford is the one who is “fix’d,” unfree and attached to a wife. Eliza, too, at this point, finds herself a fixed plant. Disabused of Major Sanford, she reflects, “I knew not my own heart...Little did I think that my regard for Mr. Boyer was so deeply rooted, as now I find it” (C 201). Eliza, however, is a fixed plant unfixed. Her tragedy is that of the branch fallen from the parent stem that fails to take root in her transplanted state.

Eliza’s question to Boyer is how to read the quotation, how to reconstitute the national connection. There is the libertine whose freedom looks like republicanism, whose rhetoric looks like English culture, but whose attachment to that nation is civil. There’s the Reverend whose studies of the present and visions of the future are coded in the language of English tradition, but whose civil connections are free and who admires a regulated republicanism. Quotations are libertine forms, Protean forms that can take whichever shape. How they are read and reproduced, fitted to make a lasting impression confines and binds the nation to that type, but quotations have also a singular capacity to be re-membered.

Re-membering Nathan Hale: Contesting Last Words

In his March 13th, 2002 speech to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences on its founder John Adams, biographer David McCullough recounts an experience of quotation-spotting. Reading a letter from John Adams to his wife, he is impressed by a line “We cannot insure [success in this war] but we can deserve it.”¹³⁸ Encountering the line again in one of George Washington’s letters, he concludes it must have been a quotation. Discovering in

¹³⁸ Quoted in David McCullough, “John Adams and the Good Life of the Mind,” *Records of the Academy (American Academy of Arts and Sciences)* No. 2002 (2002): 12.

Bartlett's that the source is Joseph Addison's *Cato*, "a play they all knew well." McCullough continues:

Educated in Greek and Latin, the leaders of the time took their cues on performance from classical history. The line from *Cato* was in perfect harmony. So were the last words said to have been delivered by Nathan Hale as he was about to be hanged as a spy: "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country." That too is from *Cato*. Imagine yourself in his place. You have a minute, perhaps, to think of what to say, and the line comes to you, as might a line from scripture.

My own feeling is that he was also throwing it right back at those English officers who were about to hang him, because he knew they knew the line too.

McCullough's act of imagining here is not unusual, particularly not around the story of Nathan Hale, where the material evidence is so slim that it would seem one can only imagine. By General Hull's account Hale's last letters to his family—material last words—are destroyed "that the rebels should not know they had a man in their army who could die with so much firmness."¹³⁹ His body, too, is lost to history. One scholar concludes that "Nathan Hale, having been denied the final, material testimony provided by a jailhouse letter or even a forensic toe tag, instead exists primarily in American history as a disembodied performance."¹⁴⁰ As a disembodied performance, Hale's dying scene is not simply something to be remembered but something to be re-membered.

Such is the power of re-membering that it is easy to forget the distinction between what is re-membered and what materially was. This is evident in the persistent tendency in scholarship to assume Hale actually said these words or something similar. George D. Seymour, who

¹³⁹ Hannah Adams, *A Summary History of New-England: From the First Settlement at Plymouth to the Acceptance of the Federal Constitution, Comprehending a General Sketch of the American War* (1799). (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2011), 359. These words are supposed to quote British officer John Montresor. Also printed in George Dudley Seymour, *Documentary Life of Nathan Hale*. (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2009), 328-330.

¹⁴⁰ Jason Shaffer, *Performing Patriotism: National Identity in the Colonial and Revolutionary American Theater*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 30.

published his *Documentary Life of Nathan Hale* in 1941, first recovered in 1913—when Addison had long fallen out of fashion though Hale’s last words had not—their original source in *Cato*.¹⁴¹ He opens his article: “Hale’s *Last Words* were quoted by Hale, as there can, in my mind, be no possible doubt, from Addison’s tragedy ‘Cato.’” Seymour proceeds to account for the discrepancy between Hale’s words and Addison’s and tries to place the text in Hale’s hands. McCullough, as well, though he mentions the purported nature of the last words (“said to have been delivered”) nevertheless accepts the report as he proceeds to imagine the scene. Jason Shaffer, too, discusses Hale’s “select[ion]” of his last words as an allusion to *Cato*. In fact, the *Cato* version of Hale’s last words is only one of the versions Hale’s words take, and a late one at that.

The earliest recording of Hale’s dying speech is in a diary entry by British officer Lieutenant Frederick Mackenzie the day of Hale’s execution. Mackenzie writes, “He behaved with great composure and resolution, saying he thought it the duty of every good Officer, to obey any orders given him by his Commander-in-Chief; and desired the Spectators to be at all time prepared to meet death in whatever shape it might appear.”¹⁴² The next account of Nathan Hale’s last words appears a year later in *The Essex Journal*. Here we are told that Hale “made a sensible and spirited speech; among other things, told them they were shedding the blood of the innocent, and that if he had ten thousand lives, he would lay them all down, if called to it, in defence of his injured, bleeding country.”¹⁴³ Lafayette also includes an account of Hale’s last words in his *Memoirs*, published by his family in 1837. In Lafayette’s account, an English

¹⁴¹ George Dudley Seymour, *Documentary Life of Nathan Hale*. (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2009), 376-382. The 1913 article is here published in a revised 1919 version.

¹⁴² Seymour, 292.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 303.

officer declares, “This is a fine death for a soldier” to which Hale replies, lifting his cap, “Sir, there is no death which would not be rendered noble in such a glorious cause.” He then replaces his cap and “the fatal cart moving on” he dies.¹⁴⁴ The first appearance of a report of Hale’s last words more closely resembling the Addison “quotation” is in the *The Independent Chronicle* on May 17, 1781, nearly five years after the execution: “I am so satisfied with the cause in which I have engaged, that my only regret is, that I have not more lives than one to offer in its service.”¹⁴⁵ Seymour suggests that the source for this article was General William Hull, who is the same source for all subsequent appearances of this version of the last words.

The inconsistencies of the report through the various times, sources, and media suggest that the historical words of Nathan Hale can never really be determined with “no possible doubt.” I therefore revise McCullough’s injunction to study the culture to understand the person, arguing instead that in this case study we must study the re-membered person/quotation to understand the culture. In *Sealed with Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America*, Sarah J. Purcell locates in memories of the Revolution another force for unifying a disparate nation. She discusses martyrs as national symbols fashioned by “those yet living” as a form of canonization and sanctification of the war and the nation it was birthing.¹⁴⁶ Purcell, however, makes a distinction between national memory and national history. She instead locates national memory in public commemorative acts that were “all about passion, prejudice, panegyrics, and party spirit.”¹⁴⁷ The early historians of the Revolution like David Ramsay

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 536. Seymour conjectures that Lafayette, being so close to Washington, must have received this account from Washington himself.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 326.

¹⁴⁶ Sarah J. Purcell, *Sealed with Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 21.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 5.

among others, she dismisses on account of claims of objectivity and impartiality which she takes at face value. In *The Politics of History: Writing the History of the American Revolution, 1783-1815*, Arthur Shaffer suggests that the early historians of the Revolution were not just leaving “records of what happened,” as Purcell describes, but were shaped by a national psychology in “attempt[s] to create a national history that would justify the Revolution and develop a sense of nationhood.”¹⁴⁸ He notes that “stridency of their bias” for which modern historians had frequently dismissed them. In this light, they look a lot more like the shared memories the commemorative acts Purcell discusses sought to base their patriotism on.

That the early histories of the American revolution were involved in the work of national memory is further evident in the resemblance they bear to the commonplace books and magazines of the culture of emulation and reprinting. These historians referred to themselves as compilers and borrowed, reprinted, and quoted (with or without quotation marks) from each other and other journals, most notably the Whig English *Annual Register*.¹⁴⁹ Excerpts were, in turn, reprinted and circulated in magazines. The histories, like the readers discussed earlier, were frequently dedicated to young people and adapted as textbooks for schools.¹⁵⁰ They reached a wide audience and in their repetition of fragments between each other, in abridgments and subsequent additions, and in the reprinting and circulating of excerpts, they helped to instantiate national memory.

This study looks at one particular early history, Hannah Adams’s *A Summary History of New-England*. This book, published in 1799, was the first American history written by a woman

¹⁴⁸ Arthur H. Shaffer, *The Politics of History: Writing the History of the American Revolution, 1783-1815*. (Chicago: Precedent Publishing, 1975), 2.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 180-182.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 28.

and the first book to print General William Hull's account of the story of Nathan Hale and gave the next closest version to what would become Hale's last words: " 'that he only lamented, that he had but one life to lose for his country.'"¹⁵¹ In her preface, Hannah Adams identifies herself as a compiler and identifies her sources, including numerous other histories, of which she writes:

In abridging the works of those excellent authors, she is sensible of her inability to do them justice, and has sometimes made use of their own words. The reader is always referred, for further information, to those ingenious performances; and the highest ambition of the compiler is, that her imperfect sketch may excite a more general attention to the large and valuable histories of the country.¹⁵²

Some of the demure language has to do with Adams's consciousness of her "female pen"; she immediately afterward explains her frequent quotations in her discussion of the American Revolution as her lack of familiarity, as a female, with military terms.

Indeed, Adams's history is presented and received as a gendered compilation. A review of her *Summary History* in *The Monthly Magazine and American Review* issue of September 1799 describes her history precisely as compilation, noting that "National occurrences, since that period, remain, for the most part, still dispersed in public offices, fugitive pamphlets, diurnal gazettes, and in private manuscript collections; and an historian of the United States in the fullest sense of the term, is still wanting."¹⁵³ This paints the picture Loughran gives of the fragmented nation and the fragmented/local archives. Adams's book is praised as the most "comprehensive," attesting to her effort to collect the dispersed histories into a single volume, but the review makes sure to note that the book is compilation (all history in the period is compilation) at second-hand—"merely a summary, compiled from the collections of more

¹⁵¹ Adams, 379.

¹⁵² Ibid., "To the Reader."

¹⁵³ "Review of *A Summary History of New England*," *The Monthly Magazine and American Review*, Sep. 1799, 445. <http://proquest.umi.com>.

laborious authors”—and highlights that “minute details and intricate inquiries were foreign to her plan.”¹⁵⁴ This effort of compilation is not exactly dismissed or diminished in the review. It waxes on the dignity and utility of the arduous task of historical compilation and concludes that “[t]hat modesty may surely be commended which deems itself unqualified for this task, and which contents itself, chiefly, with taking separate masses from the narratives of others, and placing them in a new order, without making considerable change in their substance.”¹⁵⁵ The review goes on to commend Adams’s work on the grounds that she is a woman. It contends that because so many forces condition women into “frivolous and improper channels...the same attainments are unspeakably more meritorious in women than in men.”¹⁵⁶ I want to highlight “same attainments” here. Adams’s historical practice is not too much different from other historians. William Gordon noted in the preface to his history his frequent quotations from the *Register* and other publications. He also incorporates David Ramsay’s history into his own.¹⁵⁷ He is not unique and neither is Hannah Adams, except for her “female pen.”

Adams highlights her compilation as gendered, and by effacing her “female pen” in deference to the more “ingenious performances” she makes her effort more visible to an audience that is clearly seeing through the gendered contests. Her skill of compilation (quotation) and her skill of incorporating her gender into a conventionally masculine discourse are related. Like Equiano, she interests her reader in where she breaks the rule—her gender—which she then brings to inhabit the words of other men. Yet this is the precise context in which

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid, 446.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Arthur Shaffer, 181. Gordon makes small amendments to Ramsay’s work, which Ramsay himself incorporates in the next edition.

her discussion of Nathan Hale, though flanked throughout in quotation marks with an ending footnote that “The compiler of the History of New-England is indebted to Major-General Hull, of Newton, for the interesting account of Captain Hale,” is hers. There is no other place to go to for “further reference,” no other “ingenious performance.” Furthermore, Adams makes her own intervention into the Hale account, adding a footnote to Hull’s claim that historians have celebrated British spy Major André, while Hale is forgotten:

Dr. Dwight, however, has the following beautiful lines on Capt. Hale, in his *Conquest of Canaan*, Book I. p 3, 4.

“Thus, while fond virtue wished in vain to save,
Hale, bright and generous, found a hapless grace;
And science charm’d him to her sweet abode.
In worth’s fair path his feet adventur’d far,
The pride of peace, the rising grace of war.
In duty firm, in danger calm as even,
To friends unchanging, and sincere to heaven.
How short his course, the prize how early won.
While weeping Friendship mourns her favorite gone.”¹⁵⁸

This is the only quotation Adams makes to a non-historical or archival source. In incorporating one of the type of commemorative ballads Purcell discusses as formative of public national memory, Adams carves a space for these commemorative and celebratory acts in the project of her history. This portion of her history, in turn, becomes part of the celebration and formation of a mythic national hero.

Adams’s account of Nathan Hale is reprinted frequently throughout the nineteenth century, and as the story is repeated it not only participates in Hale’s re-membering, but Adams, too, is re-membered in the process. In an 1812 reprinting of the account in the April 25th *Weekly Register*, the “Interesting Sketch,” as it is titled, is removed from Adams’s quotation marks and

¹⁵⁸ Adams, 360.

presented as her own text.¹⁵⁹ Her footnote citation of Dwight's poem is elevated from footnote to epigraph. The double quotation marks that signal the end of Hull's words in Adams's text become double exclamation points, turning her muted voice into a rally cry against the injustice that Andre is celebrated by monuments while "To the memory of Hale, not a stone has been erected, nor an inscription to preserve his ashes from insult!!"¹⁶⁰ It appeared again in 1812 in *The Port-Folio*, still attributed to Adams without her quotation marks, though it has shed the epigraph and one of the double exclamation points.¹⁶¹

This transformation of Adams's voice might be better understood in the context of a gender contest, her dispute with Jedidiah Morse over publications of histories. In 1804 Adams decided to abridge her *Summary History* for the use of schools, to try to render some more profit from her book which failed to meet expectations on the market. In the meantime, Jedidiah Morse and Elijah Parish were releasing *A Compendious History of Newengland, Designed for Schools and Private Families*. Jedidiah Morse was already a giant in the schoolbook field, his *Geography* having been successful in its original edition and in its abridgment for schools. The release of his *Compendious History* threatened whatever chances Adams had of living more comfortably off her labor. Both Morse and Adams attested to prior friendly relations, but upon the competition between the *Compendious History* and Adams's abridgment, Adams complained that Morse had deliberately set his history as a rival both to her *Summary History* and whatever possible abridgment and that remuneration was due her. Friends Stephen Higginson, William

¹⁵⁹ "Interesting Sketch," *Weekly Register*, 25 Apr. 1812, 129. <http://proquest.umi.com>.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 130.

¹⁶¹ "American Gallantry for the Port Folio," *The Port-Folio*, Nov. 1812, 481-4. <http://proquest.umi.com>.

Shaw, and Joseph Emerson of the *Monthly Anthology* championed her cause and a public dispute ensued that went on for years.¹⁶²

Morse's position in his *An Appeal To The Public: On The Controversy Respecting The Revolution In Harvard College, And The Events Which Have Followed It; Occasioned By The Use Which Has Been Made Of Certain Complaints and Accusations of Miss Hannah Adams Against the Author* is clearly evident in the title itself, as Morse states in his Preface, its "true title." He contends that a minor literary dispute has been manipulated by his liberal Unitarian rivals in ascendancy upon the election of Professor Ware to the Hollis Chair at Harvard. "Had there been no such revolution in the College," he states, "or no opposition to it—no publication at the time concerning it, on my part; the public would never have heard of any of these complaints and accusations of Miss Adams."¹⁶³ This Gary Schmidt grants to be true in his extended discussion of the dispute in *A Passionate Usefulness: The Life and Literary Labors of Hannah Adams*. Hannah Adams, however, had nothing to do with the underlining motives of her champions. Her complaint was simply that her former friend and patron Morse, after giving his consent to her abridgment of her *Summary History*, assuring her that it would mean no competition with his and Parish's *Compendious History*, turned on her. Morse, expert of the literary marketplace, was making it impossible for her "female pen" to succeed. Indeed, the review essay of Morse and Adams's published narratives and documents on the dispute in the

¹⁶² See Gary D. Schmidt, *A Passionate Usefulness: The Life and Literary Labors of Hannah Adams*. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004); Jedidiah Morse, *An Appeal To The Public: On The Controversy Respecting The Revolution In Harvard College, And The Events Which Have Followed It; Occasioned By The Use Which Has Been Made Of Certain Complaints and Accusations of Miss Hannah Adams Against the Author*. (Charlestown, 1814); Hannah Adams and Stephen Higginson, *A Narrative Concerning the Controversy Between the Rev. Jedidiah Morse, D.D., and the Author*. (Boston: John Eliot, 1814); as well as the review essay of both Morse's and Adams's aforementioned narratives on the dispute in *The Rhode Island Literary Repository*, Vol. I (Providence: Robinson and Howland, 1815); 569-588.

¹⁶³ Morse, iii.

Rhode-Island Literary Repository notes that Adams “was not so well acquainted with that part of her profession which relates to the disposal of a work, as she should have been.”¹⁶⁴ Schmidt affirms this when he describes Adams’s typical disappointment in her books’ sales.¹⁶⁵ Morse, on the other hand, emerges in both Adams’s and the *Rhode-Island Literary Repository*’s¹⁶⁶ review as an “avid book-maker.” Adams discusses his “superior dexterity in making his contracts with the printer, [for] he sold his book [387 pages] for \$1.25, while my work, containing only 126 pages more, cost \$2.25.”¹⁶⁷

Morse names a panel of judges to decide the dispute, and their ruling is that remuneration is owed to Adams. This is by no means an official legal proceeding as this is by no means an official legal dispute. Adams, as Schmidt affirms, had no real legal right to remuneration. It is not a matter of literary property. While *The Monthly Anthology and Boston Review* castigate Morse for using Adams’s *Summary History*, it is not a charge so much of plagiarism (as already noted, Adams borrowed more heavily from Morse’s *Geography*) but of false representation. Morse and Parish’s “Preface” claims that “the history of this favoured portion of the world, though abundant, have hitherto been scattered in many volumes, too expensive and too disjointed to be rendered useful to the rising generation.” This Adams and her champions—especially William Emerson who would take on the *Compendious History* in a review in his *Monthly Anthology*—read as a direct slight on her work, counting it among the scattered and “too expensive and too disjointed volumes.” It is never a matter of legality, of literary property, but a matter of manners and gentlemanliness. Thus the judges rule in favor of Adams’s “entitle[ment]

¹⁶⁴ *Rhode Island Literary Repository*, 571.

¹⁶⁵ Schmidt, 198.

¹⁶⁶ *Rhode-Island Literary Repository*, 572.

¹⁶⁷ Adams, *Narrative Concerning the Controversy*, 2.

to attention and respect from gentlemen,” adding that “[t]he peculiar circumstances of that lady were also to be regarded, and would seem to require particular tenderness and attention, in any procedure, which might tend to diminish the profits of her literary labors.”¹⁶⁸

From her first publication in 1799, Adams had been negotiating her gender with her literary enterprise. While in 1799 her womanhood precluded her from author status doubly stressing her status as compiler, by 1812, as the heat of the contest continued, her womanhood instead becomes the grounds for her entitlement to literary property, to become author. Not only do the reprintings of the Hale account take them out of quotation marks, attributing them to Adams rather than Hull, but as Schmidt points out, the parallel reviews of Adams’s abridgment and Morse and Parish’s *Compendious History* in 1814 refer to Adams as “author” of her book, while Morse and Parish are “compilers” of theirs.¹⁶⁹

Adams rise to authorship might have to do with a national contest as well. Her source General Hull had fallen into disgrace in the War of 1812 after surrendering Detroit without a fight. It was regarded an act of cowardice and he was court-marshalled, and ordered to be executed. Ironically, though his story of Hale’s last words saved Hale’s memory from shameful death in war, they did not save Hull from his own shameful death in war. When in 1836, one Andrew T. Judson delivered an address to the Hale Monument Association, he references a different story of General Hull’s relation to Nathan Hale, how he tried to prevent his going on Washington’s spy mission, insisting on the certainty of death in the event of capture. “Fear of death,” Judson says, “in the mind of Hull, overbalanced duty and honor.”¹⁷⁰ Hale’s response, “A

¹⁶⁸ *Rhode-Island Literary Repository*, 577.

¹⁶⁹ Schmidt, 192.

¹⁷⁰ Andrew T. Judson, *An Address Delivered at South Coventry, Connecticut, At the Request of the Hale Monument Association, November 25, 1836*, (Norwich: Aurora Press, 1837), 13.

soldier should never consult his fears, when duty calls” was an advice Judson laments Hull did not profit from. He concludes his discussion of Hull with a contrast:

A brave man and a coward stand at the two remotest points—at the farthest extremes from each other. Hale served his country fearlessly and died a brave soldier. Hull was convicted of cowardice, and sentenced to be shot. The memory of the one is *beloved*, and the other *hated*. The name of the one shall *adorn* our history, and the other forever remain a disgraceful blot.

The national backlash on Hull is indeed *extreme*: hatred. And if these were the feeling in 1836, we can imagine what they would have been in the period directly after the war. Hull’s very own memory is used against him and as the memory of Hale exceeds that of its original memorialist, Hull is left forgotten, a disgraceful blot. In the blotting of the man who originally gave the memory, the woman who transcribed it and compiled it becomes its author.

Though Adams had all the fervor of nation behind her, it would seem she was no match for the printing male.¹⁷¹ Her book failed, and though the dispute did temporary damage to Morse’s reputation, his book succeeded. What did this mean for the story of Nathan Hale? Adams made interesting amendments to the story in her abridgement. She removes Hull’s grandiose opening—“Perhaps the fate of America was never suspended on a more brittle thread”—and his concluding eulogy comparing the fate of Nathan Hale to that of Major Andre. There is no mention of the Dwight poem, and instead we get the bare-bones account of the expedition and execution. This edited version, to my knowledge, was never reprinted.

The extended account gets reprinted in 1823 in Dr. James Thacher’s *Military Journal, During the American Revolutionary War*. Thacher introduces the account: “It is the with the highest degree of satisfaction that I am enabled to copy the following interesting narrative, vouched by Major-General Hull, of Newton, from Hannah Adams’s history of New-England.”

¹⁷¹ For a description of their competition in amendments to their respective editions see Schmidt, 199-204.

The account is sometimes reprinted attributed to Thacher and sometimes acknowledging his own attribution. In any event, Adams's authorial voice seems to have had only a brief and tenuous life. One notable reprinting of Thacher's copy of Nathan Hale's account was Jedidiah Morse's own. In 1824, taking advantage of the national moment approaching the 50th anniversary of the Revolution and Lafayette's return visit to the States, Morse, ever the dexterous book maker, published *Annals of the American Revolution* in which he reprints the account of Nathan Hale in Adams's *Summary History*, citing Thacher as his source.¹⁷² In addition to the competition Morse's *Compendious History* and *Annals* would pose to Adams's own historical effort, Revolutionary veteran Stephen Hempstead challenged the singular part of Adams's history that was, even besides the complicated nature of attribution, hers. Also responding to the new interest in the Revolution in 1826, he published a new and original account of Nathan Hale's story in *The Port-Folio*, with the singular authority of having been his friend and confidant.¹⁷³ In 1827, he published in the *Missouri Republican* a more "complete" account, including Hale's last words. Hempstead had the same source for Hale's last words as Adams, and they now appeared in their popular form, from "lamented" as appeared in the third-person quotation in Adams's *Summary History* to "regret" in the first-person quotation: "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."¹⁷⁴

¹⁷² For a description of the renewed interest and remembering of the Revolution occasioned around LaFayette's visit, with the attendant commemorative acts and fanfare, see Sarah J. Purcell, *Sealed With Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America*, 171-209. Purcell notes another form of women's participation in the public decorations and displays, p. 185.

¹⁷³ Stephen Hempstead, "Anecdotes of the Revolution: The Capture and Execution of Nathan Hale, in 1776," *The Port-Folio*, Dec. 1826, 502-4.

¹⁷⁴ Quoted in Seymour, 311-314. This new account shows a Hempstead more versed in the re-membered narratives of Nathan Hale.

Though Hannah Adams had given up on her history of New-England, turning instead to the history of the Jews, the “female pen” took up the national cause in the figure of Nathan Hale through stories circulated in magazines and in campaigns to raise funds for the installation of a monument to Hale.¹⁷⁵ Mrs. Anne Stephen’s “His Country’s Victim,” which first appeared in 1834 in *The Portland Magazine*, fictionalizes the story of Nathan Hale, positing a co-heroine, his betrothed Sarah, who discovers on Hale’s corpse a memento, a lock of her own hair.¹⁷⁶ A version of this story is written pseudonymously under the name, appropriately enough, Memoria, entitled “The Martyrs: A Tale of the American Revolution.”¹⁷⁷ Here the figure of Sarah is replaced with one Mary who does not discover her own lock of hair on Hale’s corpse but instead, on hearing the news of his death, presses a lock of his own hair to her heart and dies in sympathetic connection. (Women’s circulation of stories about Nathan Hale’s betrothed led to the inclusion of a story of Nathan Hale’s engagement to Alicia Sheldon in Isaac William Stuart’s 1856 *Life of Nathan Hale*).¹⁷⁸ That these “female pens” might on some level have been responding to Adams’s account can be deduced from an 1829 ballad poem on Nathan Hale, “The Death of the Young Volunteer,” published in the September issue of the *Ladies’ Magazine* which is footnoted by an excerpt of the account from Hannah Adams’s *History*, so attributed. The

¹⁷⁵ David Ramsay wrote in a letter to Jedidiah Morse of intentions to print his history of the Jews, but “I do not wish to interfere with Miss Adams.” Considering his correspondent, one could read as a poking fun at the entire scandal. In any event, Ramsay could not have been much serious. In the following letter, he shares plans for publication of his *Universal History* with Morse. See *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 55, no. 4 (1965): 177-178. Arthur Shaffer discusses Ramsay’s wish not to interfere with Miss Adams but seems to take him at his word, citing this as evidence that Ramsay supported other historians. Ramsay had, indeed, supported Adams’s work. Having apologized to him for her extensive copying from his work, she writes that his reply approved of her work and enclosed ten dollars. See Arthur Shaffer, *Politics of History*, 42.

¹⁷⁶ [Anne Stephens], “His Country’s Victim,” *The Portland Magazine*, Dec. 1834, 65-74. This story is reprinted in *Atkinson’s Cabinet*, Nov. 1837, 531-536, attributed, and again in *Spirit of the Times*, 12 Mar. 1842, 15-21, this time under the title “An Incident of the American Revolution.”

¹⁷⁷ Memoria, “The Martyrs: A Tale of the American Revolution,” *Atkinson’s Cabinet*. Feb. 1837, 73-79.

¹⁷⁸ Though Seymour dismisses stories of Hale’s engagement as ‘much ado about nothing.’ Seymour, 568-70.

account and its attribution are, in turn, reprinted in *The Casket*, the following month. While Adams had lost the printing battle to Morse, she was still competing in the reprinting and circulation culture of the 19th century.¹⁷⁹

In 1837, after unsuccessful appeals to Congress to give money for a monument to Nathan Hale, the Hale Monument Association was formed to raise funds to the construction of a monument. Of the effort, T.H. Bartlett writes:

In all the exertions made to collect this amount of money, none equaled that of the ladies of Coventry and Hartford. A song was written by Miss J. Root, of Andover, Connecticut, addressed to the “Daughter of Freedom,” and was sung by the Coventry Glee-Club—the first verse ran thus:

“She came with choicest flowers
To deck a hero’s grave,
To shed the light of love around
The memory of the brave.”¹⁸⁰

The monument was completed in September 1846 with the inscription of Hale’s last words in their popular form. In 1848, the *Memoirs of General William Hull* were published as *Revolutionary Services and Civil Life of General William Hull* by his daughter Maria Campbell. The story Hull had been trying to tell since 1781 appears in his own account, still mediated by a woman. Records show that Nathan Hale, as part of his Commencement Exercises, disputed the question “Whether the Education of Daughters be not without any just reason, more neglected than that of Sons?” Classmate James Hillhouse reported on the date: “Hale was triumphant. He was the champion of the daughters, and most nobly advocated their cause.”¹⁸¹ Now may it be remembered that the daughters did as much for Hale.

¹⁷⁹ See Meredith L. McGill, *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834-1853* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003).

¹⁸⁰ T.H. Bartlett, “Memorials to Captain Nathan Hale,” *The American Architect and Building News* 14 Apr. 1888, 173.

¹⁸¹ See Seymour, 154 and Mary S. Northrop, “A Young Hero,” *St. Nicholas; An Illustrated Magazine for Young Folks*, Jul. 1894, p. 797.

CHAPTER 2- MAKE WAY: FASHIONABLE ENTRÉE, AMERICAN SPACE, AND THE MUTABILITY OF NATURALIZATION

From Rags to Riches, Riches to Rags: Irving's Literary Ecology

Quotations are, in the words of the Whig ladies of the “Remarks” discussed in the previous chapter, what “we will remember when their dissertations are lost,” those words that make a deep impression. The use and circulation that serve to fix the impression on the cultural memory, however, are the same forces by which many a dissertation is lost. “What,” asks Geoffrey Crayon in Washington Irving’s *Sketch-Book* (1819) “is quoted of Joseph of Exeter, styled the miracle of his age in classical composition?”¹⁸² Crayon here in “The Mutability of Literature” addresses the talking book who laments its fate on the dusty shelves of the library in Westminster Abbey, contending “I was intended to circulate from hand to hand” (102). Trying to convince the book that its fate is preferable to the fate it would have met in circulation, Crayon conciliates “By being stored away in this ancient library, you are like the treasured remains of those saints and monarchs which lie enshrined in the adjoining chapels; while the remains of their contemporary mortals, left to the ordinary course of nature, have long since returned to dust” (102). The simile connects literary circulation to the “ordinary course of nature,” or the cycle of life, and bibliographic preservation to hagiographic reliquary.

For Crayon, however, the worse fate, the ordinary course, is not without its own divine merit. He ultimately endorses the mutability of circulation as “a wise precaution of Providence” in another simile:

To reason from analogy; we daily behold the varied and beautiful tribes of vegetables springing up, flourishing, adorning the fields for a short time, and then fading into dust, to

¹⁸² Washington Irving, *The Sketch-Book of Geoffrey Crayon*. Ed. Haskell Springer (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1978), 103. Hereafter cited parenthetically.

make way for their successors. Were not this the case, the fecundity of nature would be a grievance instead of a blessing. The earth would groan with rank and excessive vegetation, and its surface becomes a tangled wilderness. In like manner the works of genius and learning decline, and make way for subsequent productions...otherwise the creative powers of genius would overstock the world, and the mind would be completely bewildered in the endless mazes of literature. (105)

Likening literature to vegetables, Crayon naturalizes an increasingly mechanized literary sphere, modernized by “the inventions of paper and press [that] have put an end to all these restraints”—the material restraints of scribal production—so that the prospects of books overstocking the world is palpable and, for Crayon, frightening (105). In the natural literary ecology Crayon presents, however, the technological innovations that have facilitated print dissemination are regulated by the natural check of circulation: as texts fall out of circulation, they “make way” for the circulation of new texts.

This ecological analogy grafts questions of literary space onto natural space, an analogy woven throughout *The Sketch-Book* and where the natural takes on (trans)national dimensions. Crayon in “The Author’s Account of Himself” describes his early penchant for traveling, his “rambling propensity” (8). He likes “observing strange characters and manners” and traveling to “foreign parts and unknown regions” but all in his “native city.” Traveling through his native country, he finds it superior in “the charms of Nature” (8).

Her mighty lakes, like oceans of liquid silver; her mountains with their bright aerial tints; her valleys, teeming with wild fertility; her tremendous cataracts, thundering in their solitudes; her boundless plains, waving with spontaneous verdure; her broad deep rivers, rolling in solemn silence to the ocean; her trackless forests, where vegetation puts forth all its magnificence; her skies, kindling with the magic of summer clouds and glorious sunshine;—no, need never an American look beyond his own country for the sublime and beautiful of natural scenery. (8-9)

America is extolled for its natural space. The adjectives—“mighty,” “tremendous,” “boundless,” “broad,” “deep”—all suggest a magnitude of space, sublime dimensions. This effusion on the

American natural landscape is one that Irving is not frequently prone to according to Paul Giles, who connects it with Homi K. Bhaba's notion of the "inscape of national identity" and American exceptionalism.¹⁸³ Indeed, Irving's encomium ends with an exceptionalist posture, the isolated American nationalist without the need to "look beyond." This, as Giles states, is not Crayon. His "roving passion" is attracted to Europe for its own charm, "the charms of storied and poetical association" (9). Crayon writes, "My native country was full of youthful promise: Europe was rich in the accumulated treasures of age" (9). Crayon's travels are thus positioned within a comparative relation where America is equated with the burgeoning natural and Europe is equated with "the accumulated treasures of age," with cultural and historic preservation.

Irving's own rambling propensity, his extensive travel, makes him particularly relevant for comparativists and transnationalists who position him in contrast to the literary nationalism that would overtake the rest of the nineteenth century. Giles locates in Irving a "doubleness of texture," or an "ontological double vision," rooted in his extended deracination—he lived in Europe from 1815-1832 and returned to the continent again in 1842 to serve four years as minister to Spain—and informed by traditions of burlesque and romantic irony. Irving's double vision challenges the local affiliation of the cultural nationalism Giles associates with Melville, Emerson, and Whitman, favoring instead the "chameleonic capacity" of Oliver Goldsmith's poem "The Traveller," where local attachment is harmoniously linked with the "citizen of the world."¹⁸⁴ The focus of Giles's study is on generic traditions, but the ultimate picture of Irving is of one "content to play with inherited forms...scrutiniz[ing] romantic assumptions about

¹⁸³ Paul Giles, *Transatlantic Insurrections: British Culture and the Formation of American Literature, 1730-1860*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 142.

¹⁸⁴ Giles, 150.

nature, authenticity, and originality.”¹⁸⁵ Paul Westover similarly reads Irving as inheriting forms. He situates Irving within “[a]n Anglo-American canon of authors and associated tourist sites [which] took root through a process of ‘quotation’—allusion, citation, and imitation—by which American authors, and tourists, proclaimed themselves heirs to the English tradition.”¹⁸⁶ In Westover’s positioning, Irving becomes not “heretical alternative” but a participant in a larger culture of Americans grappling with their relationship to England.¹⁸⁷ Tracing the way the literary inheritance was viewed by nineteenth-century writers in terms that appropriate for it the status of biological inheritance, Westover contends that the citational practices of Anglo-American authors make the same claim to British cultural birthright. Irving, Westover argues, enters the cannon by “quoting his way to legitimacy, as if to prove that books can be absorbed in the blood like an acquired DNA.”¹⁸⁸

The paradoxical vision that separates Irving in Giles’s argument from his nationalist contemporaries links him in the notion of “citational originality” that Westover locates as the source of Irving’s popularity: “quoting or imitating with genius.”¹⁸⁹ Irving’s appropriation of the English canon signals its naturalization in a new hemisphere where he becomes the American Walter Scott. Westover concludes his discussion with Christian Schussele’s painting

¹⁸⁵ Giles, 163.

¹⁸⁶ Paul Westover, “How America ‘Inherited’ Literary Tourism” in *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth-Century*, Ed. Nicola J. Watson (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 184.

¹⁸⁷ I borrow the term “heretical alternative” from Giles in *Transatlantic Insurrection* where he distinguishes his view of British and American self-determination through opposition suggesting instead that after the American Revolution “cultural narratives tended to develop not so much in opposition but rather as heretical alternatives to each” (2). Though Giles employs the term to define the relation of American nationalism to British nationalism, it can be applied, I think, to Giles’s own construction of the cultural narrative of Irving’s refracted transnationalism to the cultural narrative of contemporaneous literary nationalists.

¹⁸⁸ Westover, 189.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 190.

Washington Irving and His Literary Friends at Sunnyside which depicts Irving with literary cosmopolitans like Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Nathaniel Parker Willis, and William Cullen Bryant, and literary nationalists like Ralph Waldo Emerson, James Fennimore Cooper, and George Bancroft, among others. Westover identifies the painting as a “quotation piece” referencing Thomas Faed’s *Sir Walter Scott and His Literary Friends at Abbotsford*.¹⁹⁰ In this quotational story, an American literary tradition stands in the place of a European literary cannon, in much the same way that George Washington stands in for George III in “Rip Van Winkle.”¹⁹¹ Westover, however, like Giles, seeks to read in this quotational story an identity not founded on nationality. He argues that Irving “had shown that the literary tradition inhabited a transatlantic common land, not a national hunting preserve: it was an ‘English’ tradition in the sense that moderns speak of English departments, defined by language (and a shared tradition of recycling), not nationality.”¹⁹² In equating Irving’s literary tradition with a “transatlantic common land” that is not “a national hunting preserve” Westover, like Giles, puts Irving outside of the tradition of Cooper and the literary nationalists Schussele counted among his literary friends.

This chapter takes Irving’s citational genius as a connecting point between the culture of European inheritance and the culture of American nationalism. It is informed by the historical paradox that the “transatlantic common land” of letters in America was supported by a culture of reprinting that articulated national limits over and above the common English language.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 192.

¹⁹¹ Westover makes a similar comparison noting a moment of life imitating art when like George Washington replacing George III on the tavern sign, his namesake Washington Irving becomes the title of the Red Horse Inn in Stratford.

¹⁹² Ibid., 190-191. For a more postcolonial nationalist reading of Irving’s claim to inheritance, see Richard V. McLamore, “The Dutchman in the Attic: Claiming an Inheritance in *The Sketch Book of Geoffrey Crayon*,” *American Literature* 72, no. 1 (2000): 31-57.

Meredith McGill has noted the curious way in which the Copyright Act of 1790 deliberately eschews copyright protection of foreign authors, denying its extension to non-citizens.¹⁹³ She argues that “[b]y making citizenship and not linguistic identity the cutoff for copyright protection, the American provision underscores the statutory nature of this right while also that the identity of the state is not founded on linguistic difference.”¹⁹⁴ In this way, the culture of reprinting and circulation that brought European inheritance into American identity was facilitated precisely by a national enclosure. The literary common land cannot be separated from the national preserve, and this connection is what Irving allows us to see.

Indeed, literary inheritance gets figured as a preserve in “The Art of Book-making” where Irving, earlier in the *Sketch-Book*, begins to explore the mutability of literature theme. While strolling through the British Museum, Crayon is attracted to a “distant door” out of which exit “strange-favoured being[s]” (61). With the eyes of a stranger, he reads the scene in the key of the occult: “There was an air of mystery about this that piqued my languid curiosity, and I determined to attempt the passage of that strait and to explore the unknown regions beyond.” The “unknown regions beyond” would not be unfamiliar to readers of the *Sketch-Book*. The “great cases of venerable books” over which hang “portraits of ancient authors,” the “long tables, with stands for reading and writing, at which sat many, pale studious personages, poring intently over dusty volumes...and taking copious notes” all in “[a] hushed stillness” immediately suggest the ordinary scene of a library.¹⁹⁵ Still Crayon continues to call it a “mysterious apartment” and

¹⁹³Qtd in McGill, *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting*, 80.

¹⁹⁴ McGill, 80.

¹⁹⁵ For some idea of the status of libraries in the United States in the early nineteenth century, see Haynes McMullen and Larry J Bar, “The Treatment of Libraries in Periodicals Published in the United States before 1876,” *The Journal of Library History* 21, no. 4 (1986): 641-672. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25541736> By 1810, the relatively young nation had over 500 libraries (excluding school and Sunday school libraries), and McMullen and Bar’s

decides that he has stumbled on “a body of Magi, deeply engaged in the study of occult sciences” until he inquires about “the strange scene” (61, 62). He learns “that these mysterious personages whom I had mistaken for Magi, were principally authors and in the very act of manufacturing books” (62).¹⁹⁶

Crayon’s performance of misreading this not-so-“strange scene” resembles more Equiano, on first arriving in America from Africa, reading the clock and picture in his master’s room as “something relative to magic” than that of an Anglo-American upon an English library and serves to pronounce his status as a stranger, or his performance of a stranger.¹⁹⁷ I would like to suggest that the strangeness of Crayon finding the scene strange is not only ironic posturing. Crayon, after all, positions himself as a stranger from the opening epigraph of *The Sketch-Book*, taken from John Lyly’s *Euphues and his England* (1580). The section quoted is from Euphues’ tale to his traveling companion Philautus, the story of Cassander and Callimachus. Here, the hermit Cassander discourages travel to his nephew Callimachus, who, having just inherited only his dead father’s words of wisdom and not his money, is determined to set out to make his own fortune.

Learn, Callimachus, of the bird acanthis, who being bred in the thistles will live in the thistles, and the grasshopper, who being sprung from the grass will rather die than depart from the grass. *I am of this mind with Homer, that as the snail that crept out of her shell was turned eftsoones into a Toad and therefore was forced to make a stool to sit on, disdaining her own house, so the traveller that straggleth from his own country is in short time transformed into so monstrous a shape that he is faine to alter his mansion with his manners, and to live where he can, not where he would.* What did Ulysses wish in the midst of his traveling but only to see the smoke of his own chimney? Did not all the

research on reference to libraries within periodicals between 1799-1825 reveals greater interest in American libraries than foreign ones.

¹⁹⁶ Crayon makes this kind of mistake again in *The Sketch-Book*. He similarly mistakes the pensioners of Charter House returning from morning service for magi in “London Antiquities.”

¹⁹⁷ Olaudah Equiano, *The Interesting Narrative and Other Writings*, (New York: Penguin, 1995), 63.

Romans say that he that wandered did nothing else but heap sorrows to his friends and shame to himself, and resembled those that seeking to light a link quenched a lamp; imitating the barbarous Goths, who thought the roots in Alexandria sweeter than the raisins in Barbary? (Italics indicate the portion Irving takes for his epigraph)¹⁹⁸

It seems, yes, *strange* to take as the epigraph for a species of travel narrative a quotation from the character of a hermit in the process of advising against travel.¹⁹⁹ The section Irving chooses from the paragraph is the transformation of the traveler who has left his own country and “alter[s] his mansion,” suggesting a travel that is maybe not yet the traveling of Crayon but the traveling of his ancestors, the transformation of the English traveler to the American native. In the hermit Cassander’s examples of the acanthis in the thistles and the grasshopper in the grass, euphuistic *paramoion* takes on potential for nationalist interpretation.²⁰⁰ With their home turf embedded in their name, the acanthis and the grasshopper keep to their respective abodes.

This correspondence of name and home, were we to carry this to the situation of Irving’s *Sketch-Book*, begs the question of whether an Englishman outside of England can still be called an Englishman, and, simultaneously, whether an American outside of America can still be called an American. The epigraph’s answer would appear to be *no*. This answer is not unfamiliar to Irving when we consider the context of his Liverpool sojourn at the time he writes *The Sketch-Book*. Irving was not a literary tourist like Crayon but a fortune seeking traveler like

¹⁹⁸ John Lyly, *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit and Euphues and His England*, Ed. Leah Scragg (New York: Manchester University Press, 2003), 176. Interesting, though I don’t know that there’s anything special to make of it, is the fact that Irving in his quotation excludes “disdaining her own house.”

¹⁹⁹ For a background on Early Modern debates on travel and empirical experience see Melanie Ord, *Travel and Experience in Early Modern English Literature*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). Ord notes that while Lyly shares many of his contemporary Roger Ascham’s conceits on travel and includes Aschamite figures discouraging travel, his style nevertheless maintains “a doubleness of focus on these prescriptions and [expresses] precepts in an alliterative yet antithetical style that renders its message uncertain and that has led to conflicting critical assessments of his work as humanist and courtly, earnest and playful” (57). Ord’s notion of Lyly’s “doubleness of focus” resonates with Giles’s notion of Irving’s “doubleness of texture,” both playing with and between formal traditions.

²⁰⁰ On Lyly’s euphuism, see Jonas A. Barish, “The Prose Style of John Lyly,” *ELH* 23, no. 1(1956): 14-35, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2871781>

Callimachus. The “treasures of age” he sought in Europe when he went to England in 1815 were monetary, joining his brother Peter Irving in the family trading firm P& E Irving and Company, with the hope that in the peace after the War of 1812, they could turn a profit. Their hopes were frustrated and in 1818, they declared bankruptcy. Duncan Faherty explains that Peter Irving expected the consumer demand for British luxury items to surge again after the war, but “he failed to account for how the virtual suspension of international commerce had hastened the development of native U.S. industries.”²⁰¹ Faherty reads the author of *The Sketch-Book* as “a disillusioned businessman intent on recouping his losses.”²⁰² If Peter Irving failed by assuming successful transatlantic exchange after estrangement, Washington Irving would have to get the strangers reacquainted for his product to succeed in the market. His *Sketch-Book* becomes, then, according to Faherty, an attempt at transatlantic bridgework. Alice Hiller similarly reads Irving’s *Sketch-Book* as motivated by his economic ruin, noting his reference to it in a letter to his literary agent Henry Breevort as “an avenue to some degree of profit and reputation.”²⁰³ She argues that in trying to make *The Sketch-Book* a marketable product on both sides of the Atlantic, Irving is forced into artistic and cultural compromises, but Hiller focuses on what is lost in the process—his national identity. She observes Irving’s concern over the fact that back home “many ask whether I mean to renounce my country” and notes Richard Henry Dana’s opinion in

²⁰¹ Duncan Faherty, *Remodeling the Nation: The Architecture of American Identity, 1776-1858*. (Lebanon, NH: University of New Hampshire Press, 2007), 80.

²⁰² Faherty, 81.

²⁰³ Alice Hiller, ““An Avenue to Some Degree of Profit and Reputation”: The *Sketch Book* as Washington Irving’s entrée and undoing,” *Journal of American Studies* 31, no. 2 (1997): 275. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27556265>. In addition, Benjamin Lease notes further American charges against Irving’s Americanness, like a critic in the November 1833 issue of the *North American Magazine* responding in disgust to the idea that Washington Irving should be honored alongside George Washington, holding that “his literature is not national—it is not peculiarly the literature of American” but instead written “in England, on English subjects, and for an English public.” See Benjamin Lease, *Anglo-American Encounters: England and the Rise of American Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 27-28.

his review of *The Sketch-Book*: “It is as if his mother English had been sent abroad to be improved, and in attempting to become accomplished, had lost too many of her home qualities.”²⁰⁴

Directly after “The Author’s Account of Himself”, “The Voyage” sketch seconds the notion of alienating transformation in the epigraph from Lyly. The emphasis here is on distance, the separation. Crayon remarks “The vast space of waters that separates the hemispheres is like a blank page in existence. There is no gradual transition by which, as in Europe, the features and population of one country blend almost imperceptibly with those of another” (11). This assertion that there is no transition, no nearly imperceptible blending between one country and the other articulates the strong sense of distinction. By the end of “The Voyage” Crayon declares, “I stepped upon the land of my forefathers, but felt that I was a stranger in the land” (15). Remembering that Crayon’s simile for the separation by the “vast space of waters” that renders him a stranger is the blank page can draw our attention to another word that recurs again and again—six times—in the short “The Voyage”: volume.

‘Volume’ in Crayon’s usage designates both a unit of space and a literary unit, constituting both the form of transatlantic material estrangement and transatlantic literary association. If the “silver volumes” of the sea represent a blank page separating “one volume of the world” from another, there nevertheless remains on the other side a “volume of associations with every name...teeming with every thing of which his childhood has heard, or which his studious years have pondered” (12, 14). The volume of physical space takes on a literary metaphor of sterility and separation, while the literary volumes of England take on the natural quality of fertility. This is not to suggest that transatlantic literary association bridges the

²⁰⁴ Hiller, 276, 277.

national and material divide, but rather I argue that Irving is keenly aware and concerned with how the two compromise each other. Crayon, after all, is no less a stranger in the British Library as he is on the British land when he disembarks.

It is, however, through observing the “bookmaking craft” that he comes to solve the mystery of volumes, and the secret lies in fashioning quotations. While Crayon discovers that authors manufacture their works chiefly by the “pilfering” from other authors, he notes two different kinds of pilfering. In the one case, he observes a “lean, bilious looking wight” who lives, it seems, only on biscuits, composing “some work of profound erudition” by “much pondering over dry works,” only “the most worm eaten volumes” (62). His book, Crayon predicts, “would be purchased by every man who wishes to be thought learned, placed upon a conspicuous shelf of his library, or laid open upon his table—but never read.” Crayon here describes a kind of sterile book-making: the severe study of the ascetic scholars whose pains end up only serving to produce an ornamental display to convey a learning that the book never imparts because it does not get read. Crayon’s eye is subsequently caught by “one dapper little gentleman in bright coloured clothes...who had all the appearance of an author on good terms with his bookseller.” He continues:

After considering him attentively, I recognized in him a diligent getter up of miscellaneous works, which bustled off well with the trade. I was curious to see how he manufactured his wares. He made more stir and shew of business than any of the others, dipping into various books, fluttering over the leaves of manuscripts, taking a morsel out of one, a morsel out of another, line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little. The contents of his book seemed to be as heterogeneous as those of the witches’ cauldron in Macbeth. (62-63).

The dapper gentleman truly captures Crayon’s attention, and the language of his bookmaking is the language of commerce, where books turn into manufactured “wares” and his practice of composition looks the most like “business.” Unlike the ponderous study of large tomes by the

ascetic scholar, the dapper gentleman deals in scraps, “dipping,” “fluttering,” “here a little there a little,” producing a “heterogeneous...medley.” It is the dapper gentleman who inspires Crayon’s dream when he dozes off in the middle of the library, where the scraps taken from other works become the fabric of the authors’ dress. Fashioning literary works through choice quotations becomes, in Hiller’s term, the avenue of *entrée* into the literary market, the key to becoming the dapper gentleman on good terms with his bookseller.²⁰⁵

The dapper gentleman reconciles Crayon to the “pilfering disposition” of authors in another turn to ecological analogy that bring “The Art of Bookmaking” and “The Mutability of Literature” into self-citational synchrony. While in “The Mutability of Literature” Crayon meditates on the providential ecology by which old works decay to make way for new works, here he considers a providential ecology by which works are preserved through intertextuality.:

After all, thought I, may not this pilfering disposition be implanted in authors for wise purposes; may it not be the way in which providence has taken care that the seeds of knowledge and wisdom shall be preserved from age to age, in spite of the inevitable decay of the works in which they were first produced. We see that nature has wisely, though whimsically, provided for the conveyance of seeds from clime to clime in the maws of certain birds; so that animals which in themselves are little better than carrion, and apparently the lawless plunderers of the orchard and the corn field, are in fact nature’s carriers to disperse and perpetuate her blessings. In like manner the beauties and fine thoughts of ancient and obsolete writers, are caught up by these flights of predatory authors, and cast forth again to flourish and bear fruit in a remote and distant tract of time. (63)

²⁰⁵ Michael Newbury discusses Irving as the “fountainhead” of “an entire tradition of gentlemanly, anglophile authorship” in his reading of Herman Melville’s “The Paradise of Bachelors and the Tartarus of Maids.” For Newbury, as for Melville, Irving’s commercial interests are closeted in his self-representation as a literary dabbler. Melville’s diptych the “Paradise of Bachelors” reflects a nostalgia for the male genteel tradition of letters where literature was seen as an avocation with only mild commercial motivations, a tradition he nevertheless dismisses as isolated and ignorant of the grosser realities of the new industrial literary market. In the transition from the “Paradise of Bachelors” to the “Tartarus of Maids,” Newbury writes, “the man of leisured letters perusing invaluable manuscripts becomes a businessman concerned with printing “an incredible quantity.” What Melville, and Newbury, seem not to account for is Irving’s dapper gentleman, who seems to stand between Paradise and Tartarus, perusing manuscripts in the British Museum and making it look like “business” and industrial production, the manufacture of “wares.” See Michael Newbury, *Figuring Authorship in Antebellum America*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 57-70.

Preservation is here figured as cross-pollination. The birds of this cross-pollination are not the hermit Cassander's acanthis that does not leave its native thistle, but instead serve a transnational literary heritage in the "conveyance of seeds from clime to clime" and "in a remote and distant tract of time." Irving's language seems complicit here with Wai Chee Dimock's transnational scope of "deep time." In *Through Other Continents: American Literature Across Deep Time*, she argues for a changing scale in the approach to the study of literature, that through considerations of deep time, or historical continuum, challenges spatial autonomy or the "territorial sovereignty" of the nation, offering instead "one species, among others, inhabiting a shared ecology, a shared continuum."²⁰⁶ Crayon, similarly, evacuates territorial sovereignty in ecological continuum. Through cross-pollination, he figures "lawless plunderers" as *natural*. Indeed, in the state of nature, there is no law, at least no civic law. Instead, he argues, authors "but submit to the great law of nature, which declares that all sublunary shapes of matter shall be limited in their duration, but which decrees also that their elements shall never perish" (63). Cross-pollination is here rendered conservation through natural recycling.

The analogy of the literary law of nature proposed in "The Mutability of Literature" and "The Art of Bookmaking" complicates the nature of literary property law. Grantland S. Rice notes the "symmetry and asymmetry" of "The Art of Bookmaking" and "The Mutability of Literature," reading them as overturning assumptions about "'natural' definitions" of literary property.²⁰⁷ According to Rice, each sketch represents two contradictory conceptions of authorship that nevertheless co-existed in the copyright debates of the time. "The Art of

²⁰⁶ Wai Chee Dimock, *Through Other Continents: American Literature Across Deep Time*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 4, 6.

²⁰⁷ Grantland S. Rice, *The Transformation of Authorship in America*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 71-72.

Bookmaking,” set in a “quasi-public” literarium, represents “the utilitarian conception of literary activity” where free circulation and recirculation of texts overrides notions of individual genius and the perpetual rights of the author. On the other hand, Rice reads “The Mutability of Literature,” set in “a literary catacomb” watched over by vergers as emblematic of perpetual property rights.²⁰⁸ In each case, the suppressed reality rouses to make its claim: in the former, authors, and in the latter, the text. Rice concludes that Irving’s oscillation between these contradictory conceptions of authorship “reconstitutes...an intractable rift.”

The rift, however, is not the end of the story because literary property is not the nature of the story—or not the only one. There is no property in Irving’s ecological analogy in either sketch. Irving is not only challenging the nature of property. He challenges the propriety of circulation. After Crayon has made this “pilfering” look like natural recycling, he dozes off, and in his dream, the fashionable authors are rendered unnatural in motley clothing. So unnatural is the look of the authors in the dream that while Crayon acknowledges those authors who only borrow a gem “which sparkled among their own ornaments, without eclipsing them” and those who only study the old authors’ clothes to “imbibe their principles of taste, and catch their air and spirit,” he now “grieve[s] to say that too many were apt to array themselves from top to toe in the patch work manner I have mentioned” (64). These authors no longer appear natural but form instead a “literary masquerade” (65).²⁰⁹ Citational composition in Crayon’s carnivalesque

²⁰⁸ For Rice, perpetual property rights represents Lockean individualism (or in Newbury’s poles, Melville’s “Paradise of Bachelors”) while the utilitarian notion of free circulation and composing texts through other texts he aligns with Montesquieu (or “The Tartarus of Maids”). In light of the first chapter, we remember that Locke was on both sides of these poles, which anticipates the connection between them I hope to make.

²⁰⁹ Terry Castle describes the masquerade as “a kind of collective meditation on self and other, and an exploration of their mysterious dialectic.” See Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986), 4. The pleasure of the masquerade according to Castle, like the pleasure of the text according to Barthes, is “attended on the experience of doubleness...a fantasy of two bodies simultaneously and thrillingly present, self and other together, the two-in-one” (4-5). For Roland Barthes, the pleasure of texts is in “the two edges, the compromise they bring about.” He locates

dream is returned to the realm of fashion. It is the fashionable authors whom the ancient authors, viewing them in this unnatural scene as nothing more than “thieves” and waking in outrage from their portraits, hunt down and render in their natural state: naked. Crayon finds the unnatural casting of citational composition so “ludicrous” that his laugh breaks through the dream, and he wakes up to find “Nothing of the dream had been real.”

But of course, it had. Having now caught the attention of the librarian, Crayon is approached for his card of admission and comes to understand that what seemed natural ecology was a “preserve, subject to game laws, and that no one must presume to hunt there without special license and permission.” Industrious circulation may very well be natural, as in ecological recycling, but nature may just as well be fashioned, as in the preserve. The “quasi-public” library in the British Museum is, in the end, no different from the “private” library in Westminster Abbey. The difference is that by the time he gets to Westminster Abbey, Crayon knows how to get permission.

Crayon’s retreat at the end of “The Art of Bookmaking” is simultaneously his *entrée*, signaling his lawful permission in “The Mutability of Literature.” In retreating, “lest [he] should have a whole pack of authors let loose upon him” Irving performs another act of self-citational synchrony, connecting Crayon with the authors he watched as a stranger in the art of book-making. The dapper gentleman who represented literary *entrée* to Crayon had re-emerged in his dream with a particularly “fierce contention of claimants about him”—in other words, “a whole pack of authors let loose upon him.” Crayon becomes the dapper gentleman in the paraphrase, connecting literary fashion with the preserve, and as self and other, the initiate and the expelled,

the erotic in the same and thus says of texts that “their value would proceed from their duplicity.” Castle, similarly, notes masquerade’s “sensuous, exquisite duplicities, its shimmering liquid play on the themes of self-presentation and self-concealment” or, in Barthes’ terms “the staging of appearance-as-disappearance.” See Roland Barthes, *The Pleasure of the Text*, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1975), 7, 10.

he reveals a transformation of authorship between the fashioned and the natural, the transnational and the national: the naturalized.

Crayon effects this naturalization, the transformation of that earlier Lyly epigraph, in another instance of self-citation through the citation of others. In “The Mutability of Literature” the talking quarto “see[ing] how it is,” that the fashionable authors overtake “all the good old authors” supposes that “nothing is read now-a-days but Sir Philip Sidney’s *Arcadia*, Sackville’s stately plays, and *Mirror for Magistrates*, or the fine spun euphuisms of the ‘unparalleled John Lyly.’”²¹⁰ Crayon disabuses the book of its supposition, stating

the writers whom you suppose in vogue, because they happened to be so when you were last in circulation, have long since had their day...even Lyly, though his writings were once the delight of a court, and apparently perpetuated by a proverb, is now scarcely known even by name...Wave after wave of succeeding literature has rolled over them, until they are buried so deep that it is only now and then that some industrious diver after fragments of antiquity brings up a specimen for the gratification of the curious. (105)

Lyly’s vogue days may be over, but Irving’s earlier epigraph has made it so that the reader on arriving at this point in *The Sketch-Book*, is familiar with his name. Nevertheless, “wave after wave of succeeding literature” has rolled over Irving’s Lyly as well. We remember that directly after the sketch of Lily’s epigraph is “The Voyage” where numerous volumes enter in to span the distance. In this way, too, Irving’s book can be said to figure the entire English literary inheritance. But in reaching back to Lyly within Irving’s volume, we do not emerge with simply a fragment of antiquity but a Lyly returned to fashionability, by which I mean, the ability to be fashioned. Remembering Lyly with his earlier association of national transformation directly

²¹⁰ The quotation is from Lyly’s first editor Edward Blount, presenting his work in 1632. Lyly’s work, as Leah Scragg notes, immediately evinces the “mutability of literature theme” as his editor presents his attempt to renew Lyly’s popularity as “epitaphs to his memory,” suggesting, according to Scraggs, “both its prestige in the closing decades of the sixteenth century and the rapidity with which it fell from favour to neglect.” See Leah Scragg, “Introduction,” *The Anatomy of Wit and Euphuës and His England*, by John Lyly, (New York: Manchester University Press, 2003), 1, 19.

before Crayon pronounces mutability to be a good thing, Irving fashions Cassander's discouragement of travel through degenerative transformation into an encouragement of literary recycling through regenerative naturalization, the naturalization of an English inheritance to make way for a new American generation.²¹¹

So what, finally, is the answer to the question the epigraph from Lyly posed to Irving's "Account of Himself," whether an Englishman, or book, outside of England can still be called English, whether an American man, or book, outside of America can still be called American? To what extent is a self or an account connected to the national and to what extent can it move beyond? The question is not Irving's to solve but belongs to the period. What Irving provides is an avenue—the fashioning of quotations—through which to enter into the simultaneous and contradictory cultures debating the question: the cosmopolitan culture of European fashions and the nationalist culture of American nature. In what follows, I will examine the European novel of fashion and Anglophilic dandy culture in America, situating quotation and imitation within the discourse of fashion, where inhabiting the words of another, like inhabiting the dress of another, becomes a form of self-fashioning as *entrée* onto a stage of international pageantry. I move, then, to see the nationalist discourse of American literature and nature, quotation and originality, in the frontier novel and Transcendentalist thought, not as oppositions to this culture, but as fashioning by other means, making way for the nation in a multinational contest through a plotting of land rights and copy rights. This, however, is constantly undermined by the

²¹¹ Richard McLamore, connecting Irving's America to notions of postcolonial consciousness, also sees Irving epigraphs as not simply serving antiquarian ends but involved in "cultural appropriation." He finds Irving naturalizing his epigraph in another instance: the Milton quotation from *Areopagitica* where he envisions an ideally republican England, epigraph of "English Writers on America." He argues that "Irving subtly announces an American claim to English republican heritage by transforming Milton into an exemplary English writer on America" (39). Where my reading of Irving's use of quotations differs from McLamore's is that I see no distinction between how Irving sees himself quoting and how he sees English writers quoting. In his reading of "The Art of Book-making," McLamore argues that Irving positions himself in a superior citational practice, "in communion" with the English literary tradition as opposed to "consuming" it.

slipperiness of international and intertextual fashion and the instability of nature through naturalization.

Characters in Costume: Anglo-America and the Fashionable Nation

“Mr. Grey I wish you could get me an autograph of Mr. Washington Irving,” asks Miss Manvers of the titular hero of Benjamin D’Israeli’s *Vivian Grey* (1826).²¹² “Give me pen and ink; I will write you one immediately,” Grey responds. While Miss Manvers pronounces the idea “ridiculous,” Grey nevertheless produces Irving’s autograph: “Come, there is Washington Irving’s autograph for you; read it; is it not quite in character? Shall I write any more? One of Sir Walter’s, or Mr. Southey’s, or Mr. Milman’s, or Mr. D’Israeli’s? or shall I sprawl a Byron?” And Miss Manvers is apparently so impressed with Grey’s Irving autograph, that though she “cannot sanction such unprincipled conduct” she requests Walter Scott’s, as well.

D’Israeli here lightly satirizes a fashionable trend in nineteenth-century England and America: autograph collecting.²¹³ The mania for autographs in the nineteenth-century cult of author celebrity was formed on the belief that handwriting was indicative of character.

Physiognomist Johann Kaspar Lavater wrote in his *Essays on Physiognomy* in 1797, “The more I compare the different hand-writings which fall my way, the more I am convinced in the idea, that they are so many expressions, so many emanations, of the character of the writer.”²¹⁴ A

²¹² Benjamin D’Israeli, *Vivian Grey*. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1878), 50. Hereafter cited parenthetically (VG).

²¹³ See A.N.L. Munby, *The Cult of the Autograph Letter in England* (London: Athlone Press, 1962) for a history of autograph collecting, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. See also Allan Axelrad, “‘The Lumley Autograph’ and the Great Literary Lion: Authenticity and Commodification in Nineteenth-Century Autograph Collecting,” in *Susan Fenimore Cooper: New Essays on Rural Hours and Other Works*, ed. Rochelle Johnson and Daniel Patterson (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2001), 22-38. Axelrad’s reading of Susan Fenimore Cooper’s story on autograph mania provides a thorough picture of the mania on the other side of the Atlantic, as well as a useful discussion of authors’ attitudes towards the phenomenon, particularly of James Fenimore Cooper and his daughter Susan.

²¹⁴ John Caspar Lavater, *Essays on Physiognomy*. Trans. C. Moore. (London: H.D. Symonds, 1797), 201-202. Quoted in Josh Lauer, “Tracers of the Real: Autographomania and the Cult of the Signers in Nineteenth-Century

contributor to *The New Monthly Magazine and Literary Journal* in 1824, declared handwriting to be connected with character “except when some peculiar style is affected for a given purpose” and proceeded to catalogue what types of hand-writing revealed about the person’s character.²¹⁵ Dr. J.G. Cogswell similarly noted in his April 19, 1864 *Spirit of the Fair* article “Autographs and Autograph Collections” that “an autograph is more or less a transcript of mind and character.”²¹⁶ Vivian Grey’s (substantiated) claim that he could render Irving’s autograph in character nevertheless raises questions about the nature of character in the fashionable society D’Israeli’s novel emblemizes.

Vivian Grey was one of the most popular novels of fashion, or silver-fork novels as they came to be coined after William Hazlitt’s scathing description of them in “The Dandy School.”²¹⁷ In the words of Winifred Hughes, the silver-fork novels were “arguably the first best sellers in the modern sense of the term and the remote ancestors of our perennial drugstore

America,” *Text and Performance Quarterly* 27, no. 2 (2007), 148. In his discussion of the cult of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, Lauer traces the rise of the signature as a mark of authenticity, noting its performative and preservative quality: “the former in that it displays the moment of enactment, the latter in that such enactment is materialized and made permanent. Whereas writing makes language visible, signing renders the author present[.]” (146). In its performative aspect, making the author present, the signature becomes relevant for John L. Austin’s study of performative utterances in *How to Do Things With Words* as the signature replaces the presence of the author, where “[t]he ‘I’ who is doing the action does thus come essentially into the picture.” See John L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), 61. Lauer discusses Derrida’s rebuttal, that the signature in serving to perform and preserve the presence of the signer, must perform “the absolute singularity of the signature as event” but in order for the signature to be readable as such it must “have a repeatable, iterable, imitable form.” See Jacques Derrida, “Signature Event Context.” Trans. Samuel Weber and Jeffrey Mehlman. (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988), 1-23. This, Lauer notes, is what opens signature to the possibility of forgery, and where I would argue we can find in Vivian Grey’s forgery the connection between the performative and performance of character.

²¹⁵ “On Keeping, Or Costume in Character,” *The New Monthly Magazine and Literary Journal*, Jan. 1824, 167.

²¹⁶ J.G. Cogswell, “Autographs and Autograph Collections,” *Spirit of the Fair*, April 19, 1864, 148. Cited also in Axelrad p.

²¹⁷ Hazlitt wrote of the writers of the dandy school that “provided a few select persons eat fish with silver forks, he considers it a circumstance of no consequence if a whole country starves.” William Hazlitt, “The Dandy School,” *The Examiner*, November 18, 1827, 722.

paper-backs.”²¹⁸ This was true not only in England but in the United States. The New York *Commercial Advertiser* wrote of the dandy novels of Edward Bulwer-Lytton and D’Israeli as the companions of the American fireside: “While snugly ensconced in our ingle corner, we pore over their pages[...].”²¹⁹ In 1831, *The National Gazette and Literary Register* reported that “among transatlantic wits the sayings of Vivian Grey and Popanilla have passed into proverbs; and that a literary society in New York was drawn together, in the first instance, by enthusiasm for those piquant but somewhat hyperbolic romances.”²²⁰ Perry Miller gives an account of Bulwer’s popularity in America:

[*Knickerbocker* editor Lewis Gaylord Clark] could not stop American women (and they made up most of the reading public) from reveling in Bulwer. As Harriet Martineau said in 1836: “I question whether it is possible to pass half a day in general society without hearing him mentioned.” The “morality” of his books was a constant theme of discussion, from the most sensitive of the clergy down to the schoolboy. And why should not all social classes read the fascinating Bulwer, since they could get uncopyrighted editions so cheaply?²²¹

Indeed, the Regency romances featured prominently in Harper’s Library of Select Novels and publishers vied over their publication due to their popular demand and cheap production in the absence of international copyright.²²²

²¹⁸ Winifred Hughes, “Silver Fork Writers and Readers: Social Contexts of a Best Seller,” *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 25, no. 3 (1992): 328.

²¹⁹ Review of *Cecil Hyde, a novel in two volumes*. *The Commercial Advertiser*, October 17, 1834, 2.

²²⁰ *The National Gazette and Literary Register*, June 23, 1831, 2. The quotation is the *Gazette*’s own quotation from the *London Court Journal*. The *National Gazette* goes on to say that “We are sorry that things so discreditable to American literary judgment and taste, should be known or have been heard.” Though popular in the public, the novels of fashion were often reviled by the press on both sides of the Atlantic. *The Voyage of Captain Pompanilla* was another novel by D’Israeli.

²²¹ Perry Miller, *The Raven and the Whale: The War of Words and Wits in the Era of Poe and Melville* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1956), 34.

²²² See William Demarest, Catalogue, Harper & Brothers Records, MS 0555, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York. William Demarest was the bookkeeper for the Harper brothers and kept a catalogue of books published from 1833-1878. In his entry for GPR James’s *Morley Ernstein* (James was another

Winifred Hughes attributes the popularity of the Regency dandy novels in England to their exploitation of the middle-class fascination with aristocracy during the Reform Era. Its popularity in the US fits in with the nineteenth-century American fascination with the symbolic forms of England Elisa Tamarkin discusses in her study of *Anglophilia*.²²³ Tamarkin reads American fascination with things English not as escapist retreat from “the burdens of their own nationality, but where their ‘Americanness’ was lived in other languages of national expression.”²²⁴ Americanness-in-quotation-marks here suggests a national character that works in the sense of character we see in the novel of fashion, a character that can inhabit and be inhabited by “other...national expression”—something like the character Mr. Grey is able to inhabit.

Vivian Grey is a gifted young man with no fortune or title to his name, aiming to ascend in his political ambitions by hobnobbing with the fashionable elite. He gives fashion tips to the women on how to wear bracelets and the Toadey’s complain that he has the Marchioness of Carabas wrapped around his finger. Despite the novel’s claim that “[i]n England, personal distinction is the only passport to the society of the great” and that “to enter into high society, a man must either have blood, a million, or a genius,” Grey’s genius is strangely rooted in a lack of personal distinction, a kind of self-effacement and imitation. His particular talent, related to his art of autograph forgery, is his talent at fashioning quotations: “He possessed also the singular faculty of being able to improvise quotations, that is, he could unpremeditatedly clothe his

British author hugely popular in the US), he tells of a fire in 1842 started by a rival publisher to secure for themselves the book and destroy Harper’s copies of the book. Harpers retaliated by publishing Bulwer’s Novels in a new cheaper edition, starting Harper’s “Library of Select Novels.”

²²³ See Elisa Tamarkin, *Anglophilia: Deference, Devotion, and Antebellum America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).

²²⁴ Tamarkin, xxvi.

conceptions in language characteristic of the style of any particular author” (VG 26). Like Geoffrey Crayon and his dapper gentleman, Grey clothes himself in the style of other authors to effect his *entrée* into high society.

The styling of quotation as clothing is a common trope. Roland Barthes reminds us that etymologically speaking the text is “a tissue, a woven fabric.”²²⁵ He likens the intertextual production of the text as the weaving of Valenciennes lace: “each thread, each code, is a voice; these braided—or braiding—voices form the writing.”²²⁶ Crayon and Grey’s fashioning of quotations are woven from a larger nineteenth-century conversation on quotation as affected costume in the tradition of Aesop’s fable on the Jackdaw. In the fable, the vain Jackdaw decks himself in the plumes of the Peacock to enter into that society. His affectation offends Jackdaw and Peacock alike, and the Peacocks strip him of their feathers, leaving him disgraced and shut out of both communities. The fable lent itself to nineteenth-century critiques of quotation. At the beginning of the century, a writer in *The Monthly Magazine and American Review*, referring to classical quotations in Latin and Greek, asserted that “[m]en whose native stores are large...disdain this puerile display of memory; this bedecking themselves in foreign and gaudy plumage.”²²⁷ Baltimore literary critic Samuel F. Glenn, in his 1837 “Brief Chapter on Quotations” discussing what he terms “the ornamental quotation” notes that “all the poetry of

²²⁵ Roland Barthes, “From Work to Text” in *Image-Music-Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977, rpt. 1978), 159.

²²⁶ Roland Barthes, *S/Z: An Essay*. Trans. Richard Miller (New York: Hill and Wang, 1974), 160.

²²⁷ “On Mottos and Quotations from the Ancients,” *The Monthly Magazine and American Review*, Dec. 1800, 405. “Gaudy plumage” was frequently used to describe the peacock. It is so used in printer Samuel Richardson’s *Aesop’s Fables: With Instructive morals and Reflections* (1796). Sir Brooke Boothby’s verse translation of the fable in *Fables and Satires: With a Preface on the Esopean Fable* (1809) also contains the descriptor.

fact and fiction is pictured forth in these ‘borrowed plumes’ ... ‘Motley,’ appears, indeed, to be the ‘only wear’ with those thus *bigoted in phrases*” (original emphasis).²²⁸

These critiques, as the above example from Samuel Glenn demonstrates, were often rather tongue-in-cheek, participating themselves in the cultural fashion of quotation. In an 1832 issue of *The Albion*, quotation was declared “the reigning vice” across the Atlantic among the fashionable circles. Theodore Hook, from whose novel *Sayings and Doings* Hazlitt derived the “silver-fork school” appellation, advised in “The Elements of Conversation; Or Talking Made Easy” a program of quotations “and if you don’t happen to recollect a quotation...make a quotation, as Sheridan did in the House of Commons, out of your own head”—the improvising of quotations that Grey practices.²²⁹ The advice to speak in quotations was no less followed across the Atlantic. In “A Coterie,” published in *The Boston Lyceum*, the narrator recounts his preparation for a visit to “a legitimate Coterie,” and his first order of business is “to brush up my quotations[...].”²³⁰

Quotation’s fashionability positions it within a larger critical tradition on fashion, one preoccupied with a crisis in character. Autograph forgery, improvising quotations, and the clothing oneself as other in quotation threatened the integrity of character as distinct from costume. It was precisely the dandy novel’s focus on fashion over character that so irritated William Hazlitt. Commenting on D’Israeli’s dedication of his novel to “the Best and Greatest of Men,” Hazlitt bemoans, “Oh ! Mr. Grey, you should have been more humble—you should have

²²⁸ Samuel F. Glenn, “A Brief Chapter On Quotations,” *Lady’s Book*, Aug. 1837, 64. “Borrowed plumes” is a familiar quotation derived from translations of the fable.

²²⁹ Theodore Hook, “The Elements of Conversation; Or Talking Made Easy,” *The Albion*, Feb. 27, 1836, 67.

²³⁰ “A Coterie,” *The Boston Lyceum*, Aug. 15, 1827, 56.

inscribed your work to the best-dressed Man in his Majesty's dominion."²³¹ In his essay "On Fashion," he describes fashion as, "the abortive issue of vain ostentation and exclusive egotism: it is haughty, trifling, affected, servile, despotic, mean, and ambitious, precise and fantastical, all in a breath—tied to no rule, and bound to conform to every whim of the minute."²³² The contradictory terms that make up Hazlitt's definition of fashion show that it is defined by its defiance of definition, a lack of stable character.

Fashion's protean whimsicality accounts for its earlier lack of scholarly treatment. In *The Silver-Fork School: Novels of Fashion Preceding Vanity Fair*, until recently the only full-length study on the silver-fork novel, Matthew Whiting Rosa writes, "Fashion as a material for study is singularly evanescent. Of the day only, like one's newspaper, fashion becomes ridiculous—old fashioned—overnight, and when a century has passed impossible of anything other than the faintest recreation."²³³ In order to study the silver-fork novel, Rosa must ground his work on the light it sheds on the more permanently canonical Thackeray.²³⁴ Ellen Moers foundational study *The Dandy: Brummell to Beerbohm* began giving weight to the silver-fork fashion itself in the character of the dandy, distinguished from the "simple foppery" as a "social, even political phenomenon, with repercussions in the world of ideals."²³⁵ Scholars after Moers have focused

²³¹ Hazlitt, "The Dandy School," 721.

²³² William Hazlitt, "On Fashion," *The Edinburgh Magazine and Literary Miscellany*, September 1818, 203-04.

²³³ Matthew Whiting Rosa, *The Silver Fork School: Novels of Fashion Preceding Vanity Fair*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), 13. Two book-length study on the silver fork novel was published this year: Cheryl Wilson, *Fashioning the Silver Fork Novel* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2012) and Edward Copeland, *The Silver Fork Novel: Fashionable Fiction in the Age of Reform* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

²³⁴ April Kendra challenges the current scholarly consensus that takes Thackeray's satire of the genre in *Vanity Fair* as positioning him outside of it, noting that self-satire was a staple convention of the genre. See April Kendra, "Gendering the Silver Fork: Catherine Gore and the society novel," *Women's Writing* 11, no. 1 (2004), 36.

²³⁵ Ellen Moers, *The Dandy: Brummell to Beerbohm* (New York: Viking Press, 1960), 12.

on the social and political concerns of the Regency as reflected in the silver-fork, concerns like changing class dynamics and social critique in the era of Reform, D'Israeli's Jewishness and marginalization in the Regency, or the place novels of fashion gave women in the literary market—but often at the expense of the dandy and silver-fork fashion.²³⁶ Recently, scholars like Claire Nicolay, Lauren Gillingham, and Edward Copeland have argued for valuing fashion and the dandy in the silver fork novels as mediums for the navigation of social change.²³⁷ Still, these studies have focused their consideration of the fashionable novel on Regency and Victorian society alone. Few Americanists have studied the popularity of the British novel of fashion in the United States.²³⁸

²³⁶For the silver-fork novel and the Reform era, see J.W. Oakley, "The Reform of Honor in Bulwer's *Pelham*," *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 47, no. 1 (1992), 49-71 and William E. Cragg, "Bulwer's *Godolphin*: The Metamorphosis of the Fashionable Novel," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 26, no. 4 (1986), 675-690. For D'Israeli's Jewishness and social mobility, see Robert O'Kell, "The Autobiographical Nature of D'Israeli's Early Fiction," *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 31, no. 3 (1976), 253-284. For women and the silver-fork, see Winifred Hughes, "Elegies for the Regency: Catherine Gore's Dandy Novels," *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 50, no. 2 (1995), 189-209; Anne K. Mellor, "What's Different about 'Regency' Women Writers?" *Keats-Shelley Journal* 55 (2006), 42-47; April Kendra, "Gendering the Silver Fork: Catherine Gore and the society novel," *Women's Writing* 11, no. 1 (2004), 25-38. As Kendra's study notes, the fashionable novels of women writers, particularly Catherine Gore, showed greater longevity than either D'Israeli or Bulwer's dandy novels though Gore and other women writers of the fashionable novel have been obscured or written off as mere imitators of D'Israeli and Bulwer. Kendra calls for a subcategorization within the genre of the fashionable novel: the male dandy novel and the female society novel. While, in this chapter, I regretfully follow suit in focusing on the male authors this is only incidental to my interest in the centrality of fashion represented by the dandy hero. The dandy is not the hero of the society novel but either a comic figure or the villain. Kendra's gender assignation to the subgenres, she notes, does not refer to the gender of the author. The dandy novel is masculine because of its focus on individualism while the society novel focuses on community and cooperation. As my study seeks to read the dandy within the inhabiting of otherness and international networks, I think it is possible to see the dandy novel in my reading as both masculine and feminine.

²³⁷ I distinguish Nicolay's, Gillingham's, and Copeland's work from earlier work on the silver-fork and the Reform Era since these scholars look specifically at how fashion itself is involved in the political negotiations of the Reform Era. See Claire Nicolay, "Delightful Coxcombs to Industrious Men: Fashionable Politics in 'Cecil and Pendennis'," *Victorian Literature and Culture* 30, no. 1 (2002), 289-304; Lauren Gillingham, "The Novel of Fashion Redressed: Bulwer-Lytton's *Pelham* in a 19th-Century Context," *Victorian Review* 32, no. 1 (2006), 63-85, and Copeland.

²³⁸ Bulwer-Lytton is no stranger to Americanists for his influence on the writing of Edgar Allan Poe, but intertextual studies on Bulwer and Poe look at Bulwer's Newgate novels like *Paul Clifford* or his historical romances. They do not reference his dandy novels. See Burton R. Pollin, "Bulwer-Lytton and 'The Tell-Tale Heart,'" *American Notes and Queries* (September 1965): 7-8 and "Bulwer's *Rienzi* as Multiple Source for Poe," *Poe Studies* 29.2 (December 1996): 66-68.

My own interest in the fashion of the silver-fork novels lies in the concern shared on both sides of the Atlantic: the fashionableness of quotation, of clothing oneself as other, and what this self-fashioning through others reveals about the nature of national character. If the criticism was that fashion was too evanescent and lacking in stable character, the dandy hero reveals that fashion itself form a tradition that runs through time and nation. The dandiacal tradition proposes that character, and particularly for our purposes, national character, is always a thing fashioned, and as fashion, it makes it grand *entrée* on the international catwalk through the interpenetration of self and other. In what follows, I will look at the dandiacal national fashioning in Disraeli's *Vivian Grey* and Bulwer-Lytton's *Pelham* and how citation's intertextual and international cross-reference establishes this interpenetration. I will then look at American responses to the fashionable novel and its own negotiations with silver-fork self-fashioning.

The Dandies Are Out: Dandiacal Traditions and National and Universal Pageants

While the reference to Irving in a British novel of fashion signifies the *entrée* his *Sketchbook* sought through its citational practice, by the end of the page, Irving is already on his way out. After Miss Manvers has requested of him Sir Walter Scott's autograph, Grey proceeds to tell an anecdote of Irving's well-known narcolepsy at dinner parties. Miss Manvers, in her response, remarks, "He seems quite forgotten now in England. How came we to talk of him?" (VG 50). She seems to forget that she was the one who brought up the subject of Irving with the autograph request. She and England have forgotten their own desire for his letters. Grey explains Irving's fall from grace as a failure to perform Europe:

Forgotten! Oh ! he spoilt his elegant talents in writing German and Italian twaddle with all the rawness of a Yankee. He ought never to have left America, at least in literature;

there was an uncontested and glorious field for him. He should have been managing director of the Hudson Bay Company, and lived all his life among the beavers.²³⁹

Of course, Irving owed his literary career and celebrity to his leaving America and his successful inhabiting of another nation. What interests me about Grey's assessment is what it reveals about literary and national character. In calling America "an uncontested and glorious field" he reveals establishing literary and national character as a contest. The national and literary establishment of Europe was, according to Grey, too contested for Irving's chances of success to increase. Instead, in positioning Irving as a managing director for the Hudson Bay Company—the royal-chartered Hudson's Bay Company had controlled the North American fur trade since the late seventeenth century—he reverses Irving's original mercantile endeavor, from an American company trying to secure British goods for the American market to a British company trying to secure American goods for a British market. Though Grey would send Irving back to America, it is not the independently nationalist America from which Irving hails but a British America—indeed, Canada. Grey does not relegate Irving to the American beavers because Irving is an American—he does not return Irving to America without nationalizing Irving and the America Grey would have him inhabit for Britain—but because Irving's talents at performance would allow him to perform America, where there would be no contest.

Similar to Irving, Vivian Grey's talents of fashioning quotations that brought him into the fashionable elite ultimately do not save him from *exeunt*. After his political ambitions are

²³⁹ Interestingly, Grey's opinion of Irving was seconded across the Atlantic. In a notice on *Vivian Grey*, the *Daily Georgian* notes that within the novel "our countryman Washington Irving, is sneered at and justly blamed, for quitting American scenery and character for foreign manners and places, which have been a thousand times described." *The Daily Georgian*, September 21, 1826, p. 3. The following month, a correspondent for *The National Advocate* wrote on Irving's *Tales of a Traveller*, "Well may Vivian Grey recommend him to describe the scenes and manners of his own country, instead of walking over a beaten path[...]"²³⁹ Comparing Irving's Italian depictions therein with Gothic novelist Ann Radcliffe's, the correspondent insists that Irving can only be "a poor imitator" and ultimately "advise[s] an immediate flight of his genius from Parma to his native country, where it may be enabled to shine with that former splendor, which, once chaste in the ornaments that created it, has lost its purity in its foreign garb." "Washington Irving," *The National Advocate*, October 28, 1826, p. 1.

spoiled and he accidentally kills his party designate Frederick Cleveland in a duel, Grey flees to Germany. The German episode of *Vivian Grey* has received less scholarly attention. Matthew Whiting Rosa declared that, after an increasingly labored storyline, “[w]hen he took Vivian into Germany D’Israeli virtually confessed his defeat. He threw himself doggedly back on memories of his trip there two years before and supplemented them with half-digested incidents of *Wilhelm Meister*.”²⁴⁰ In its own time, the second part was criticized for relegating its hero to a “passionless rambler” who “has little else to do throughout these pages than patiently listen.”²⁴¹ What the German episode lacks in plot, it makes up for in fashion as it becomes, I would argue, the stage on which D’Israeli showcases national pageantry. What characterizes the literary culture of the fictional Reisenburg is a focus on fashion. Mr. Von Chronicle, a novelist Grey meets in the Reisenburg Court, discovered: “We have ever considered that the first point to be studied in novel writing is character: miserable error! It is costume” (VG 399).²⁴²

To be sure, the novel is being satirical on this point, but only half so, in that the dandy novel does not dismiss character for costume, but equates them. We are told that Mr. Von Chronicle’s novel *Rienzi* goes on for thirty pages on a Cardinal’s dress with his seven petticoats—and this is its “great scene” (VG 400). His novel *ends* with Rienzi’s coronation, essentially leaving out the plot, his career as tribune.²⁴³ Mr. Sievers, Grey’s friend and guide through the fashionable circles of the fictional Reisenburg, defends the novelist’s decision: “for,

²⁴⁰ Rosa, 104.

²⁴¹ From an American review. Review of *Vivian Grey*. *The Album and Ladies’ Weekly Gazette*. May 9, 1827, p. 6-7.

²⁴² The quotation is from Grey’s friend Mr. Sievers discussing Mr. Von Chronicle.

²⁴³ Interest in *Rienzi* surged during the Reform Era and literary treatments tended to focus on his “tragedy,” as Mary Russel Mitford subtitled her play *Rienzi* (1828), which recounted his rise to being crowned tribune—in Mitford’s version he is given the keys to the city instead of a crown—his fall from popular grace, and assassination. Bulwer-Lytton’s novel *Rienzi* (1835) similarly explored in greater detail, according to the 1835 Preface, “the true, but somewhat intricate causes of his rise, his splendor, and his fall” (x).

as he [Von Chronicle] well observes, what else is there in the career of Rienzi which would afford matter for the novelist? Nothing! All that afterwards occurs is a mere contest of passions and development of character; but where is a procession, a triumph, or a marriage?" (VG 400). In other words, where is there an occasion for clothes?

Von Chronicle's foil is the wife of the Grand Duke of Reisenburg, Madame Carolina, who writes histories. Mr. Sievers declares it "the most amusing thing" to contrast Von Chronicle's fashionable novel writing with Madame Carolina's fashionable history writing, and the amusement can only lie in the impossibility of contrasting the two rivals who nevertheless find their works incomparable. While Von Chronicle insists on costume over character in novels, Madame Carolina insists on manners over matter in histories. That this amounts to the same thing is evident in Madame Carolina's history of the eighth-century caliph of Baghdad. Her plans for *Haroun Al Raschid* seem to follow the same line as Von Chronicle's *Rienzi*, promising a ten-page description of the Caliph's druggist Alboussan in his "upper garment of green velvet, and loose trousers of pink satin; a jeweled dagger ...in his golden girdle; [and] his slippers...of the richest embroidery" (VG 404). If Madame Carolina's druggist, in attire she derives from contemporary "authorities for the costume of men of his dignity," suggests to us a dandy like the hero of D'Israeli's novel, only set in the eighth century, the resemblance does not end at the clothes. Alboussan, like Vivian Grey, is described as a man of uncommon "wit and politeness" who chooses clothes and jewels for the ladies "with admirable taste" and is the center of the fashionable elite: "His house was the rendezvous of all the nobility in the Court" (VG 403-4).²⁴⁴ D'Israeli weaves a literal intertextual thread that creates a sense of dandiacal tradition, despite the changing fashions of times and nations.

²⁴⁴Even Von Chronicle's treatment of *Rienzi* resembles Vivian Grey inasmuch as both make autobiographical reference to D'Israeli. Sievers mentions the "contrast of costume of Master Nicholas, the notary in the quarter of the

What the dandiacal tradition has to teach us is precisely this intertextual, international thread through which self-fashioning occurs. In Reisenburg, Grey attends a production of Rossini's *Othello*, where the German production of an Italian opera of an English play itself based on an Italian short story elicits questions of adaptation. The narrator notes that while English productions have Othello in the clothing of his own country (i.e. turbaned), the German production has him in "the full dress of a Venetian magnifico of the middle ages" (VG 424-5). Pondering the historical probability of the British over the German, the narrator muses:

Is it natural to suppose that such a man should have retained, during his successful career, the manners and dress of his original country? Ought we not rather to admit that, had he done so his career would, in fact, not have been successful? In all probability, he imitated to affectation the manners of the country which he had adopted. (VG 425)

Though Grey's earlier efforts prove that not everyone who imitates is successful, the implication here is that everyone who is successful imitates. What is interesting here is the use of the word "natural." The narrator asserts that it is, in fact, not natural to expect original retention, and what is to be expected is the fashioning of the self—even to affectation—as other. Naturalization is only natural.

When we shift the focus from Othello the man to *Othello* the text, the adaptation of an adaptation raises the question J. Hillis Miller poses to the citation of a citation and the intertextual chain: "is a citation an alien parasite within the body of its host, the main text, or is it the other way around, the interpretive text the parasite which surrounds and strangles the citation which is its host?"²⁴⁵ Through his etymological exploration of parasite and host, Miller reveals

Jews, and that of Rienzi, the tribune, in his robe of purple" (400) where Rienzi, like Grey, mirrors D'Israeli's own political ambitions as a marginalized Jew.

²⁴⁵ J. Hillis Miller, "The Critic as Host," *Critical Inquiry* 3, no. 3 (1977), 439. As part of an ongoing debate with M.H. Abrams, and Wayne Booth, Hillis Miller here responds to the M.H. Abrams' and Wayne Booth's criticism of the deconstructionist readings as parasitical by performing a deconstruction of their claim, working through the

the equivocal meaning of host, as both ‘host’ and ‘guest.’ ‘Host’ and ‘parasite,’ as terms that each contain their opposite, contradict their own polarity, and in Miller’s rendering the univocal polarity is converted to equivocal reciprocity. Similarly, D’Israeli’s discussion of the *Othello* adaptation is rendered equivocal in the synonymous relation between host and guest. Even while the narrator’s question challenges the probability of Othello maintaining his originality, the question itself is based on the retention of an original *Othello*. Before Othello comes on the scene, Grey marvels at the staging of Brabantio’s house “copied accurately” from Venetian architecture. The hallmark of the Reisenburg production is its accurate rendering of the original story, its own ability, as host, like the guest Othello in the drama, to faithfully copy Venice. The polarity between original and destination is evacuated as both become the objects of fashioned copying.

D’Israeli refashions the Othello citation to success on the stage where the national and the other-national converge. The day after the opera, Madame Carolina throws a costume party. She has arranged to circumvent the typical problem of the “fancy-dress ball”: “the commonplace effect generally produced by this species of amusement, in which usually a stray Turk...looked sedate and singular among crowds of Spanish girls, Swiss peasants, and gentlemen in uniforms” (VG 436). This stray Turk, like Shakespeare’s turbaned Othello, fails to blend in with the crowd.²⁴⁶ In the case of the fancy-dress ball, the issue is not entrée into a nation nor the origins of the Turk but the lack of originality of everyone else. Madame Carolina therefore assigns the fancy-dress ball the theme of “an age.”

etymology of “parasite” to reveal the ever equivocal meaning of a text, seeing citation and host, criticism and text in a reciprocal relationship of meaning.

²⁴⁶ Othello’s dying speech hinges on his identification both with the Venetian and the “turban’d Turk.”

This new fancy-dress ball falls under the phenomenon of the historical pageant that, with carnivals, exhibitions, and *tableau vivant*, formed part of the public and parlor spectacles popular during the period.²⁴⁷ These spoke to the nineteenth-century craze for things historical, particularly the history of the Middle Ages, and provided a means of ordering and organizing the social world.²⁴⁸ As spectacles, they participated in what Tony Bennett has called “the exhibitionary complex,” where the “power to command and arrange things and bodies for public display” allows those bodies to know and be known, transforming what was once chaos to “a spectacle of ordered totality.”²⁴⁹ The historical pageant that Madame Carolina proposes seeks this very ordering, the movement from anonymous singularity in the lack of social order to a public representational scheme in which the characters can know and be known, see and be seen.

The bodies that get ordered in the historical pageant are national bodies. As they struggle to decide on an age, the Grand Duke of Reisenburg advises “something national,” to which Madame Carolina objects on the grounds that “Germany had only been a land of barbarism” and had not great national characters to boast of. Finding a national period was further complicated by the internal divisions of the un-unified German states after the end of the First French Empire as represented by the rivalry between Reisenburg and Little Lilliput. A compromise between the nationals and cosmopolitan fashionables is reached when someone proposes “a period which not only would be German, not only would compliment the House of Austria, but, what was of still

²⁴⁷ See Stéphane Gerson, *Pride of Place: Local Memories and Political Culture in Nineteenth-Century France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003); Joseph M. Brophy, *Popular Culture and the Public Sphere in the Rhineland, 1800-1850* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Monika M. Elbert, “Striking a Historical Pose: Antebellum Tableaux Vivants, ‘Godey’s’ Illustrations, and Margaret Fuller’s Heroines,” *The New England Quarterly* 75, no. 2 (2002): 235-275.

²⁴⁸ Gerson, 25, 76. Gerson argues that historical narratives provided a “symbolic order and coherence” to events.

²⁴⁹ Tony Bennett, “The Exhibitionary Complex,” *New Formations* 4 (1988): 76, 98.

greater importance, would allow of every contemporary character of interest of every nation, the age of Charles the Fifth!” (VG 436).

We see in this selection what Stéphane Gerson finds typical of the historical pageant: the interpenetration of the local, the national, and the universal (or international). The French historical pageants Gerson discusses, popular from 1825 to 1865 in the Nord, were community-building festivals that used affection for the local *pays* to build identification with the national *pays*. Local affiliation, however, also threatened national unity as well as the liberal universalist values of post-Revolution France as it could become an exclusive *patriotisme de clocher* [parochial patriotism]. This put pageant organizers in an irresolvable tension, making these pageants a precarious balancing act of public spirit.²⁵⁰

In Madame Carolina’s pageant, it is Von Chronicle as head of the Committee of Costume, who fashions this national-international balancing act by rendering nation in the key of other nations. He dissuades his patron the ultra-nationalist Prince of Pike and Powdren, “one of those true North German patriots who think their own country a very garden of Eden” and who dreams of a unified German nation where the North would enjoy “all the privileges of empire,” from his plan to dress “in a style peculiarly national” as his hero Arminius.²⁵¹ Instead, Von Chronicle has him portray King Henry VIII, insisting that his head deserved a crown. The flattery works, and Von Chronicle accomplishes his ulterior motive of getting to portray Cardinal Wolsey to bring to life his own “great scene” of the Cardinal in *Rienzi*. Von Chronicle’s pageant

²⁵⁰ See Gerson 183-202. Gerson notes a similar phenomenon in Germany as *Heimat*, like *pays*, functions as both a local and national unit of space. He observes that from the 1820s German’s engaged with local memories and consciousness to “root the abstract Fatherland in the tangible, affective *Heimat*.” Though Gerson claims that the German local traditions did not reach the scale of the French ones, nor were they as inherently conflicted, it is enough, I think, to justify seeing the Reisenburg fancy dress ball in relation to the French historical pageant. See Gerson, 280-281.

²⁵¹ D’Israeli, *Vivian Grey*, 441.

has all the while been a kind of *tableau vivant*, bringing to life great scenes, painted in words by “those much-neglected and much-plundered persons, the old chroniclers” and by the fashionable historical novelists. As *tableau vivant*, it functions, in Monika M. Elbert’s description, as an opportunity for participants “try on a variety of personae [...] to envision themselves in idealized roles, and as they did so, they were learning how to integrate their identities as public and private figures” or, in light of the historical pageant, as local, national, and international figures.²⁵² The Prince of Pike and Powdren dreams of a German nation that would not come to be for almost another 50 years, but Henry VIII allows him to try on the pride of place he imagines for the Northern German in the yet-to-be-realized nation. He proudly struts as he wears his national figure in different colors, even if he is outdone by his vizier Von Chronicle, dressed as Wolsey to rival his own *Rienzi* Cardinal.

But what of the stray Turk? Baron Gernsbach dons a turban to portray Suleiman the Magnificent and his friend Bernstorff attends him as “that Turkish Paul Jones, Barbarossa” (VG 436). Instead of a “stray Turk,” we find the turbaned Turk networked in other-national representation: identification with a British-American sailor and an Italian name. Unlike the turbaned Othello of the British production, the historical Barbarossa does not find himself fatally torn between identification with the Venetian and the “turban’d Turk” nor does he have to shed his turban, fighting under Venetian colors like the Othello of the Reisenburg production. The historical Barbarossa. Kheir-ed-Din or Hayreddin, was appointed by Suleiman the Magnificent as admiral of the Ottoman fleet. Though his origins are uncertain, his career was a singularly

²⁵² Monika M. Elbert, “Striking a Historical Pose: Antebellum Tableaux Vivants, ‘Godey’s’ Illustrations, and Margaret Fuller’s Heroines,” *The New England Quarterly* 75, no. 2 (2002): 236.

Ottoman one, despite Charles V's attempts to get him to switch sides, and he is considered a Turkish national hero.²⁵³

Calling Barbarossa "That Turkish Paul Jones," though ostensibly meant to resonate in their shared status as naval fighters—or pirates depending on which side they are viewed—rings a significant dissonance. John Paul Jones considered himself a "citizen of the world."²⁵⁴ He sailed under many colors; he was a British merchant sailor turned American navy fighter in the Revolutionary War, a French *Chevalier* who fought for Empress Catherine in the Russo-Turkish War. As a British sailor fighting the British in the American Navy, he resembles that turbaned Moor fighting against the turbaned Turk in the Venetian fleet. The denomination likens Barbarossa to one who fought against the Turks, and so the adaptation of Barbarossa as "that Turkish Paul Jones" puts him in the same tension as Othello.

Reading nation in the key of other nations in the historical pageant, Barbarossa's nationalism is recognizable with a "the citizen of the world" and the Othelloesque conflict of allegiance rendered in the Anglo-American identification is synonymous with the Turkish national figure. The point I am trying to make is that "that Turkish Paul Jones Barbarossa" is another adaptation of Othello. While the conflict of national identities marked Othello's final exeunt, at Madam Carolina's fancy dress ball, the turbaned figure makes a successful entrée in national costume that is recognizable on the international stage through intertextual and

²⁵³ For a full biography of Barbarossa, see Ernle Bradford, *The Sultan's Admiral: The Life of Barbarossa* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968). Bradford, following Barbarossa's own account, maintains that he and his brothers were born in Lesbos of a Turkish father and Greek mother. Christine Isom-Verhaaren surveys the more varied accounts of Barbarossa's origins, European accounts that claim that Barbarossa was a Greek Christian who converted to Islam with his brother after they became corsairs, or that he was from Cilicia of an Andalusian mother, or that he and his family were French and converted to Islam upon emigrating to Lesbos. According to Isom-Verhaaren, in the sixteenth-century, allegiance was not given to territories but to rulers of territories. Barbarossa's allegiance to Selim and to Suleiman made him Turkish, no matter his origin. See Christine Isom-Verhaaren, *Allies with the Infidel: The Ottoman and French Alliance in the Sixteenth Century* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2011), 49-76.

²⁵⁴ Samuel Eliot Morison, *John Paul Jones: A Sailor's Biography* (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., rpt. 1999), 19.

international cross-reference. In this citational complex of self-fashioning as other, character is inhabitable as costume and on the stage of the international pageant, knows and is known through the interpenetration of the national and the international.

For Vivian Grey, the night of the fancy dress ball confirms what he had “too often” observed, “that the face of man is scarcely more genuine and less deceitful than these masquerade dresses which we now wear” (VG 443). He makes this admission sadly to the object of his affections, but Vivian Grey doesn’t get the girl and leaves in heartbreak bound for Vienna. The novel ends with a high romantic scene, where Grey contemplates the ruin of castles, “the desolation is complete,” and a lightning bolt kills his servant and his horse, leaving Grey fallen on the ground²⁵⁵. The narrator, however, undercuts whatever great revelation we might expect from this final tragic *exeunt*. The hero is not dead, and the narrator would have told us all about his exploits in the “light-hearted Vienna” had he not occupied the reader’s attention long enough. Grey has no final *exeunt*; his is perpetual *entrée*. We can expect that he will make it in Vienna just as well as anywhere else through his talents of self-fashioning as other. *Vivian Grey*’s lack of conclusion disrupts our sense of character development, but it is consistent with the novel’s insistence on character as costume, endlessly fashionable.

Reforming the Dandy: Contests of Literary and National Character

Not all dandy heroes fall the way of Vivian Grey, and so it might be worth looking at another novel, which rivaled *Vivian Grey* on both sides of the Atlantic, where the dandy hero does take on a development of character: Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton’s *Pelham; or, The Adventures of the Gentleman*. Henry Pelham, unlike Vivian Grey, is born into the fashionable elite. He receives a classical education in school and a fashionable education in all things

²⁵⁵ Ibid., 486.

recherche from his mother. After graduating, he enters the London fashionable circles where he strikes particular friendship with “the really clever, and affectedly pedantic Lord Vincent.”²⁵⁶ In London, he reunites with a dear school friend, Sir Reginald Glanville who has since been marked by a shadow, the death of his beloved Gertrude Douglas, raped by the wealthy Sir John Tyrrell. Glanville is thus, the prime suspect when Tyrrell is found murdered, and in a blend of silver-fork and Newgate novel (the Regency crime novel), Pelham turns sleuth in the urban underbelly of London to prove Glanville’s innocence and be able to marry his sister Ellen Glanville. Over the course of the novel, “Pelham transforms from an ineffective dandy to a man of action[...].”²⁵⁷ By the end of the novel, he finds himself settled into married life, though still ambitious to be out before the world. He says, “If I am less anxious than formerly for the reputation to be acquired in society, I am more eager for honour in the world; and instead of amusing my enemies, and the saloon, I trust yet to be useful to my friends and to mankind” (*P* 444).

By all appearances, *Pelham* is a dandy *Bildungsroman*, the story of young man who graduates from fashion and dandyism to substance and character, and in this Bulwer’s dandy seems outside of *Vivian Grey*’s dandiical tradition. Ellen Moers, indeed, draws sharp and biting contrasts between the two figures:

Pelham is a dandy who conceals a serious moral purpose behind his affectations; Vivian is a dandy whose lust for power defies concealment, and whose dandyism is a pose to gild immoral means used for an immoral end...For Pelham is withal a gentleman, and Vivian is a scoundrel...Pelham is absorbed by dandyism; Vivian *uses* it.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁶ Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton, *Pelham; Or, the Adventures of a Gentleman*, Ed. Jerome J. McGann (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1972), 12. Hereafter cited parenthetically (*P*).

²⁵⁷ Cheryl Wilson, *Fashioning the Silver Fork* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), 50.

²⁵⁸ Moers, 94-95.

The contrast between the two for Moers has to do with character. Pelham's dandyism is clothing that conceals a moral character while Grey's is clothing that dresses up an immoral character. What makes Vivian's character so immoral is precisely its lack of character, that Grey's defining character is his fashionability, his ability to fashion himself and others for the purposes of *entrée*. The emphasis Moers places on "uses" suggests the sin of manipulation. She ultimately concludes that Pelham is an "effortless success" as a dandy, while Vivian is a failure. The irony here is that the successful dandy is the one who ceases, at least in part—he never ceases to pay attention to his toilet—to be a dandy.

There is, however, another "failed" dandy in the novel whose relation to Pelham might restore him to the dandiacal tradition. This dandy is Lord Vincent and his signature trait is quotation. Pelham contends that a simple character sketch would "present the reader a man, whose conversation was nothing but alternate jest and quotation—a due union of Yorick and Partridge," referring to the witty pastor in *Tristram Shandy* and the pedant schoolteacher turned barber of *Tom Jones*, respectively (P 42). But this is only one of Lord Vincent's "moods," according to Pelham as he also notes that "deep beneath the surface of his character" was a hidden ambition which Lord Vincent himself, in his dandiacal leisure, might not have been aware of. "It was this insight into Vincent's nature," Pelham affirms, "which drew us closer together. I recognized in the man, who as yet was only playing a part, a resemblance to myself, while he, perhaps, saw at times that I was somewhat better than the voluptuary, and somewhat wiser than the coxcomb, which were all that at present it suited me to appear" (P 43). Lord Vincent and Pelham are connected in that both are only playing the part or appearing as the dandy, while nursing a greater political ambition beneath.

We would expect from this that Lord Vincent has his own developmental narrative to unfold by which he sheds the dandy persona to settle into his real character. But as Lord Vincent begins his political career, he finds it difficult to shed his borrowed plumes, to shed quotations:

It has probably been observed that Lord Vincent indulged less of late in that peculiar strain of learned humour formerly his wont. The fact is, that he had been playing another part; he wished to remove from his character that appearance of literary coxcombry with which he was accused. He knew well how necessary, in the game of politics, it is to appear no less a man of the world than of books; and though he was not averse to display his clerkship and scholastic information, yet he endeavoured to make them seem rather valuable for their weight, than curious for their fashion. How few there are in the world who retain, after a certain age, the character originally natural to them! We all get, as it were, a second skin; the little foibles, propensities, eccentricities, we first indulged through affectation, conglomerate and encrust till the artificiality grows into nature.

When Lord Vincent stops playing the part of the dandy, he only “[plays] another part.” Yet, as character becomes playing a part, playing a part also becomes character. What was “affectation” becomes “a second skin” and again we find the denial of the possibility of original retention, where playing a part becomes natural as “artificiality grows into nature”—in other words, naturalization. There is something to Lord Vincent’s character, however, that he retains: his “scholastic information” is only dressed differently. He fashions his quotations for a different *entrée*.

Lord Vincent’s *entrée* fails because he cannot strike the right balance between his knowledge of books and his knowledge of the world. This is most evident in his failed *exeunt* in his visit to France. In the cosmopolitan Parisian fashionable circles, everyone can make pronouncements on every national literature, and exchange quotations in English, French, and Latin, but these exchanges are engaged in national comparisons and contests. Lord Vincent at first does the French “more than justice,” as Monsieur D’A— affirms, defending the French

against English national stereotypes.²⁵⁹ His praise of the French enthusiastic reception of strangers, as opposed to English indifference, even elicits censure from Pelham—“you forget yourself, Vincent. How can the private virtues be cultivated without a coal fire? Is not domestic affection a synonymous term with domestic hearth? And where do you find either, except in honest old England?” (P 48). But by the end of their visit to Paris, after a critique of French philosophy, Lord Vincent is regarded as *un horreur, un bête*, having *mauvais goût* and *mauvais coeur*. Pelham concludes that “one may not speak of anything relative to a foreign country, as one would if one was a native” (P 95). Lord Vincent forgets himself indeed, and the limits of speaking other nations.

The French *soirée* in *Pelham*, like the Reisenburg fancy dress ball in *Vivian Grey*, is marked by the interrelationship between the national and the universal, but with a change in emphasis and direction. Distinguishing French from British philosophy, Lord Vincent observes that the French

are fonder of considering man in his relations to society and the active commerce of the world, than in the more abstracted and metaphysical operations of the mind. *Our* writers, on the contrary, love to indulge rather in abstruse speculations on their species—to regard man in an abstract and isolated point of view, and to see him *think* alone in his chamber, while you prefer beholding him *act* with the multitude in the world. (P 55-6)

On first glance, it would seem that French philosophy takes a more expansive position, man in the world instead of man in the chamber. But Sir George Lynton, another Englishman in attendance suggests the opposite. Responding to Monsieur D'E—'s conclusion upon Lord Vincent's distinction that the French philosophy is therefore the more useful, Lynton contends that philosophies focused on man in his relations to society particularize the individual so that

²⁵⁹ For an overview and appraisal of French stereotypes and a discussion of French treatment of strangers, see Eugene Weber, “Of Stereotypes and of the French,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 25, no. 2 (May - Jun., 1990), pp. 169-203.

their relevance is confined to the time and nation treated, “a philosopher of a single country or a single age.” On the other hand, the British philosophy, treating “man in *se*...must evidently be applicable, and consequently useful, to all times and nations.” The tension that underlined the project of the historical pageant is here more at the forefront. While the historical pageant represented local scenes that would found values of national and universal union, Bulwer here gives us the representation of a foreign scene of contest that exposes the national values that complicate universal union.

Though both national philosophies pretend to a more expansive dimension, they finally prove insular when taken to another national audience. What distinguishes the national philosophies is precisely the problem. Lord Vincent’s critique that sends him out of favor with the French fashionables is that their philosophy is too much in the world and not enough in the chamber. He observes, “with you *les gens de lettres* are always *les gens du monde*” which is a different problem from the man of books trying to be a man of the world. Instead, it speaks to the problem of when men of the world try to be men of books. “They make observations acutely,” he continues,

and embody them with grace; but it is worth remarking, that the same cause which produced the aphorism, frequently prevents its being profound. These literary *gens du monde* have the tact to observe, but not the patience, perhaps not the time, to investigate....An English writer would not dare to make a maxim, involving, perhaps, in two lines, one of the most important of moral truths, without bringing pages to support his dictum. (*P* 94)

The French, according to Lord Vincent, observe the world and their expressions on the world have grace, but they lack substance due to failure of book study, “bringing pages” of support. Pelham, however, notes the reverse problem in Lord Vincent, as the other conclusion he draws from Lord Vincent’s fall from grace with the Parisian elites is that he was too much a

philosopher of the chamber and not of the world: “[T]hose who know mankind in theory, seldom know it in practice; the very wisdom that conceives a rule, is accompanied with the abstraction, or the vanity, which destroys it” (*P* 95). Pelham observes that the “philosopher of the cabinet” fails as he considers his *science des lettres* a *science du monde*. He therefore concludes of Lord Vincent: “He has reach much upon men, he has reflected more; he lays down aphorisms to govern or to please them. He goes into society; he is cheated by the one half, and the other half he offends.” If we feel more at liberty to trust Pelham’s critique of Lord Vincent than Lord Vincent’s critique of the French or the French critique of Lord Vincent, it may be because they are fellow nationals.

Indeed, the novel undermines the possibility for cross-national critique or revelation. While in France, Lord Vincent remarks on the conversation of two Englishmen on the Persian prince, about to publish his observations on Paris. He notes that when a national character assesses another national character, civilized or less civilized, satire is always rendered, either of the nation assessed or the nation assessing:

[T]here are few better satires on a civilized country than the observations of visitors less polished; while on the contrary the civilized traveller, in describing the manners of the American barbarian, instead of conveying ridicule upon the visited, points the sarcasm on the visitor; and Tacitus could not have thought of a finer and nobler satire on the Roman luxuries than that insinuated by his treatise on the German simplicity. (*P* 55)

What must be noted here is that no matter which nation is doing the assessing, the revelatory satire is always of the civilized nation. Nothing, in the end, is revealed of an other. Foreign representation does not reveal the other nation. Even the less polished nation’s foreign representation of the civilized nation only reveals the civilized nation because the readership Lord Vincent is considering is that of the civilized nation. There is no getting outside of the nation.

Except, maybe, through the nation. While *Vivian Grey* needed the scene of international pageantry, of self-fashioning as other, to articulate the national costume, *Pelham* needs the national scene to articulate universal character. Back in England among his fellow national fashionables at their mistress Lady Roseville's, Lord Vincent discusses Thomas Hope's *Anastasius, or, Memoirs of a Modern Greek Written at the Close of the Eighteenth Century* (1819). The novel recounts the picaresque adventures of a Greek in the Ottoman world, and fed the Orientalist fervor of the period. Though it was lauded in its time, Lord Vincent offers a tempered praise:

It is a thousand pities...that the scene of that novel is so far removed from us. Could the humour, the persons, the knowledge of character, and of the world, come home to us, in a national, not an exotic garb, it would be more popular, as it is certainly a more gifted work, than even the exquisite novel of *Gil Blas*. But it is a great misfortune for Hope that—

“To *learning* he narrowed his mind,

And gave up to the *East* what was meant for mankind.”

One often loses, in admiration at the knowledge of peculiar costume, the deference one would have paid to the masterly grasp of universal character. (*P* 211)

Lord Vincent essentially laments the novel's “exotic garb,” its “peculiar costume” because it distracts from appreciating “universal character,” for him only appreciable when it has “come home to us” in a national garb. This seems counter-intuitive. We would expect that identifying with persons and characters of other nations would speak to universal values, but Vincent's point is that in the international scene we only see nationally. It is in the chamber, in the domestic hearth, where the national becomes itself just “garb,” beneath which we can discern “universal character.”

Lord Vincent's quotation, a play on a line from Oliver Goldsmith's “Retaliation” on Edmund Burke, conflates the conflict of national character with the conflict of *science des lettres* and *science du monde*. Goldsmith's line on Burke on which the quotation plays reads:

Who, born for the universe, narrow'd his mind,
And to party gave up what was meant for mankind,
Though fraught with all learning, yet straining his throat
To persuade Tommy Townshend to lend him a vote [...]²⁶⁰

Burke's universal *science des lettres* is "narrow'd" to the worldly purposes of political party. Goldsmith continues to describe Burke, "too deep for his hearers," trying with little success to convince his audience. Vincent's quotation, that in its intertextual resonance simultaneously speaks the failure of the *gens des lettres* as *gens du monde* and the failure of universal character in inter-national representation remembers the failure of the French episode and the exigency for the right balance between polarities. Thus Lady Roseville responds, "It must require...an extraordinary combination of mental powers to produce a perfect novel."

The extraordinary combination takes the form of a novel that can combine French and English literary character. Though Lord Vincent asserts that the perfect novel does not yet exist, he imagines its being attained by "an author [who] could combine the various excellencies of Scott and Le Sage," and gives his own recipe for writing a novel:

For me, if I was to write a novel, I would first make myself an acute, active, and vigilant observer of men and manners. Secondly, I would, after having thus noted effects by action in the world, trace the causes by books, and meditation in my closet. It is then, and not till then, that I would study the lighter graces of style and decoration; nor would I give the rein to invention, till I was convinced that it would create neither monsters of men nor falsities of truth. For my vehicles of instruction or amusement, I would have people as they are—neither worse nor better—and the moral they should convey, should be rather through jest and irony, than gravity and seriousness. (*P* 213)

²⁶⁰ Oliver Goldsmith, "Retaliation" in *The Deserted Village, The Traveller, and Other Poems*, The Riverside Literature Series (Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press, 1894), 75. "Retaliation" presents a series of epitaphs on British notables, imagined to have died at the dinner table upon over-eating and drinking. The famous eighteenth-century actor David Garrick recounted that the poem emerged from an challenge between him and Goldsmith, levied by Goldsmith, as to who could write the greatest epigrammatic verse by writing each other's epitaph. Garrick's epitaph for Goldsmith—"Here lies Nolly Goldsmith, for shortness call'd Noll,/ Who wrote like an angel, but talk'd like poor Poll"—rendered this "Retaliation." See "Introductory Note," 72-73.

What Vincent imagines here is precisely the combination of French and British philosophy, first being an “observer of men and manners” through “action in the world” and then “trac[ing] the causes by books, and meditation in my closet.” Combining these two philosophies renders, according to Lord Vincent, “people as they are—neither worse nor better.” It would seem that what we find here is an inter-national representation that renders people as they are in natural character, not fashioned character. This natural casting is further corroborated by Lady Roseville who remarks in response, “Thank you, my lord. For once you have condescended to give us your own sense, and not other people’s; you have scarce made a single quotation.” We saw previously that Lord Vincent had been unable to shed quotations to come into his true character beneath the surface, but here in this singular moment, we are given to believe that Lord Vincent has finally shed quotation and shown us his real character. The moment where we have the ideal of inter-national representation is the moment character is established, people as they are in their own sense.

But Lord Vincent has not given us his own sense; he’s given us Bulwer-Lytton’s, and in this regard, we might still consider him quoting. In the Preface to the second edition of the same year, Bulwer explains the purpose of his novel, justifying his dandy hero on the grounds that the moralist, through observation, can extract wisdom from anything. He writes, “By treating trifles naturally, they may be rendered amusing, and that which adherence to *Nature* renders amusing, the same cause also may render instructive: for Nature is the source of all morals[...]

 (*P* xxxiii). Understanding “trifles” to mean the dandy, the fashionable circles, and their habits, we understand treating trifles naturally as treating fashion naturally. In this way, “People as they are, neither better nor worse” turns out to be the man of fashion. Bulwer writes:

I have not scrupled to attribute, even to a degree which some (perhaps with too literal a judgment) have censured as excessive, the fopperies and flippancies of those respectable

individuals, classed under the common appellation of Dandy; first, because of that class my hero is, albeit an unworthy, a devoted member; and my Novel professes to describe manners, not as they ought to be, but as they are. (*P* xxxiv)

Bulwer does not worry about fashioning the dandy because his novel is not about “manners as they ought to be,” or ideal characters, but “as they are” where now we can understand “as they are” not as natural but as fashionable.

The man of fashion, like “trifles naturally,” is oxymoronic in Bulwer’s description, “a fop and a philosopher, “voluptuary and a moralist,” and it this figure riddled in contradiction who can consequently unite the contradicting French and English system in the way Lord Vincent proposes. Indeed, the epigraphs to *Pelham* are two, one French and one English:

Je suis peu sévère, mais sage—
Philosophe, mais amoureux
Mon art est de me rendre heureux,
J’y réussis—en faut-il davantage?
[I am somewhat austere, but sensible; philosophical yet amorous too; my aim is to please myself. I am successful—What more do I need?]

A complete gentleman, who, according to Sir Fopling, ought to dress well, dance well, fence well, have a genius for love letters, and an agreeable voice for a chamber.—Etherege (*P* xxxi)²⁶¹

The twin quotations signal the novel composed under the two systems, the two national colors that Lord Vincent imagines for his own novel. The quoting/quoted dandy, “a complete gentleman” is the reconciler of the oppositions, English and French, *sciences des lettres* and *sciences du monde*. Bulwer felt the need to write his second preface so as not to be

²⁶¹ Ibid., xxxi. From a facsimile of the title page. The translation of the French is McGann’s. It should be noted that since the French quotation has no attribution and is untraceable, it could be Bulwer-Lytton’s own composition, especially considering his description of the dandy hero in the Preface: “a personal combination of antitheses—a fop and philosopher, a voluptuary and a moralist—a trifler in appearances, but rather one to whom trifles are instructive than one to whom trifles are natural—an Aristuppus on a limited scale, accustomed to draw sage conclusions from the follies he adopts, and while professing himself a votary of Pleasure, in reality a disciple of Wisdom (xxxiii-xxxiv). It would still signify the author’s ability at last to inhabit France, at least for his own British audience and novel. The epigraph from Etherege is from *The Man of Mode* (1676).

misunderstood, and the misunderstanding he wants to clarify is that he is not Pelham. But what his preface reveals in the language it echoes from Lord Vincent's speech, its intervention, too, it seems, to clarify what "people as they are" really means, is that Bulwer's corollary in the novel might just as well be Lord Vincent.²⁶²

After Lady Roseville remarks gratefully that Lord Vincent has finally given us his own sense and not used quotation, Lord Vincent replies with a quotation from Edward Young: "Accept a miracle instead of wit." And with these words he seems to assure the reader that his not using quotations is a miracle, a rare occurrence, out of character, and not to be expected in nature. Quotation, after all, is the nature of fashioning in the dandy novel. It is the mechanism by which the dandy hero makes his entrée, the materials in which nations dress themselves for the international stage and the literary coterie, negotiating national character as characters in costume, for character is costume.

The Dandy in American Character

Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote in April of 1843 in *The Dial* magazine on American imports of British culture: "We go to school to Europe. We imbibe an European taste. Our education, so called, --our drilling at college, and our reading since,--has been European, and we write on the English culture and to an English public, in America and in Europe."²⁶³ Indeed, the climate of American culture at Harvard was thoroughly in the English fashion. James Russell Lowell, returning from England, set the Harvard fashion decked in top hat and frock, with his cane and

²⁶² It should be noted that Lord Vincent's political career does not reflect in his associates Bulwer's political beliefs. Pelham reflects Bulwer politically. At the same time, Lord Vincent confesses that he does not sympathize with his political associates either and sides with them as a means towards an end. He tells Pelham that their positions may very well be the same under different guises.

²⁶³ [Ralph W. Emerson], "Europe and European Books," *The Dial*, Apr. 1843, 511.

pipe, “a fashion that suggested in the words of the *Harvard Crimson*, ‘[the Harvard man] must be as Britannic as possible.’”²⁶⁴ Emerson, however, looks forward to a turn:

This powerful star [Europe], it is thought, will soon culminate and descend, and the impending reduction of the transatlantic excess of influence on the American education is already a matter of easy and frequent computation. Our eyes will be turned westward, and a new and stronger tone in literature will be the result. The Kentucky stump-oratory, the exploits of Boon and David Crockett, the journals of western pioneers, agriculturalists, and socialists, and letters of Jack Downing, are genuine growths, which are sought with avidity in Europe, where our European-like books are of no value. It is easy to see that soon the centre of population and property of the English race, which long ago began its travels, and which is still on the eastern shore will shortly hover midway over the Atlantic main, and then as certainly fall within the American coast, so that the writers of the English tongue shall write to the American and not to the island public, and then will the great Yankee be born.

Emerson predicts that European fashion will decrease and the American natural character will increase. The top hats and frock coats are traded in for coonskin cap and hunting shirt as Emerson directs our eyes westward to the frontier. Interestingly, he points out that American frontier literature is more popular in Europe than “our European-like books.” He seems to echo Vivian Grey’s point that depicting America is more profitable for the American writer in the European market as it is “an uncontested” field on the international literary stage.

Emerson has to set up this movement from the present-day European “excess of influence on the American education” to the prophecy of when “the great Yankee [will] be born” before he can return to appreciate and appraise the present influence: “But at present we have our culture from Europe and Europeans. Let us be content and thankful for these good gifts for a while yet.”²⁶⁵ He proceeds to review the current state of European literature, and comes round to its novels. First addressing the novels of Bulwer-Lytton, he credits him with adding “dignity and

²⁶⁴ Tamarkin, *Anglophilia*, 253.

²⁶⁵ Emerson, “Europe and European Books,” 512.

grace” to the “behavior of the ball room and the hotel” among the “most imitative class.”²⁶⁶

Emerson is no great reader of Bulwer, he admits, but has “read...enough” to confirm that Bulwer knows London society and can paint it well.

These small praises reveal that Emerson is not quite impressed, and as he begins to more systematically categorize the English novel, we get a clearer idea of where he stands. He offers a division of novels in two kinds, what we might already expect: the *novel of costume* and the *novel of character*:

We conceive that the obvious division of modern romance is into two kinds; first, the novels of costume or of circumstance, which is the old style, and vastly the most numerous. In this class, the hero without any particular character, is in a very particular circumstance; he is greatly in want of a fortune or a wife, and usually of both, and the business of the piece is to provide him suitably.²⁶⁷

It should be noted from the above description that Emerson’s novel of costume is not simply the fashionable novel, but takes on a wider scope to cover the British novel more generally, including those of Maria Edgeworth and Walter Scott. At issue here in the novel of costume is that the plot development is in the externals. There is no development of character as the hero is “without any particular character.”

This wider category of the novel of costume takes on the aristocratic pomposity frequently attributed to the silver fork. Emerson describes the American reader of these novels as a dupe, who follows the story of the hero and, once hero and wife are married at the end, is “instantly turned out of doors, like a beggar that has followed a gay procession into a castle.” He continues:

²⁶⁶ Ibid., 519.

²⁶⁷ Ibid.

Had one noble thought opening the chambers of the intellect, one sentiment from the heart of God been spoken by them, the reader had been made a participator of their triumph; he too had been an invited and eternal guest; but this reward granted them is property, all-excluding property, a little cake baked for them to eat and for none other, nay, a preference and cosseting which is rude and insulting to all but the minion.

The novel has a plot to give only its characters a certain property, offering no moral, nothing of intellectual value to the reader. Since the story ends at the wedding, Emerson's conclusion that the reader is not invited certainly corresponds to the effect, the shutting of the books figuring the shutting of the doors. The British novel of costume reflects an aristocratic, "let no one else eat cake" exclusivity that insults the republican spirit.

Far from being a trifling matter, fashion was targeted as a serious threat in the argument of literary nationalism. Indeed, criticism of American imitation of English fashions and, in particular of the fashionable novel often emphasized a dangerous influence of aristocracy against republican institutions. A two part essay on "American Literature" that ran in the *Knickerbocker* in 1835 advocated an American literature on American subjects, lamenting that "[w]e imitate foreign fashions...we have neither a national dress, a national taste, or a national character of our own."²⁶⁸ This results in "the strange phenomenon...of a country whose social habits are diametrically opposed to its political institutions." Its social habits, the writer argues, are tainted with aristocratic pretensions imbibed from the fashionable novel of England, and this foreign fixation "[holds] up to our imitation or admiration, precisely what, as republicans, we ought to neither imitate nor admire" and "weaken[s] the attachment to our republican system."²⁶⁹ And yet, it really is a trifling matter. After all, the connection between quotation or European imitation and aristocracy had been made since the founding of the republic, as evinced in

²⁶⁸ "American Literature: Number Two," *The Knickerbocker*, May 1835, 380.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 383.

“Thoughts on Quotations from Authors,” discussed in the previous chapter. The difference is that the connection is no longer advocating against aristocratic authority but aristocratic fashions.

What, for Emerson, “[opens] the chambers” of aristocratic exclusivity and makes the reader a “participator” is a different nobility, the “noble thought” or “sentiment from the heart of God,” something that renders, not property but character. Turning to the novel of character, Emerson asserts that it “treats the reader with more respect; a castle and a wife are not the indispensable conclusion, but the development of character being the problem, the reader is made to partake of the whole prosperity.”²⁷⁰ The reader can partake of the wisdom learned from the character’s *Bildung* whereas s/he gains nothing from the wedding at the end. The model of the novel of character for Emerson is Goethe’s *Wilhelm Meister*, that gives an image of ideal democratic society, where “the only power recognized is the force of character.”²⁷¹

After his discussion of character, Emerson moves to discuss more specifically the silver-fork novel, which he classifies predictably under the novel of costume, but one wonders why the novel of character came between the novel of costume or circumstance and the fashionable novel. The novel of costume does not present “one noble thought” to illumine the mind, but the fashionable novel, according to Emerson, “discuss[es] sun and planets, liberty and fate, love and death, over the soup.”²⁷² The fashionable novel presents thoughts that seem deep, but “over the soup,” suggests shallow treatment. They can in this way pretend to character, but for Emerson, they don’t qualify.

²⁷⁰ Emerson, “Europe and European Books,” 519.

²⁷¹ Ibid., 520.

²⁷² Ibid., 520.

Writing only five years after the coronation of Queen Victoria that sparked a wave of “Reginamania” in the nation, Emerson’s styling of the novel of character (for which he offers no British example) as participatory democracy and the British novel of costume as exclusionary aristocracy seems to forget, or to want to forget, how much the nation did participate in the British aristocratic forms of power.²⁷³ American interest in the aristocratic forms of England and in the fashionable novel recognized the dynamics of international fashioning and pageantry as another theater for national self-realization, as Elisa Tamarkin contends in her investigation of nineteenth-century fascination with all things England, *Anglophilia*. Discussing the Victorian imperial pageantry of the Prince of Wales’ tour of India in 1875-1876, Tamarkin states that “[t]he desperate anachronism of these gestures orchestrated a show of British rule as traditional, as rooted in the local character of even its most ‘exotic’ habitations, and despite all logic to the contrary, as participatory for how it invited colonial subjects to embrace the theatricality of their own domination.”²⁷⁴ These local pageants, as we saw in Gerson’s discussion of France and in the fictional Reisenburg, presented, according to Tamarkin, “a model of the state *as* a style.”²⁷⁵ In the colonial context of empire, this style takes the form of disguise. America, however, was not a colony of England, and so the theatricality of domination is “less historically fraught.” Rather than disguise, it is simply costume.

As pure theatricality, disconnected from British forms of power, what did the American connection to the British fashionable novel mean for American nationalism? What kind of vision did it present for the style of state and what did this mean for American national

²⁷³ Tamarkin, 30, 30-45.

²⁷⁴ Ibid., 35.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., 37.

character? One of the figures who participated thoroughly in celebrating the forms of England, saluting its queen and hobnobbing with its fashionables in his own dandy caliber was Nathaniel Parker Willis, foreign correspondent and editor of the *New-York Mirror* later the *Evening Mirror*. Willis had visited England and wrote back reports on the silver-fork scene, giving sketches on Lady Blessington's soirees and the conversations between D'Israeli, Bulwer, Count D'Orsay, *et al.*, for an American public eager to receive them. Sandra Tomc takes Willis as the emblem for an understanding of Old World fascination and mimicry/imitation where "the showy display of costumes or 'masks' borrowed from other cultures was in itself a mark of originality and was thus indigenous—paradoxically local—to the United States."²⁷⁶ She argues that Willis's imitation of Europe was not rooted in a desire for the object of imitation, but rejected its object, "declaring that copies were independent from originals, that they were, in fact, more original, more truly authentic."²⁷⁷ Tomc, therefore, reassigns Willis's dandy persona, not as a European form, but as the Jacksonian myth of the self-made man.

But Willis's valorization of the copy, the imitation, as authentic, falls precisely in the logic of the British fashionable novel's dandy hero. Rather than reassign his self-fashioning from a European form to an American one, I would like to hold the two together. Willis made his *entrée* in the 1820s on the dandy model. Like Grey, he had no rank or riches, but made his way into the Boston elite circles through his literary talents and fashion. Willis carries his extravagant proto-Wildean dandy fashion with an air such that *entrée* "among the dignitaries" is a virtual given.²⁷⁸ He was singularly identified with his clothes, so that it was imagined that

²⁷⁶ Sandra Tomc, "Restyling an Old World: Nathaniel Parker Willis and Metropolitan Fashion in the Antebellum United States," *Representations* 85, no 1 (2004), 99.

²⁷⁷ Tomc, "Restyling," 100.

²⁷⁸ Qtd. In Tomc, "Restyling," 101-2.

clothing was all there was to him. Tomc finds in this empty suit image the break from European imitation, replacing the original object with a blank. But if we remove from imitation the need for an original, we find N.P. Willis participating in the British dandiacal tradition that maintained the equivalence of character and costume, or a costume where there was no character underneath.

Willis's participation in the European dandiacal fashion was, nevertheless, still part of an American nationalism. In his "Lecture On Fashion" before the New York Lyceum, he makes a similar move to Emerson's, assessing the American importation of Europe of his present day and deriving from this a prophetic vision of the future of American national character. He notes the rapidity with which European fashions are adopted in America, "Nothing appears abroad—in dress, equipage, usage of society, style of furniture or mode of amusement, that is not conjured over the water with ariel quickness, copied with marvellous fidelity in New York, and incorporated at once into national habitation."²⁷⁹ American women, he attests, are not behind in French fashion, and European things even take on faster in America than in Europe in Willis's depiction, as the New York gentleman are wearing the latest in St. James Street fashion before it reaches beyond Temple Bar. He concludes:

We copy everything we can hear of—import and imitate instantly every new model of equipage—follow every whim of society, take the new dance, the new by-word, the new public amusement,—and enter heart and soul into every rage that is handed over to us, dramatic, operatic, sumptuary, and literary. This daguerreotype imitation is no less improving in its results, however, than it is miraculous for its facile rapidity. We have beaten England and France in progressive civilization and elevation, three centuries in one. At this rate, and with the increasing facilities of commerce, we shall soon have nothing to learn from Europe, but what transpires between the traverses of packets—and when that period arrives, we shall be, of all countries the most cosmopolite—comparing

²⁷⁹ Nathaniel Parker Willis, *Lecture on Fashion, Delivered Before the New York Lyceum, June, 1844* (New York: Mirror Library, 1844), 7.

with other nations as the enlightened and liberal traveler compares with the home-keeping villager.²⁸⁰

The rampant imitation of Europe, Willis contends, was “no less improving” for nationalism. As with the eighteenth-century culture of emulation, nineteenth-century imitation meant rivalry as well; Willis describes learning Europe until there is nothing left to learn, and in this way, his imitating European fashions resembles Emerson’s nationalist vision. Both imagine a nation that in one form or another leaves Europe in the dust. Emerson’s vision ends in the birth of the great Yankee. Willis’s ends in “the most cosmopolite” country.

The distinction between the Yankee and cosmopolite vision of the American future hinges on where Emerson and Willis see the place of fashion in American society. Since Emerson saw the novel of costume as aristocratic and exclusive, his vision of the American future was a movement away from fashion to Nature, from costume to character, participatory and democratic. Willis’s “Lecture on Fashion,” however calls for a government of fashion. After discussing the mark of the English and French fashionable classes, he notes that America does not have a clearly defined mark of fashionableness, no distinct fashionable class, and calls for such a class for the sake of republicanism, for fashion, he argues, bears a republican principle:

The very core and essence of that which constitutes a republic is the first principle in fashion—rebellion against unnatural authority. What would be the state of England at this enlightened day, with no counterpoise to that nobility which is an accident of birth, and no asylum in society from the overbearing haughtiness of official and court privilege? There would be a tyranny of ill-endowed aristocrats [...] Now, there is a republic in the heart of monarchical England—*fashion*, ruled by the manifest stamp of superiority. There is a republic in the heart of monarchical France—*fashion*, ruled by wit and intellect. These are intermediate powers inseparable from a state of high civilization, let the government be what it will. Under the two hoary monarchies just named, they are

²⁸⁰ Ibid.

a check to the tyranny of rank, the insolence of wealth and pomposity of the court—to all of which intolerable evils the smile or frown of fashion is wholesomely and triumphantly paramount.²⁸¹

Fashion, Willis here claims, constitutes a republic because it is the authority that even the highest powers obey, and its own authority is natural, as opposed to the “unnatural authority” of monarchical government. Natural authority, we can infer, is the authority of some mark of merit, not “that nobility which is an accident of birth,” “the ill-endowed aristocrat.”

Taking the authority of fashion as natural, Willis reconciles fashion to nature, an equation that in the dandy novel produced naturalization. This naturalization spoke to the conditions of *entrée*. In the authority of merit, we see that what Willis finds in fashion that he values is social mobility and the opportunity for *entrée*, the recognized authority of a person of talent like Vivian Grey. Indeed, when Willis makes his case that New York has no distinct fashionable class because it has no fixed mark of fashion, he brings this to the question of social mobility. After investigating the possibilities for the mark of fashion in New York that decides the fashionable class, he asks “are these attractions, in a youth of unknown family and of no fortune, sufficient to give him, in New York as in England, easy access to fashionable circles, and consequence and influence, the town over, in all matters of taste and elegance?”²⁸² What fashion allows is the opportunity for a “youth of unknown family and no fortune” to make his *entrée* into consequence and influence.

Fashion constitutes a republic in the heart of monarchies, because it is an authority that the rulers obey and that is generally inhabitable. This same authority constitutes an aristocracy in the republic, as an authority that the people obey and that would be inhabitable by a select set

²⁸¹ Nathaniel Parker Willis, *Lecture on Fashion*, 9-10.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, 9.

of merit. But it is an aristocracy to serve the republic. Willis considers republican government under the danger of an even greater tyranny because unimpeachable, the tyranny of the people, of “public opinion.”²⁸³ To protect the republican individual, he calls for the institution of an American literary aristocracy, the fashionable class. Ultimately, he agrees with Emerson’s equation of fashion with aristocracy, but he joins aristocracy to the republic as well, reconciling fashion to the republic, costume to national character.

What is the role of quotations in this literary aristocratic republic? In its first issue of the year 1845, the *Knickerbocker* published an installment of the very popular Polygon Papers on “Quoters and Quotations, Plagiarists and Plagiarisms” that proposed sumptuary laws for “the Republic of Letters.”²⁸⁴ The writer opens with an address to the reader on the inevitability of falling into the sterile abundance of quotations at *soirées* and *conversaziones* “because Fashion has established the reign of this glittering inanity.”²⁸⁵ He proposes a law that would forbid writers being “decorated in a style above his visible resources, or his fair and legitimate credit.”²⁸⁶ He essentially proposes reducing the fashioning in self-fashioning, rendering style more synchronous with natural character. The effect would be class distinction:

²⁸³ Ibid. 11.

²⁸⁴ “Polygon Papers, Number Twelve: Quoters and Quotations, Plagiarists and Plagiarisms,” *The Knickerbocker*, Jan. 1845, 32-42. The authorship of the Polygon Papers is still uncertain. The *Merchant’s Magazine and Commercial Review* and *The Ladies’ Companion and Literary Expositor* attributed the series to Harry Franco, the *nom de plume* of Charles F. Briggs. See “The Book Trade,” *The Merchant’s Magazine and Commercial Review*, Jul. 1843, 104; “Editor’s Table,” *The Ladies’ Companion, and Literary Expositor; a Monthly Magazine Embracing Every Department of Literature*, Jun. 1843, 104. The *Boston Courier* assigns it to Henry W. Herbert. See “Literary Notices,” *Boston Courier*, November 14, 1844, 1. Yale’s *Statistics of the Class of 1837* attributes it to alumnus Horace Benjamin Colton, who in 1837 assumed the name William Henry Herbert. See *Statistics of the Class of 1837; From 1837 to 1847, with a Notice of Their Meeting Held at Yale College, August 19, 1847, Published by Order of the Class* (New Haven: Byington & Adams, 1847), 13.

²⁸⁵ “Quoters and Quotations,” 33.

²⁸⁶ Ibid., 39.

Then it would no longer be with men's spiritual, as it is with their bodily clothing. The mental robes and jewelry of our intellectual princes would no longer become the livery of their footmen, and descend from the lackeys to set off the apish antics and coarse buffoonery of Jack Puddings in the circus [...] Were the man of talents to be robbed of any of his elegant attire, he would not as now perspire with terror lest it should disgrace its former weaver by appearing on the person of a small-beer guzzler in a hedge-tavern [...] The scriblerian menials, the mobocrats among the *literati*, would revert to their natural and proper level, and, associating among themselves, living upon each other, would fear to grasp heartily by the hand, and slap familiarly on the shoulder, the autocracy of the mind. Then quotations would resume their legitimate office, tallying in some degree with the context, and a worthless book would not so often resemble a linsey-woolsey coat embroidered with gold-lace. Could a poor goose of an author then peep into the future, and see how he would be plucked by the geese among posterity, he might be reasonably content; for his starveling plumage would grow on cacklers of the same silly feather.

What the writer sees as the problem with quotation in the fashionable circles is precisely the social mobility that quotation enables, the ability of "footmen," "Jack Puddings," and "the small-beer guzzler" to appear in the clothing of "intellectual princes." In the "natural and proper level," the "autocracy of the mind" is inapproachable as the lower orders are instilled with fear of the lord. In a revision of Irving's "Art of Bookmaking," returned to the anthropomorphized aviary of Aesop's Jackdaw fable, the authors who regard the future authors in their borrowing of plumes are not angry and vengeful but content as the authors borrowing are birds of a feather. But while regulation of quotation renders a natural equality within separate and distinct hierarchical spheres where authors need not deplume their peers of their borrowing and dare not borrow plumes from their betters, if there is no danger of *exeunt*, neither is their opportunity for entrée between spheres. Yet, the distinction of spheres maybe represents an alternate vision of entrée where a book can be recognized and judged by its cover.

The sumptuary law on the republic of letters seems itself quite unnatural. It reflects the regulation of space to render a natural appearance, but that natural appearance is itself fashioned

by law. The nature of quotations in this nineteenth-century culture is fashion, and as such it offers itself to the project of national *entrée*, either through a socially mobilized *entrée* or the *entrée* of distinction. But it seems that either way the dandiacal tradition was right, that character is always costume, a thing fashioned for the purposes of *entrée*. Read this way, fashion, it would appear, is indeed multiply natural.

Fashioning Nature: The Art of the Preserve and Righting Plots

Nine years after Geoffrey Crayon's travel account was received by the reading public on both sides of the Atlantic, the same public was presented with the account of another "travelling bachelor," but this bachelor traveled in the other direction. James Fenimore Cooper's *Notions of the Americans; Picked Up by a Travelling Bachelor* (1828) was written as a European travelogue on America. Told as a series of letters to the components of a club of traveling bachelors, the epistler describes his American tour in the company of John Cadwallader of Cadwallader, an American who serves as his cultural informant and as Cooper's mouthpiece on American manners. That Cooper's bachelor travels in the opposite direction of Geoffrey Crayon already begins to suggest that these two figures will have opposing views. The bachelor abandons his plans to meet a fellow club member in Turkey after his encounter with Cadwallader en route between Moscow and Poland, deciding instead to join Cadwallader on his return to America. What attracts the bachelor to America, in contrast with the "accumulated treasures of the age" that attracted Crayon to Europe, is "a soil that is still virgin," "new scenes," "so much that is fresh," a country whose influence is "so much independence and manliness of thought."²⁸⁷

Cooper himself admitted he did not see eye to eye with Irving. In a letter to mutual friend Rufus Wilmot Griswold in 1842, he complained of Irving's career, literary and political,

²⁸⁷ James Fenimore Cooper, *Notions of the Americans; Picked Up by a Travelling Bachelor*, vol. 1 (1828, New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, rpt. 1963), 1, 3.

which he deemed “of a piece.”²⁸⁸ Of Irving’s faults, Cooper wrote, “They were all meannesses, and I confess I can sooner pardon crimes, if they are manly ones.”²⁸⁹ He references obliquely Irving’s “[double-dealings]” with the rights of his *Columbus*, but we might infer from the conclusion of his letter, where he states “This country must outgrow its adulation of foreigners, Englishmen in particular, as children outgrow the rickets,” that the problem Cooper found with Irving was precisely this foreign direction.²⁹⁰ Irving’s literary career became increasingly marked by representations of other countries and cultures, and his political career of ambassadorship similarly pulled him away from America.

We can see this counterpoint between Cooper and Irving over American relationship to foreigners in their literature as well, particularly the attitudes toward quotation. When Crayon witnessed and considered quotation in European learning, he saw a natural ecology. When Cooper’s bachelor witnessed and considered quotation in American learning, it smacked of something unnatural:

I have heard, I will confess, an American legislator quote Horace and Cicero; but it is far from being the humour of the country. I thought the taste of the orator questionable. A learned quotation is rarely in any use in an argument, since few men are fools enough not to see that the application of any maxim to politics is liable to a thousand practical objections, and nine times in ten, they are evidences of the want of a direct, natural, and vigorous train of thought. They are the affectations, but rarely the ebullitions of true talent...The Americans are strong speakers and acute thinkers, but no great quoters[...].²⁹¹

²⁸⁸ Cooper to Griswold, August 7, 1842, *The Letters and Journals of James Fenimore Cooper*, vol. 4, ed. James Franklin Beard (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1964), 306. Also quoted in Benjamin Lease, *Anglo-American Encounters: England and the Rise of American Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

²⁸⁹ Ibid.

²⁹⁰ Ibid., 307.

²⁹¹ James Fenimore Cooper, *Notions of the Americans; Picked Up by a Travelling Bachelor*, vol. 2 (1828, New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, rpt. 1963), 95-96.

Again we are told that Americans are not given to quotation, this time because Americans are “direct, natural, and vigorous” in thought, and quotation is “affectation,” unable to stand up to “practical” objections. We know, as did Cooper, that this was a fiction. In his *Letter to His Countrymen*, written in 1834 to respond to criticisms he had received during his European sojourn and to address his own critiques of the state of the nation, Cooper described the opposite reality: “The practice of quoting the opinions of foreign nations, by way of helping to make up its own estimate of the degree of merit that belongs to its public men, is, I believe, a custom peculiar to America.”²⁹² Cooper denounces this practice as “destructive of those sentiments of self-respect, of that manliness and independence of thought that are necessary to render a people great or a nation respectable.”²⁹³ While Washington Irving found in quotation a tool for self-fashioning, Cooper here renders it self-destructive.

Though Cooper and Irving seem diametrically opposed, I argue that they are not so different. There is a sense in which Cooper’s *Notions of the Americans* shares a tradition with Irving’s *Sketch-Book*. Both, after all, are seeking European recognition of their American authorship. Cooper’s career had been marked by a ferocious effort at literary entrée on both sides of the Atlantic. In *Notions*, his discussion on American literature highlights the obstacles to overcome before “it can ever enter the markets of its own country on terms of perfect equality with that of England.”²⁹⁴ A significant factor in this issue was the culture of reprinting and the absence of international copyright, discussed by Meredith McGill and Martin T. Buinicki. Cooper was actively interested in the movement for international copyright, and, in the

²⁹² Qtd. in Martin T. Buinicki, *Negotiating Copyright: Authorship and the Discourse of Literary Property Rights in Nineteenth Century America* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 21.

²⁹³ Ibid.

²⁹⁴ Cooper, *Notions*, vol. 2, 106.

meantime, trying to figure out how to copyright his works on both sides of the Atlantic. Though American copyright law only protected the work of citizens, British copyright law protected any work produced within its confines. It was, then, common practice for American authors in Europe to receive petitions from fellow American authors across the Atlantic to secure copyrights for them. A friend of Cooper sought precisely this assistance from Washington Irving for Cooper's second novel *The Spy*, but Irving's delay in reply resulted in an unauthorized British reprint before copyright could be secured.²⁹⁵

The absence of international copyright and the different copyright laws governing the American and British literary markets raise the same question that emerged from Irving's *Sketch-Book*, namely the relationship between a text and the soil, but inflected with the concern of ownership. We might revise the question, does an American book, outside of America still fall under American legislative property protection? Does an English book, outside of England, still fall under English legislative property protection? If an American book outside of America *does* still fall under American legal property, then the book does verily take on nationality—a national literature, indeed. Within the concern of ownership, the relationship between text and soil takes on another dimension: a similarity of objects the claims of ownership to which must always be plotted through negotiation of rights.

Cooper's novels often engage with the plotting of national territory, the claims of the white men and the red men and the rights of national inheritance. Though framed within the dynamics of American wilderness and civilization, the settler American and the native American, scholars have frequently noticed a substitution, or what Jared Gardner calls “the vanishing act”

²⁹⁵ Martin T. Buinicki, 15. This may have been part of the bad feeling Cooper had for Irving, but this is simply speculation on my part.

where, as with the plot of *The Pioneers* (1823), the Indian becomes a Brit.²⁹⁶ Leslie Fiedler also observes a substitution rooted in American imitation of Europe where Cooper converts Walter Scott's contests of Highland and Lowland, Saxon and Norman, to "Indian and white, American and European."²⁹⁷ Ezra Tawil posits another substitution, where Cooper uses the novels about Native Americans to address the issue of slavery and nineteenth-century notions of race.²⁹⁸ Gardner similarly discusses the slave in Cooper's *Notions* as another form of the Vanishing Indian, a move he has to make to address the European critique of American hypocrisy, boasting a republican freedom while sanctioning slavery.²⁹⁹ In some form or another, Cooper's plots, whether about the American settler and the American native, the American master and the American slave, seem always about America's relationship to England.

Cooper's national plots, then, are engaged in international contest. This constitutes what Benjamin Lease has called "the two voices of Fenimore Cooper—one artificial and derivative, the second natural and colloquial."³⁰⁰ In Fiedler's assessment, Cooper, whose first novel *Precaution* was an outright imitation of Jane Austen and who continued his initial literary entrée under the pen-name 'Jane Morgan,' never quite escaped imitation even when he came into his American manly tradition. His novel *The Spy* Fiedler describes as "an American imitation of the kind of book written by Europeans for whom the United States is a symbol of primitivism and

²⁹⁶ See Jared Gardner, *Master Plots: Race and the Founding of An American Literature, 1787-1845* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 81-124.

²⁹⁷ Leslie A. Fiedler, *Love and Death in the American Novel* (New York: Criterion Books, 1960), 185.

²⁹⁸ See Ezra Tawil, *The Making of Racial Sentiment: Slavery and the Birth of the Frontier Romance* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

²⁹⁹ Gardner, 100. The vanishing black is Cooper's way to mark the slavery issue as irrelevant in the assessment of American character, but Gardner's and Tawil's readings find him tripping up on the slave in the process.

³⁰⁰ Benjamin Lease, 46.

anti-culture.”³⁰¹ Fiedler’s version of Cooper’s two voices renders Cooper’s novels as, for the European, the romantic imaginary of pre-civilized space and for the American, a space of nostalgia for the American past that enacts its own sense of sophistication. *The Spy* as an American imitating a European form about America bears resemblance to *Notions of the Americans* and Cooper’s attempt to speak two voices, the bachelor’s and Cadwallader’s.

These two voices, however, are manifold, or to use Cooper’s term in *The Pioneers*, “a composite order.” Colleen Glenney Boggs discusses Cooper as having founded a “world literature,” a claim she derives from Bryant’s tribute to Cooper after his death, wherein he discusses the translatability of Cooper’s works.³⁰² Boggs highlights how Cooper often crafted his writing as translation and how his footnotes are frequently engaged in discussions of language and etymology. Cooper’s sense of language, according to Boggs, is informed by Adam Smith who in his *Theory of Moral Sentiments* described language as developing through a discursive process by which two speakers negotiate their immediate concerns into a wider framework.³⁰³ Following his own brand of Smith’s philosophy, Cooper situates his attempt at a national idiom, a national literature, as a discursive process. Boggs argues that he “thinks of nationalism as a displaced discourse that negotiates its relationship to global as well as local concerns through a process of translation that occurs in a ‘neutral ground’[...].”³⁰⁴ I would like to contend that this neutral ground is quotation.

³⁰¹ Fiedler, 180.

³⁰² Colleen Glenney Boggs, *Transnationalism and American Literature: Literary Translation 1773-1892* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 61.

³⁰³ Boggs, 64-65.

³⁰⁴ Ibid., 62.

Cooper, after all, is actually a great quoter. His two voices speak to the tradition of imitation, the practice of speaking an other, and figure quotation's essential ambivalence, the balance of assimilation and dissimulation. His nationalist discourse, written in the language of nature and preoccupied with natural rights and preservation, is a fashioning of nature: the preserve that Irving came to experience in the British Library in "The Art of Book-making." Reading *The Pioneers* as a metaphor not only of natural or national property and inheritance but international literary property and inheritance, i.e., the movement for international copyright, I locate Cooper's own version of the preserve, naturalization, that comprises the fashioning of nature we find in *The Last of the Mohicans*. Cooper emerges as much as a fashioner of quotations as Irving, though he doesn't fashion the dapper gentleman, but the simultaneous stripping and dressing of the gentleman into a composite naturalization.

Game Laws and Property Rights: Naturalizing Preservation

In *The Pioneers*, Judge Marmaduke Temple and Leather-stocking are concerned about the excesses of settlement. Temple worries about the excessive felling of trees, the excessive hunting of deer and birds and fish, even as he is the force behind the settling of the Otsego region. The Sheriff, Temple's cousin Richard Jones, seems to get at the dilemma in Temple's position, mocking Temple's gloomy speech about the fish which "like all the other treasures of the wilderness,...already begin to disappear before the wasteful extravagance of man."³⁰⁵ He interjects:

Disappear, 'duke! Disappear!...If you don't call this appearing, I know not what you will. Here are a good thousand of the shiners, some hundreds of suckers, and a powerful quantity of other fry. But this is always the way with you, Marmaduke; first it's the trees, then it's the deer, after that it's the maple sugar, and so on until the end of the chapter.

³⁰⁵ James Fenimore Cooper, *The Pioneers* (1823; New York: Penguin, 1988), 260. Hereafter cited parenthetically, (TP).

One day, you talk of canals, through a country where there's a river or a lake every half-mile, just because the water won't run the way you wish it to go; and the next, you say something about mines of coal, though any man who has good eyes, like myself—I say with good eyes—can see more wood than would keep the city of London in fuel for fifty years.” (TP 260)

Marmaduke's penchant for structural regulation is both cause and effect of the need for it. It is the regulation of space in the very fact of settlement, the manipulation of nature for civilization that creates the problem, the lack, which then requires regulation. In contrast to Temple's sense of structural regulation is Leather-stocking's personal sense of regulation, one characteristic of the people of the wilderness, the natives and the hunters. It is the age-old battle of farmers and hunters.

The Templeton settlement is figured on Cooperstown in a rewrite of Cooper's family history. In the novel, Marmaduke Temple receives the lands as a trust from his friend, the loyalist Tory Lord Effingham, during the Revolution. Cooper's father William Cooper similarly received the land from the loyalist George Croghan, only it was not an exchange between friends but a coup over the bankrupt Croghan in legal battles that extended into the next century.³⁰⁶ William P. Kelly and Jared Gardner both find in Cooper's revision of his father's story an exploration of the nation's relationship to paternal England and questions of literary inheritance.³⁰⁷ Kelly positions Cooper's narrative between two contradictory goals, a national

³⁰⁶ See Gardner, 86-87; for a psychological reading of the Templeton-Cooperstown relationship, see Stephen Railton, *Fenimore Cooper: A Study of His Life and Imagination* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978), 75-113. For another biographical reading of William Cooper as Judge Temple focused on ideologies of nature and conservation, see Lloyd Willis, *Environmental Evasion: The Literary, Critical, and Cultural Politics of Nature's Nation* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2011), 43-47. Buinicki also discusses a Cooper fictionalizing of the Cooperstown family history in *Home As Found*, where Cooper returns to Templeton under the Effinghams to discuss the Three Mile Point controversy. See Buinicki, 27-36.

³⁰⁷ See William P. Kelly, *Plotting America's Past: James Fenimore Cooper and the Leatherstocking Tales* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983), 1-43.

departure from the past and the right of inheritance of a tradition for national continuity.³⁰⁸ Both Kelly and Gardner demonstrate how the novel reconciles these goals through narrative plotting. I am interested in how this narrative plot is fashioned according to property rights, which in turn participate in the fashioning of nature and literary tradition. The questions of literary space that Irving explored graft themselves onto Cooper's questions of national space: how to make way for a new nation and a new national literature within America, and how does it advance?

The plot of the tale begins with the problem of rights after Leather-stocking and a young hunter, Oliver Edwards, quarrel with Temple over rights to a buck. Temple, learning that he has shot the young hunter instead of the deer, extends to Edwards "the right to shoot deer, or bears, or any thing thou pleasest in my woods, forever. Leather-stocking is the only other man that I have granted the same privilege to" (*TP* 25). This question of the young man's right to the buck arises again when Richard tries to arrange a deal with Edwards to leave him the rest of the deer but to keep the saddle. Edward claims the protection of the law over his right to what he has killed and Temple leaves him the whole deer, to which Richard responds to his cousin:

Well, 'duke, you are your own master, but I would have tried law for the saddle, before I would have given it to the fellow. Do you not own the mountains, as well as the valleys? Are not the woods your own? What right has this chap, or the Leather-stocking, to shoot in your woods, without your permission?...There is Mohegan, to-be-sure, he may have some right, being a native; but it's little the poor fellow can do now with his rifle. How is this managed in France, Monsieur Le Quoi? Do they let every body run over your land, in that country, helter-skelter, as they do here, shooting the game, so that a gentleman has but little or no chance with his gun? (93)

What is being considered here is the relationship between the law and natural rights, whether the law protects natural rights or supersedes them. Oliver Edwards claims his natural right over what he has killed and pushes for the law to protect that right. Richard, however, here speaks the

³⁰⁸ Kelly, 27.

law as sovereign over natural rights. His question, “Do you not own the mountains, as well as the valleys?”, casts the law of property rights in an unnatural or supranatural position. After dismissing native rights, Richard then takes the question internationally, seeking to test how the rules and conditions of other nations compare. He articulates the contest as one between natural rights and international legal rights.

Ezra Tawil has explored the discrepancies in the logic of natural rights within the discourse of slavery, a discrepancy Cooper grappled with in his political writings. While natural rights theory posited that persons in nature are in a state of total freedom and perfect equality and in entering into civil society sacrifice a portion of that freedom and equality for general security, Cooper, in order to reconcile slavery to American democracy, denies natural equality and has government existing to regulate the fact of inequality.³⁰⁹ This, as Tawil notes, “dramatically shifted the emphasis” with regard to government and nature.³¹⁰ There are correspondences between nature’s relationship to law in Cooper’s racial thinking according to Tawil and in his environmental thinking according to Lloyd Willis. Willis counters scholars who read in Cooper an expansionist myth-builder by contextualizing his novels in the contemporary federalist discourse of conservation. Reading his father William Cooper’s *A Guide in the Wilderness* (1810) and Timothy Dwight’s *Travels in New-England and Neew York* (1821-1822) as representatives of the federalist vision of American civilization’s expansion across the wilderness, he notes that even when they entertain worries of environmental depletion, their proposed solution to threat is “a faith in the regenerative capacity of the natural world[...].”³¹¹

³⁰⁹ Tawil, 76-78.

³¹⁰ Ibid., 78.

³¹¹ Lloyd Willis, 45.

Cooper's novels, he argues, reveal a loss of faith in this federalist optimism, where the wilderness is no longer a virgin soil into which society expands, but always the seat of conflict that reveals the bloody trail of Euro-American civilization. He argues that Cooper's environmental conservationism reveals a criticism of American expansion, contrary to the critical consensus. In both Tawil's and Willis's reading, nature is subordinated to law and civil society.

If we read William Cooper and Dwight's federalist faith in nature's regeneration on the level of the literary, it becomes Irving's literary ecology. Cooper's rejection of the optimism that human fashioning of civilization will be corrected by nature results in the necessity for human fashioning to fashion nature itself: the art of the preserve. We can, then, understand why for Cooper national entrée on the literary scene had to come through copyright, legal intervention into the natural circulation of texts. Irving, too, of course, had supported international copyright, but he had a surprising, and for the more vigorous supporters, frustrating way of failing to lend much help to the movement. He refused to sign Henry Clay's 1837 Appeal for International Copyright on the grounds of "phraseology," as he explained in *The Knickerbocker* where he did express his support without quite explaining what it was about the phrasing he "did not relish."³¹² When Cornelius Matthews asked him to write something for his magazine on the matter, his response was "I have no idea of 'employing my pen publicly in advocacy of this interest,'" though it has been noted that the rejection may have had more to do with his dislike of Matthews

³¹² Washington Irving, "International Copy-Right Law," *The Knickerbocker* Jan. 1840, 78-79.

than of the subject matter.³¹³ Irving's record in the international copyright movement, like his views on the nature of literary property in the *Sketch-book*, remained rather ambivalent.

Cooper, however, seems to have been convinced of the limits of natural *and* literary ecology to sustain an advancing career, either the nation's or an author's, and that legal intervention was necessary. His role in the Copyright movement, nevertheless, was no less ambivalent. During Charles Dickens's tour of the United States in 1842, where he tried to unite American authors with British authors in support of international copyright, he claimed that James Fenimore Cooper had signed the petition. In an editorial to the *Evening Post*, Cooper in the firmest terms denied the claim, saying, "I wish for no *international* legislation on any subject and least of all with England."³¹⁴ Martin Buinicki, in his thorough analysis of Cooper's copyright activity, surmises that his refusal to join Dickens's campaign stemmed from a need to dissociate himself from the vituperative response Dickens was receiving.³¹⁵ Dickens, too, had just published the kind of travel narrative on America he had written his *Notions* against less than twenty years before.

In the same editorial letter, however, he does make a different case for international copyright in terms of the golden rule; it was a cause he had long been interested and advocated in letters to the publisher and among his literary compatriots. In his *Notions*, he had already taken up the cause of international copyright, writing in the character of the bachelor: "The fact, that an American publisher can get an English work without money, must, for a few years longer,

³¹³ Catherine Seville, *The Internationalisation of Copyright Law: Books, Buccaneers and the Black Flag in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 164. Seville notes that he might have declined Matthews's request on account of the requester and not of the subject matter.

³¹⁴ James Fenimore Cooper, Letter of August 6, 1842 to the Editors of the *Evening Post*. *The Letters and Journals of James Fenimore Cooper*, vol. 4, ed. James Franklin Beard (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1964), 302.

³¹⁵ For an excellent study of Dickens's tour and its response, see McGill, 76-108.

(unless legislative protection shall be extended to their own authors,) have a tendency to repress a national literature.”³¹⁶ While only suggesting it in parentheses, it reveals much: that a “national literature” can only be expressed with the extension of legislative protection of foreign authors, where I see “protection” having the function of the preserve. The preserve is necessary for entrée.

Nevertheless, it was not easy to support international copyright before a reading public. As Buinicki notes, “The copyright debate was framed in such a way as to oppose the elitist English authors against the humble ‘everyman’ of the United States. Few congressmen were willing to see themselves cast as supporting the British.”³¹⁷ It would appear that the American public may have been willing to participate in the forms of British aristocracy from, as Tamarkin points out, a position of political freedom, but copyright took the form of a political legislative restriction of the British that its opponents used to turn public opinion away from it. Readers did not buy the nationalist claims to copyright, as the regulation of texts spoke simultaneously of the restriction of knowledge of the populace that could in no way be justified as nationalist and of the monopoly, the government sponsored economic oppression of the people. If the American copyright movement was to convince the reading public, it had to reconcile restriction with public progress and law as the guarantor of natural rights.

While Cooper, like Irving, had to be careful with public political expressions of copyright support—he also failed to join the American Copyright Club in 1843 though he insisted “I would cheerfully join them, did I join any thing”—where he paints a less ambivalent picture is in his fiction where the logic of the preserve, the legal regulation of natural rights to property, is most

³¹⁶ Cooper, *Notions*, vol. 2, 106.

³¹⁷ Buinicki, 51.

frequently at play.³¹⁸ Buinicki offers readings of *Home As Found* and *The Littlepage Manuscripts*, centered on controversies of individual ownership rights over public use rights, that reveal Cooper's justification of the necessity of international copyright. The logic of preservation established in *The Pioneers* appears at the foundation, however, of Cooper's copyright support.

But if, as I am arguing, *The Pioneers* figures the problem of literary and national space as the preserve, necessary for sustainable entrée, why do the two representatives of the law, Judge Temple and the Sheriff Richard Jones, end up so terribly mistaken? Things go astray when the characters read *native* and *natural* instead of *naturalization*. Considered by all to be a miscegenated Indian based on the speculation of Richard and others of the town, Oliver Edward's resentment of Temple is attributed to scorn over the loss of his natural rights. Another speculation that begins the meat of the plot is that Edwards, Leather-stocking and the Mohegan Chingachgook are connected in a pursuit to find gold in the mountains. Both Temple and Richard suspect the possibility of mines. Richard says, "reasoning from analogy, as you say, if there be mines in South America, ought there not to be mines in North America, too?" (TP 319). Following these narratives particularly native to America, Richard reads a conspiracy of the hunters:

But listen: you are not to be told that the natives have long known the use of gold and silver; now who so likely to be acquainted where they are to be found, as the ancient inhabitants of a country? I have the best reasons for believing that both Mohegan and the

³¹⁸ Buinicki, 39. The reason I see Irving's position on copyright as more ambivalent than Cooper's is that Irving did not have the same vulnerability to public pressure that Cooper did. His address on the issue in the *Knickerbocker* was prefaced with the editor's stressing his disinterestedness as an author who was actually successful on both sides of the Atlantic as he was able to secure copyrights on both sides of the Atlantic. Irving himself also noted that he stood nothing to gain from the question as he had retired from his literary career. His refusals to more publicly advocate the cause I read then as more ideologically motivated, caught in the fundamental ambivalence expressed in his *Sketch-Book*, than due, as in Cooper's case, to the need not to fall out of favor with a literary public he's still writing to.

Leather-stocking have been privy to the existence of a mine, in this very mountain, for years. (*TP* 319).

This suspicion leads to the framing of Leather-stocking, the overstatement and excess of the powers of the law. It is only when the truth is revealed that Edwards' resentment comes not from losing a native right but losing his right as an Effingham and that what Leather-stocking conceals in his hut is not the riches of the American mountains but the poverty of the old Tory soldier, Oliver's grandfather, that Temple commands the forces of law to "March thy soldiers back again, and dismiss them; the zeal of the Sheriff has much mistaken his duty" (*TP* 438). The judge relinquishes his right to judge the stranger, telling the grandson Effingham "Thou shalt be thyself the judge" (*TP* 439). Temple reveals that during the political rift between friends over the cause of the revolution he remained loyal both to the independent nation and to the loyalist. He restores the right of Effingham. The Mohegan and the Tory are killed off since, as native and willful foreigner, they fail to be legible in the logic of naturalization.

The only person who reads Edwards properly is the young lawyer Lippet. When Edwards comes upon the young lawyer Lippet, whom Cooper describes as "belong[ing] to the more intelligent class," he tells Lippet, "I am a native of this state" to which Lippet replies, "Well, I've often heard that point disputed; but it's so easy to get a man naturalized, that it's of little consequence where he was born" (*TP* 339). Lippet is the only one who doubts Edwards/Effingham is a native, and this is linked to his awareness of naturalization. Naturalization is the way out of the dispute over "native of state," the property rights, and regulation of the land. Granting the non-native the same rights as the native through the law of government, it reconciles the British claim of property to the native/American claim of property. It also establishes the ability of the law to fashion something that looks like nature, has the

properties of nature, but is fundamentally fashioned nature. Naturalization emerges as the figure of the logic of the preserve.

Engendering a Neutral Ground: The Nature of Representation

With naturalization, Cooper's logic of the preserve leaves us where Irving's self-fashioning of the dapper gentleman left us. This opens the door to the possibility that Cooper and Irving may look more alike than we might have ventured. After all, both were considered the "American Scott," both, as we have said, had a transatlantic interest in entrée, and both quote. Despite Cooper's claims on quotation, his novels follow the convention of the chapter epigraphs. Related to this, I would like to also highlight that Cooper, like Irving, had an eye for clothing. Consider that in *The Last of the Mohicans* one of the most prominent "scenes" in the opening chapter is a description of clothes:

The ill-assorted and injudicious attire of the individual only served to render his awkwardness more conspicuous. A sky-blue coat, with short and broad skirts and low cape, exposed a long thin neck, and longer and thinner legs, to the worst animadversions of the evil disposed. His nether garment was of yellow nankeen, closely fitted to the shape, and tied at his bunches of knees by large knots of white ribbon, a good deal sullied by use. Clouded cotton stockings, and shoes, on one of the latter of which was a plated spur, completed the costume of the lower extremity of this figure, no curve or angle of which was concealed, but, on the other hand, studiously exhibited, through the vanity or simplicity of its owner. From beneath the flap of an enormous pocket of a soiled vest of embossed silk, heavily ornamented with tarnished silver lace, projected an instrument, which, from being seen in such martial company, might have been easily mistaken for some mischievous and unknown implement of war...A large civil cocked hat, like those worn by clergymen within the last thirty years, surmounted the whole, furnishing dignity to a good natured, and somewhat vacant countenance, that apparently needed such artificial aid to support the gravity of some high and extraordinary trust.³¹⁹

We have a description here of what a dandy might look like after trailing the wilderness. His sky-blue coat and cape, his nankeen trousers, his silk vest with silver lace might all suggest a

³¹⁹ James Fenimore Cooper, *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826; New York:Penguin, 1986), 16. Hereafter cited parenthetically (*LM*).

man of high fashion if they weren't consistently described as "sullied," "soiled," and "tarnished." The character here described is the song-master David Gamut, and that "mischievous and unknown implement of war" is simply his pitch pipe. He makes a strange sight among the military men, and in the "manly" novel of the American wilderness, he is the least manly. As an instructor of psalmody, David Gamut is given to his own habit of quotation, quoting scripture. David Gamut is indeed the dandy of the American wilderness, and the novel begins with a focus on him.

The novel continues in its eye for fashion with the introduction of its two heroes, the scout Hawkeye and Uncas. They first appear as "two men," and in the next paragraph are distinguished, one showing "red skin and wild accoutrements of a native of the woods" and the other, "through the mask of his rude and nearly savage equipments...one who might claim descent from a European parentage" (*LM* 28). One is a native and one is a European in native "mask." After this we get a detailed description of the dress of the two men, on the level with the description of the wilderness dandy. Uncas is described as "nearly naked." His head is closely shaved except for the "chivalrous scalping tuft" and "without ornament of any kind, with the exception of a solitary eagle's plume, that crossed his crown, and depended over the left shoulder" (*LM* 29). What clothing he has is "[a] tomahawk and scalping-knife, of English manufacture...in his girdle; while a short military rifle, of that sort with which the policy of the whites armed their savage allies, lay carelessly across his bare and sinewy knee." By contrast, Hawk-eye's body is largely "concealed by his clothes." He wears "a hunting shirt of forest-green, fringed with faded yellow, and a summer cap, of skins which had been shorn of their fur." Hawk-eye, like Uncas, carries a knife in his wampum girdle, "but no tomahawk." We are also told that "[h]is moccasins were ornamented after the gay fashion of the natives."

One of the striking things we find in this fashion description is the interweaving of native and European. Uncas's native identifiers are curiously Europeanized as his tuft of hair is described as "chivalrous" and his tomahawk and scalping-knife are "of English manufacture." He is armed by the whites, too, in his military rifle. Hawk-eye's native mask is constructed by being clothed in the wilderness; his hunting shirt, Cooper tells us in a note in the 1831 edition, is colored "to imitate the hues of the wood" and his head and legs are covered in animal skins. If it is a mask, it is at the same time, wholly natural. Interestingly, his moccasins in their native fashioning give him something of a dandy description, ornamented and fashioned—a native dandy.

Sandra Tomc, in her reading of Cooper's later fiction, specifically *The Deerslayer*, notes Cooper's sartorial representations, the synchrony between skin and clothing, as Cooper's denial of a "natural" creature and argues that Cooper in the novel puts the truth of the character in clothing that is nevertheless interchangeable.³²⁰ She notes that *The Deerslayer* was written after Cooper's European sojourn where he was criticized for having returned with European notions. Tomc argues that, "rather than insisting on his own naturalness and thus cementing his own peculiar claims to his own piece of natural wilderness, Cooper adopts a different strategy, which is to represent the wilderness itself as un-natural."³²¹ Tomc thus positions this denatured, fashioning Cooper as a later development. She contrasts a disguise scene in *The Deerslayers* with Effingham's disguise in *The Pioneers*, where the disguise conceals his true nature rather than revealing the true nature. But the way costume features in *The Last of the Mohicans* suggests that Cooper, even in his early fiction, wasn't the author of nature he appeared, which to

³²⁰ See Sandra Tomc, "'Clothing upon sticks': James Fenimore Cooper and the Flat Frontier," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 51, no. 2 (2009): 142-178.

³²¹ Tomc, "Clothing," 157.

me does not so much say that he painted un-natural characters, but naturalized characters—characters whose natures were fashioned. This is actually the continuity between *The Last of the Mohicans* with *The Pioneers*.

The Pioneers accomplishes naturalization by rule of law; *The Last of the Mohicans* accomplishes it by rule of fashion, and in this we find the dapper gentleman's self-fashioning through quotation restyled. Cooper, who like all American authors faced the issue of American national and literary entrée on the world stage essentially took the dandy Vivian Grey's advice. He painted America instead, and in fashioning America toward entrée fashioned the nation and its literature as natural and manly, but in the fashion of the dandy novel, these were characters that, styled, were very much inhabitable.

David Gamut, for example, comes out of nowhere, having traveled from Connecticut.³²² We don't know his story, but we can assume that he's made some unfortunate *exeunt* from somewhere only to make his *entrée* among a military camp. His "gift" of psalms—David Gamut's song has the ambivalence of quotation as he is repeatedly said to have little talent even as his song moves people, and his song both endangers and saves lives —wins over to his cause Alice, one of the daughters of Colonel Munro, and he is able to join them on their expedition with the column of soldiers, including Major Heyward, and the scout and Uncas, to meet Colonel Munro at Fort William Henry. Gamut's manhood is continuously berated by Hawk-eye: "You might be better employed...Can you use the smooth bore, or handle a rifle?...Perhaps you understand the compass, and lay down the water courses and mountains of the wilderness on

³²² Karen S. Sloan posits that David Gamut represents the nineteenth-century neo-Calvinism of a Connecticut church music controversy over whether to pronounce eternity in a certain him "eternitee" or "eternitii" to preserve the rhyme. Her reading of Gamut makes him the object of the novel's scathing critique, even if, she argues, Cooper's religious tolerance allowed him to grant the character some benevolence. See Karen S. Sloan, "The Nineteenth-Century Church Music Controversy: A Possible Referent for Cooper's 'Manifestly Impossible' Singing-Master in *The Last of the Mohicans*," *ANQ* 19, no. 1 (2006), 33-42.

paper, in order that they who follow may find places by their given names?” (*LM* 58). Gamut can do none of the above as he “follow[s] no other than [his] own high vocation, which is instruction in sacred music” (*LM* 58). This man of high vocation and high fashion, it would seem, does not seem to fit in with the world of the novel.

That the dandy does not fit into the world of the novel we might expect from Cooper’s own words in *Notions of the Americans*. The bachelor says of the Americans:

[I]t is not possible to conceive a state of society in which more of the attributes of plain good sense, or fewer of the artificial absurdities of life, are to be found, than here. There is no costume for the peasant, (this is scarcely a peasant at all,) no wig for the judge, no baton for the general, no diadem for the chief magistrate.³²³

The idea, well familiar, is that America is particularly plain, natural, unfashioned. He moves on to discuss the poets who must “extract sweetness” from “native plants.” As a singer and quoter of biblical Psalms, David Gamut does not fall under the imitation and fashioning of Europe that Cooper, in this mode, deplored. But to the extent that he butts heads with Hawk-eye, he is not far from it. In an argument of doctrine, he demands from Hawk-eye chapter and verse when Hawk-eye denies belief in an afterlife. Hawk-eye responds:

Book!...do you take me for a whimpering boy, at the apron strings of one of your old gals; and this good rifle on my knee for the feather of a goose’s wing, my ox’s horn for a bottle of ink, and my leather pouch for a cross-barred handkercher to carry my dinner! Book! What have such as I, who am a warrior of the wilderness, though a man without a cross, to do with books! (*LM* 117).

The opposition here is clear. David Gamut, in demanding a quotation from books, represents the effeminate tradition of the English author, of artificial culture consonant with the dandy figure. Hawk-eye belongs to the tradition of American natural masculinity. But if, as I have been

³²³ Cooper, *Notions*, vol. 2, 109.

arguing and as the opening description of Hawk-eye suggests, Cooper's natural demeanor is a fashion, the dandy can restyle it, and indeed he does.

Dandiacal self-fashioning, we've seen, happens through quotation, and it is in quotation where we see Cooper revealing the natural and the manly as fashioned characters, and in quotation he refashions them to a more neutral ground. The paradigmatic manifestation of the fashioning of nature is Hawk-eye's performance of a bear when he is trying to infiltrate the Huron camp to rescue the captured Uncas. Heyward, on his own disguised mission to save Alice, meets with the bear, and frightened at the bear's approach, he is relieved when it shakes off its skin to reveal the person of Hawk-eye who recounts how he came to infiltrate the camp.

"[...]I made free with his finery, and took the part of a bear on myself, in order that the operations might proceed."

"And admirably did you enact the character! The animal itself might have been shamed by the representation."

"Lord, major," returned the flattered woodsman, "I should be but a poor scholar, for one who has studied so long in the wilderness, did I not know how to set forth the movements and nature of such a beast! Had it been now a catamount, or even a full sized painter, I would have embellished a performance, for you, worth regarding! But it is no such marvelous feat to exhibit the feats of so dull a beast; though, for that matter too, a bear may be over acted! Yes, yes; it is not every imitator that knows nature may be outdone easier than she is equaled[...]" (*LM* 257-8).

Here the language of drama is mapped onto nature. Hawk-eye describes himself as having "took the part of a bear," Duncan praises the enactment and anthropomorphizes the bear as one who can appreciate the performance and experience shame at the superior representation. A human can be a better bear than a bear. We find it humorous to see that the always "manly" Hawk-eye is here flattered at the praise given his acting, and it seems to immediately go to his head.

Another animal, the catamount or the painter, and he would have "embellished a performance, for you, worth regarding!" He marks the fine line one has to tread not to overact the part of the bear. How is Cooper using this unusual portrait of Hawk-eye, the actor?

This passage of play-acting, acting the part of nature, brings us to questions of imitation and quotation. The scene is in dialogue with the epigraph of the chapter from Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream*, where the Mechanicals prepare for their performance. Snug says, "Have you the lion's part written? Pray you, if it be, give it me, for I am slow of *study*" (255, emphasis mine). Quince replies, "You may do it extempore, for it is nothing but roaring." Snug's desire for assiduous study to play the part of a lion well is undermined by Quince's "nothing but roaring." This humorous meta-theatrical moment that implicitly comes into the dialogue in Cooper's novel destabilizes our sense of the relationship between art and nature. Mention of the mechanicals' performance of the lion would easily remind Cooper's readers of the mechanicals' fear that the audience might mistake the lion for a real lion. Is Cooper rewriting Shakespeare, making the laughably serious Mechanicals actually right on the subject, i.e. you *can* mistake a performance of a lion for a lion? Or does he use the humorous epigraph from Shakespeare to make Hawk-eye's serious knowledge and skill just a little bit laughable? What is at stake in either?

I think what is at stake lies in the line "nature may be outdone easier than she is equaled." After all of Hawk-eye's insistence that nature is a better book, in this intertextual moment where Hawk-eye acts as another and betrays himself, we see that nature can be equaled and even bested. If Nature is a better book, Cooper demonstrates an ambition that his book, the chronicle of Hawk-eye, can equal it by fashioning it in an equal representation. In this we come to understand that Cooper's real message is that nature makes for a better book. The fashioning of an American nature constitutes his preferred vehicle for American literary entrée. And if outdoing nature is easier than equaling it, then the equaling nature is a superior form of

excellence, the better outdoing of nature that Cooper achieves in his chronicle of Hawk-eye. Cooper's novel can adapt nature, can adapt the drama, and emerge as the superior representation.

The next chapter, under the epigraph from Bottom's speech in the same play, "Let me play the lion, too" signifies wider intertextual fashioning by which the dandy hero makes his entrée into the novel's world of fashioned nature and manliness, and the manly hero of natural fashioning takes on the dandy character. It is worth taking a closer look at Shakespeare's text:

Bottom: Let me play the lion, too. I will roar that I will do any man's heart good to hear me. I will roar, that I will make the Duke say, "Let him roar again, let him roar again."

Quince: And you should do it too terribly, you would fright the Duchess and the ladies, that they would shriek; and that were enough to hang us all....

Bottom: I grant you, friends, if you should fright the ladies out of their wits, they would have no more discretion but to hang us: but I will aggravate my voice so that I will roar as gently as any sucking dove; I will roar you an 'twere any nightingale.

Quince: You can play no part but Pyramus; for Pyramus is a sweet-faced man; a proper man as one shall see in a summer's day; a most lovely, gentlemanlike man; therefore you must needs play Pyramus.³²⁴

The potential for Bottom to play the lion is informed by gender. Bottom, who earlier wanted to play the woman's part in the play with a soft voice, proposes now to play the lion as he will give the part a manly roar. Quince's response is that Bottom's manly roar would scare off the women, so Bottom modifies his promise of a roar to give one "gently as any sucking dove...an 'twere any nightingale." Rather than a gentle lion, Quince would have him play a "sweet-faced man, a most lovely, gentlemanlike man"—a dandy, if you will.

The distribution of parts, then, centers on negotiations of gender, of masculinities, and the same happens in Cooper's novel. To free Uncas, Hawk-eye, Uncas, and David Gamut must each trade parts. Hawk-eye proposes to David Gamut the part of Uncas. "Are you much given to

³²⁴ William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, I.ii.70-89.

cowardice?” he asks in his proposal of the scheme (*LM* 275). David Gamut is “nettled at so direct an attack on his manhood.” Though he declares himself a man of peace, he insists he is no coward, and agrees to take the place of Uncas, receiving for once Hawk-eye’s recognition of manhood: “You have spoken as a man, and like one who, under wiser schooling, would have been brought to better things” (*LM* 274). The dandy fashions himself the manly native, but with a difference. While Hawk-eye promises him that if he is discovered and killed, they will avenge him, David rejects this vengeance and asks instead that they forgive his killers and pray for them. Hawk-eye acknowledges, “There is principle in that, different from the law of the woods! and yet it is fair and noble to reflect upon!” The dandy inhabiting the native masculinity establishes a new code of noble manliness that draws a pining sigh from Hawk-eye.

While the dandy takes on a masculinity that impresses Hawk-eye, Hawk-eye must take on the character of the dandy, as Uncas adopts the part of the bear in an even better performance of nature than the scout himself. Hawk-eye switches clothing and accoutrements with David Gamut, and “he drew up his tall form in the rigid manner of David, threw out his arm in the act of keeping time, and commenced, what he intended for an imitation of his psalmody” (*LM* 274). To the “little practised” ear of the Hurons, the cheat is enough. The plan fails on the part of David who due to his large frame and “mild countenance” cannot keep up the part of Uncas for long. Then again, it wasn’t Uncas’s clothes that David wore, but Hawk-eye’s. Cooper’s point was not so much for David to take the part of Uncas, but for him to take the part of Hawk-eye so that Hawk-eye can inhabit the dandy character and recognize a dandy masculinity.

Where David Gamut does come to sustain a native identification is with the Delaware women who sing Uncas’s funeral chant. David listens to the songs “enthralled.” After the women are done, Hawk-eye gives the floor to David as “one who better knows the Christian

fashions” to lead in funeral psalms: “Excited by the scene he had just witnessed, and perhaps influenced by his own secret emotions, the master of song exceeded his usual efforts. His full, rich, voice was not found to suffer by a comparison with the soft tones of the girls” (*LM* 346). The Delaware girls “listened like those who knew the meaning of the strange words, and appeared as if they felt the mingled emotions of sorrow, hope, and resignation, they were intended to convey” (*LM* 346). It is the American wilderness dandy that we find, like Bottom, able to identify with the soft voice of the women and play the part of the manly man. Through identification, the naturalizing influence of the native women, he finds the voice he hadn’t achieved throughout the novel. He makes his entrée on neutral ground.

Memorial Epigraphs: *Hope Leslie* and Resurrecting Plots

In a review essay of Catherine Maria Sedgwick’s novels, Sedgwick is praised for “embod[ying], as no other of our writers has, the spirit of her native soil.”³²⁵ The writer continues with a curious speculation: “We have often imagined with what delighted wonder such authors as those of Pelham, and Almacks, Vivian Grey, and Godolphin—or even those of De Vere, Belinda, and Discipline, would read of Magawisca and Hope Leslie.”³²⁶ Why does this reviewer imagine the authors of dandy novels reading Sedgwick’s novel with wonder and delight?

Hope Leslie was published in 1827, the year following Cooper’s *The Last of the Mohicans*, and has been viewed as Sedgwick’s response to Cooper. Nina Baym reads in *Hope Leslie* a series of reversals on Cooper’s *Mohicans*, one of the most prominent being the presentation of an Uncas with a sex-change in the figure of Magawisca “that cannot but bring

³²⁵ “The Novels of Miss Sedgwick,” *American Monthly Magazine*, Jan. 1836, 15.

³²⁶ *Ibid.*, 16.

strongly to the reader's mind the functional absence of Indian women from Cooper's narrative."³²⁷ Ezra Tawil has noted that domestic frontier novels like *Hope Leslie* and Lydia Maria Child's *Hobomok* contain an oxymoron since the frontier novel was seen as a reaction against the domestic novel, the masculine flight from the domestic sphere.³²⁸

I have tried to argue that the self-fashioning of quotation and imitation for the purposes of entrée reveals a connecting point between the European novel of fashion and the American frontier novel. In locating a dandy hero in *Last of the Mohicans*, we find the Indian women come to have a function in Cooper's narrative, as it is their influence and identification with David Gamut that brings the dandy hero to entrée, to recognition. But to be sure, even if David Gamut is, as I contend, a dandy hero within Cooper's novel, he is not *the* hero of Cooper's novel. That the reviewers of *Hope Leslie* could not help but imagine the authors of dandy novels reading her text, suggests that there's something more explicitly of the dandy novel in *Hope Leslie*. Reading in *Hope Leslie* a shared dynamic of plotting and fashioning with Cooper rooted in the dandiactal tradition of self-fashioning, I argue that Hope Leslie as a female hero who resurrects the dandy hero identified with the native woman, allows us a clearer case study of how the dandy fashions the frontier novel for American national entrée, while quotation's ambivalence allows a different kind of preservation.

Examining the various meanings of the word "plot" in *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*, Peter Brooks identifies the common thread between the meanings as "the idea of boundedness, demarcation, the drawing of lines to mark off and order." The exception is the "plot" that means conspiracy, that nevertheless attaches itself to the common thread by

³²⁷ Nina Baym, "Putting Women in their Place: *The Last of the Mohicans* and Other Indian Stories" in *Feminism and American Literary History: Essays* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 33.

³²⁸ Tawil, 92.

complementing organization with intention, purpose. This sense of the word, Brook says, "seems to have come into English through the contaminating influence of the French *complot* and became widely known at the time of the Gunpowder Plot."³²⁹ We can see "plot," therefore, in its etymological history as a site of foreign penetration and Catholic conspiracy.

Sedgwick's *Hope Leslie* as a narrative that fashions otherness through plotting, delimits American inheritance through the fashioning of the self as other. This fashioning of the self as other is different, however, from Irving's self-fashioning or Vivian Grey's, where the self is fashioned as other for *entrée*. Here, the self is fashioned as other for *exeunt*. At the beginning of the novel, Sir William Fletcher is concerned about "divers of the leaders of the Commons [who] are secret friends of the seditious mischief-brewing puritans."³³⁰ "Secret," "seditious," and "mischief-brewing" reiterate over again the sense of conspiracy. The conspiracy he is concerned about, however, is the puritan conspiracy. His solution to the puritan problem he proposes as such:

If my master took counsel of me, he would ship the mad-canting fools to our New-England colonies, where their tender consciences would be no more offended because, forsooth, a prelate saith his prayers in white vestments, and where they might enjoy with the savages that primitive equality, about which they make such a pother. (*HL* 8)

Sir William Fletcher here in relocating the Puritans to a different plot of land, plots them outside of the Church of England by relating them instead to the American Indian. Sir William Fletcher's voice, however, is framed by American history and consciousness. The reader is already meant to be on the side of the Puritans. While Sir William opposes the puritans to the prelates in white vestments and places them with the American Indian, there is another relation

³²⁹ Peter Brooks, *Reading For the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 12.

³³⁰ Catherine Maria Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie* (1827; New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006), 7. Hereafter cited parenthetically (*HL*).

going on, and that is the Church of England to the Roman Catholicism of Continental Europe that the white vestments symbolize, the relationship the puritans are set against.

In England, Sir William removes the religious plotters he finds noxious, including his nephew, through equation with the foreign other in America; in America the puritans that would remove the foreign other do so by equation with the religious and cultural other that, for the puritans, is the Continental Catholic, or the Catholic Church of England. When the Fletchers' servant Jennet accuses the Native American Nelema of curing Hope Leslie's tutor Cradock by witchcraft, she offers a test, "see if she can read in the Bible—or Mr. Cotton's catechism—no, no; but give her your aunt Grafton's prayer book, and she will read as glib as a minister" (*HL* 106). The test to determine Nelema's witchcraft is determined by her easy connection with a Catholic-tinged Anglican prayer book. Jennet may be drawing this conclusion about Nelema from her experience with the Fletchers' Native American servant Magawisca. Earlier, in Mrs. Fletcher's letter to her husband she tells of Magawisca's refusal to be instructed in Cotton's catechism, but Everell is able to share with her fictional stories from Mrs. Grafton's books (*HL* 32).

The Puritan identification of the Native American and the European Catholic starts to take on the character of plotting in line with Sir William in the "going native" captivity narrative of Hope Leslie's sister Mary Fletcher, or Faith, who, abducted by the natives, makes her complete removal from the Puritan settlement in marrying Oneco, Magawisca's brother, becoming both Indian and Catholic (the natives were converted by the French). Here is where we come to the layers of plotting. It is the plot to reunite the sisters that activates a series of plots that will intertwine Indian and Continental European/Catholic plotting. The proliferation and entangling of plot enlarges beyond the domestic plot and comes to the level of "state secret." Governor

Winthrop, we learn, has been anxious about native conspiracy, and this anxiety has brought him into "secret conferences" with the Catholic conspirator Sir Philip. The narrator characterizes this as an anomaly: "in relation to this stranger, [Winthrop] appeared to have departed from his usual diplomatic caution, and to have admitted him to the most confidential intimacy" (*HL* 205). I am interested in the words 'depart' and 'admitted' as designators of space, where Winthrop is leaving a particular space and Sir Philip is entering into a particular space. All these plots are drawing particular spaces, where some depart and some enter in, and the reader recognizes at this point in the narrator that Winthrop has made a fatal departure and a "contaminating influence"—the Catholic conspirator—has entered in.

Philip Gardiner makes his entrée through self-fashioning as other. He dresses the part of the Puritan having learned that clothing was essential to making his way among the Puritans. Nevertheless there are tells. The ruff of his collar and his page-boy, actually his lover Rosa in disguise, who looks "a queen's page." Gardiner is described as "a dandy quaker" (*HL* 125). That the dandy is the villain here might seem to suggest that the dandy tradition is irreconcilable to this frontier novel, but it must be noted that Gardiner as a dandy does not look like a dandy. What is villainous about this dandy is his character, as if the novel had to evacuate clothing as the dandy signature. Nevertheless, the surface still reveals.

This Catholic's plotting, we learn, coincides with the plotting of a renegade Indian who divulges information to Governor Winthrop of the Pequod hostility toward the Puritans and the conspiring activity of Mononotto and Magawisca. The Indian renegade conspirator's story serves to support the Catholic conspirator's story about a larger Indian conspiracy, both of which are revealed in secret meetings with the Puritan magistrates, who have turned conspiratorial themselves. The renegade heightens the conspiratorial atmosphere even further:

He stated also, that the chiefs of the different tribes, moved by the eloquence and arguments of Mononotto, were forming a powerful combination. Thus far the treacherous savage told the truth; but he proceeded to state plots and underplots, and artfully to exaggerate the number and power of the tribes. (248)

If the renegade's "plots and underplots" are untrue, the severe entanglement of the plotting we have already cannot be exaggerated. How do we organize and thus resolve this entanglement of plotting, to identify and expose the multi-layered religious and racial plots and to reconstitute the American space?

Hope and Magawisca's plot was the central plot around which the others proliferated, temporally if not always causally. To find our way out of the entanglement of plot, we have to follow the thread of fashion. Quentin Miller argues that clothing is the unifying ideology of the novel. He argues that Hope Leslie in her chaste Puritan dress with the singular ornament of the blue fillet given to her by her beloved Everell represents the ideal of republican womanhood.³³¹ This blue fillet Miller reads as a symbol of Hope's individuality, not falling into the Puritan/anti-Puritan polarity of her friend Esther Downing and her aunt Dame Grafton, respectively. But I would like to propose that Hope Leslie may be closer to the culture of European fashion than what Miller posits. She has read her aunt Dame Grafton's books. She has received a classical education from the pedantic Cradock. She makes the same gestures with her sister that Grafton makes, trying to make her look more "natural" with fashion and seduce her away from her Native American husband with jewelry.

Most of all, in the substitutions and disguises of her rescue plots, as in Cooper's *Last of the Mohicans*, she and Cradock together figure the Indian and Euro-Catholic self-fashioning as

³³¹ Quentin Miller, "'A Tyrannically Democratic Force': The Symbolic and Cultural Function of Clothing in Catherine Maria Sedgwick's Hope Leslie," *Legacy* 19, no. 2 (2002): 127. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25679424>

other. After being taken by Oneco and Mononotto in retaliation for the seizure of Magawisca and Mary, Hope effects her escape back to safe Puritan territory, back to Boston, by "going Catholic," as Antonio Batista mistakes her for a visitation from his patron saint. I would qualify the extent to which Hope goes Catholic, however. She is not the Catholic in the role play but the object of the Catholic's adoration. Nevertheless, this scene does effect an important European Catholic relation that will order the various plots and plot the boundaries of the American space. The relation is not to Hope but to Cradock.

Cradock is very important to Hope's encounter with Batista. The effect Hope has on Batista is a familiar one. She has had this same effect on Cradock. When Hope seeks confirmation on a story he had told her, the narrator states that Cradock "always felt, at the slightest notice from Hope, an emotion similar to that of a pious catholic, when he fancies the image of the saint he worships to bend propitiously towards him" (147). Cradock becomes here the "pious catholic" foreshadowing in metaphor what Batista comes to embody.³³² It is also important to note that Hope's communication with Batista would not have been possible had she not learned "the tongues" from Cradock.

Hope's orchestration of Magawisca's rescue by switching her with Cradock recalls David Gamut's taking the place of Uncas. Sedgwick seems to deliberately establish this intertextual reference since, when they arrive at the jail, the jailer Barnaby Tuttle is singing his Psalms and asks them to join him. He leads them in a "long, and very irregular metre" of his own composition, and at the end of the singing, Barnaby tells Cradock, "Service to you, Mr. Cradock, you are not gifted in psalmody, I see" (*HL* 306). Cradock responds, "Not in the outward

³³² Batista is not Cradock's only connection to Catholicism. He, along with Grafton, is reprimanded by Governor Winthrop for placing too much emphasis on Hope's status in good works when she disappears the night of her first secret meeting with Magawisca.

manifestation, but the inward feeling is, I trust, vouchsafed to me.” That Cradock has to pass through psalmody before he can perform his part in the rescue sets him up as the representative of David Gamut, at once of European fashions and native.

Cradock has been the site of Indian-European/Catholic crossing before. After he is poisoned by a snake bite, Hope proposes to suck the poison from Cradock's hand on the authority of one of Grafton's Catholic books, "The Wonders of the Crusades" (102). All refuse to put Hope in danger by such a scheme outside of the authority of the Bible, so Hope then procures Nelema's help. Cradock's body can be restored either through a kind of Catholic "witchcraft" or Indian "witchcraft." Hope Leslie's sympathies with both the Catholic and the Indian can only go so far. Even when she "goes Catholic" she is the idol and not the idolater. Her acceptance of Catholic knowledge is not allowed to be tried in her own body. Cradock, however, becomes the site on which the European Catholic-Indian plots can cross, as Nelema's cure through her "witchcraft" is seen in terms both Euro-Catholic and Indian.

I read Cradock as doubly effecting the Indian (Magawisca) removal from the plot because of his relation to Batista and Batista's role in completing Magawisca's removal. Sedgwick writes her own gunpowder plot of Catholic conspiracy in Sir Philip's abduction of Jennet, who he thinks is Hope Leslie. Batista's absence due to the visitation of Hope Leslie, whom he thinks to be his patron saint, becomes an important shortage of hands that then allows for the jilted Rosa to throw the lamp into the barrel of gunpowder while Sir Philip handles Jennet. Meanwhile, Batista has reported to the magistrates Philip's plot, leading Winthrop to discover in Gardiner's letters his true identity. Batista's intervention exposes that the real conspiracy was not an Indian conspiracy but an other-European one, and removes Magawisca from continued suspicion.

Hope Leslie's skill as a plotter throughout the narrative was her ability to navigate both the European/Catholic and Indian spaces without getting scathed. This is accomplished through domestic frontier heroine's substitution with the resurrected dandy hero of Cooper's novel in the form of Cradock. Cradock makes a more successful rescue here because he identifies with a Native American woman. In the conclusion of the narrative, however, these get plotted out of the space. Magawisca, through the exposure of the European Catholic plot, is removed from the plot altogether, and the Catholic plots are resolved. In the end, Hope's acceptance of her sister's Catholic and Indian marriage is her acceptance of her sister's ultimate departure from the narrative. The Catholic and the Indian plottings are plotted in the narrative until they are plotted out.

There is, however, a sense in which Sedgwick gives these populations an enduring voice. After a series of epigraphs chiefly from British and American authors, the final two chapters have epigraphs in Italian and French, respectively, representative of that other European presence in the novel. Within the final chapter, a quotation also memorializes the Spanish Rosa, who died in the explosion. The final words of the novel are a quotation in reference to Esther, the other heroine who we might see as written off if not for the fact that she comes to figure Sedgwick herself. Her decision never to marry after Everell has wed Hope Leslie is attributed to the same Goldsmith quotation Lord Vincent referenced for a novel given to a mistaken orientalism. Esther does not "give to a party what was meant for mankind." Esther, who here figures the author, points to the possibility of not settling into a plot, of staying in the quotations where the enduring voice of other American presences remain.

The two closing epigraphs in other tongues also remember for us Cradock and Hope and the entrée that comes from the learning Winthrop deemed useless, the traditions of other

presences in the nation. If Cradock is David Gamut reincarnated in *Hope Leslie*, he resurrects for us a problem as well. David Gamut's song in his enthusiastic identification with the native women, seems to have had an influence on Colonel Munro. After the song, Munro thanked the native women for their song and says to Hawk-Eye, "Tell them, that the Being we all worship, under different names, will be mindful of their charity; and that the time shall not be distant, when we may assemble around his throne without distinction of sex, or rank, or colour!" Hawk-eye does not like the sound of this, and responds, "To tell them this... would be to tell them that the snows come not in the winter, or that the sun shines fiercest when the trees are stripped of their leaves!" Instead, he translated his own version of Munro's sentiments, but Cooper doesn't tell us what that version is. Those other presences in the American story that Sedgwick gives us in quotation are only accessible through translation. The next chapter, viewing the Native American and the other Europe as indicative of the "Other America" will consider these quotational presences in translation and what translation suppresses or hides.

CHAPTER 3- MANIFEST TRANSLATING: ASSIMILATING POWER IN THE HEMISPHERE AND PARALLEL ENCOUNTERS

Passable Verses: The Homeric Questioning of American Originality and Influence

While Irving's *Sketch-book* opened on the problem of volumes the protagonist traveler, Paul Flemming in Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's *Hyperion* (1839) opens Mary Ashburton's sketchbook on the problem of Homer. Admiring her sketch of a bust in Rome of "the Blind Man who dwells in Chios [whose] songs excel all that can ever be sung," Flemming nevertheless asks, "But do you really believe that this is a portrait of Homer?"³³³ Mary Ashburton certainly does not. "It is only an artist's dream," an artist's vision, she says, and everyone has his/her own vision; there are many Homeric visions. When asked if her own image reflects the bust she sketched, Mary offers a different vision:

Whenever I think of Homer, which is not often, he walks before me, solemn and serene, as in the vision of the great Italian; in countenance neither sorrowful nor glad, followed by other bards, and holding in his right hand a sword!³³⁴

Mary's vision is essentially a quotation of Dante's *Inferno*, when Dante Pilgrim and Virgil encounter Homer, followed by Horace, Ovid, and Lucan in Limbo. Dante's *Divine Comedy* was Longfellow's translation project, and we might infer from Flemming's response to Mary—"That is a finer conception than this"—that Dante was for Longfellow the better Homeric vision.

Of course, Dante knew no Greek and had never read Homer. What Mary Ashburton's denial of a "real portrait" of Homer suggests is that accessing Homer is, as the sketch of a marble bust might suggest, always a matter of mediation, of translation. But can one translate without knowing the original? This question William Cullen Bryant took up when on February 22, 1870,

³³³ Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, *Hyperion* (Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1861), 192.

³³⁴ *Ibid*, 193.

the Williams College Alumni offered William Cullen Bryant “a toast made up of quotations from the Greek and Latin poets.”³³⁵ Bryant, in his response, a speech entitled “The Translators of Homer” nevertheless proceeds to pull further and further away from the classic tongue:

That passable verses may be written by one who knows neither Greek nor Latin I suppose will be allowed. The very greatest of modern poets, Shakespeare, was said by the learned Ben Jonson to have “small Latin and less Greek.” Nay, I suppose that a very moderate knowledge of Greek might suffice even for translating Homer. Pope, the most popular of translators, is thought to have had but a very slender stock of Greek. I go still further, and assert that one very good translation of the Iliad was made without knowing a word of the Greek original. The eminent Italian poet, Vincenzo Monti, author of the grand tragedy of “Aristodemo,” translated the Iliad into excellent blank verse without any knowledge of Greek. An epigram was made to be inscribed under his portrait in these words:

“Questi è Vincenzo Monti, Cavaliero,
Gran traduttore de’ traduttori d’Omero,”³³⁶

As Bryant progresses, the quality of the verse described increases (from “passable” to “very greatest” to Homer and the “eminent” Monti’s “excellent” translation) while the knowledge of the classic tongue decreases (from “very moderate” to “very slender” to “without knowing a word.”). What’s interesting about this progression and decline is how it separates two forms of originality, the originality of self-reliant genius and the originality of historical origin. The increased quality of verse is measured on originality as genius. Shakespeare and Homer, after all, are the period’s quintessential representatives of original genius. The decreased knowledge of the Greek and Latin signifies an increasing distance from the historical original text. The progression and decline, separating these two originalities, render a paradox in which moving further away from Homer a writer becomes more like Homer.

³³⁵ William Cullen Bryant, “Translators of Homer” in *Prose Writings of William Cullen Bryant*, vol. 2, *Travels, Addresses, and Comments*, ed. Parke Godwin (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1884), 267.

³³⁶ Bryant, “Translators of Homer” 267. Bryant provides the translation for the Italian: “This knight is Vincenzo Monti, / An author highly rated, / By Whom the translators of Homer / So cleverly were translated.”

The progression and decline are linked, however, by “the great marvel of the origin of the Homeric poems.”³³⁷ Bryant notes that the *Iliad* was not composed by Homer in manuscript, but oral tradition: “His poems—for I hold to one Homer as I hold to one sun in the firmament—were engraved on his own iron memory and that of the minstrels who inherited and repeated his poems in public assemblies.” Homer’s original text, Bryant here notes, can only be accessed through a history of quotation/transmission and translation. The “numerous translations,” “imitat[ions] by poets innumerable,” and “borrow[ings]” that have ensued become then completely continuous with its originality.

Bryant had established the relation between original production and imitative reproduction long before in his 1825 *Lectures on Poetry*, delivered before the New York Athenaeum. In the fourth of these lectures, “On Originality and Imitation,” he argues that “[g]enius...with all its pride in its own strength is but a dependent quality.”³³⁸ He attributes the failures of original endeavor to “not paying sufficient attention to the consideration that poetry is an art...that a great deal of its effects depends upon the degree of success with which a sagacious and strong mind seizes and applies the skills of others, and that to slight the experiences of our predecessors on this subject is a pretty certain way to go wrong.”³³⁹ The failure to originate is thus a failure to imitate. Nevertheless, Bryant concludes his essay privileging originality. He considers the question whether too great a focus on originality or too great a focus on imitation has a better chance to produce true poetry, concluding that “whatever errors in taste may spring from the zeal for new developments of genius and the disdain of imitation, their influence is of

³³⁷ Bryant, 268.

³³⁸ William Cullen Bryant, “Lectures On Poetry,” in *Prose Writings of William Cullen Bryant*, ed. Parke Godwin, vol. 1, *Essays, Tales, and Orations* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1884), 37. The text Godwin provides is described as “sketches or suggestions” for the lecture, not perhaps the exact text of the lectures as delivered.

³³⁹ Bryant, “Lectures on Poetry,” 36.

short duration.”³⁴⁰ Imitation, he claims on the other hand, can “perpetuate itself indefinitely” so that the poetic spirit loses its vitality. The implication is therefore that imitation should serve the pursuit of originality. As when Bryant compares Homer to the sun, originality appears to be the supreme principle. It is worth remembering here that Dante’s Homeric vision as rendered by Longfellow has Homer as “Poet Sovereign,” and though he is followed by other Poets who each share in the honor of the title, he is the leader of the host, “with the falchion in his hand...as their lord.”³⁴¹ What this lets us see is that when Homeric originality is rendered the supreme principle, it mobilizes an army.

This image of a Homeric originality leading an army of poets with a sword relates also to Bryant’s Homeric vision as Homeric influence comes to look like Manifest Destiny. He concludes his “Translator’s Homer” with a notable parallel, comparing the influence of Homer to the fluidity of the Mississippi, where the confluence of imitation and originality suggests also the resemblance of universality with nationalist expansion:

It has occurred to me that the fame of the venerable Greek bard, in its progress through the centuries, may be compared with our own great midland river. The waters of our Mississippi [...] pour themselves into the main ocean through many broad mouths, and, forming a part of it, are carried by its current to the ends of the earth. They move in the Gulf Stream; they beat on the cliffs of Europe; they sweep at one time round Cape Horn, and at another round the Cape of Storms; they join company in one distant part of the globe with the waters of the Amazon, and in another with the waters of the Congo; they are carried into the Arctic Sea; they ripple on the beaches of the Spice Islands within the tropics, and on shores overshadowed by palm-groves; they dash against the icy coasts near the southern-pole; they drift into the secret caverns of the great deep, the dim abodes assigned by Homer to the venerable Oceanus and the ancient Tethys, the primal father and mother of all the gods of Olympus and the Underworld.

³⁴⁰ Ibid., 43.

³⁴¹ Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Trans. *The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri: The Inferno* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1886), 41.

So wide-extended, so universal, so all-pervading—notwithstanding the rude and remote antiquity in the shadows of which it had its birth—is the fame of Homer; it knows no limit or latitude, or race, or language; in its mighty progress it is bounded only by the barriers of barbarism; nor will it cease to enlarge the sphere of its dominion while civilization extends itself on the earth from land to land and clime to clime.³⁴²

The Mississippi's influence traces the United States's sphere of influence, across the northern continent down the gulf, twice connecting Africa and Spanish America ("Cape Horn" and the "Cape of Storms"; "the Amazon" and "the Congo")—the slave trade and manifest destiny—and ends in a mythical point of origin. With such an extended description of the flow of the Mississippi, it is impossible not to see the nation in what Bryant concludes of Homer, "[s]o wide-extended, so universal, so all-pervading." But it is the nation, too, that "knows no limit of latitude, or race, or language" and that "will not cease to enlarge the sphere of its dominion."

The meeting of literary imitation and national expansion also has its precedent in Bryant's Lectures on poetry. In the third lecture, "On Poetry in Its Relation to Our Age and Country," he details the nation's favorable prospects for producing worthy poetry, refuting popular claims to the contrary. His defense of national poetic genius contains a recourse to imitation, that distinguishes Bryant's plan from the burgeoning movement toward a self-reliant national literature. He argues that "it is the privilege of poets, when they suppose themselves in need of materials, to seek them in other countries."³⁴³ Thus Bryant imagines the possibility of a national poetic creation dependent on international borrowing, where a poetic exceptionalism conscripts cosmopolitan materials for nation-building.

Bryant's Mississippi image raises one of the central questions of this chapter: what distinguishes nineteenth-century national expansion from its cosmopolitan universalism?

³⁴² Ibid., 269.

³⁴³ Bryant, "Lectures on Poetry," 33.

Bryant sees imitation as an act of possession. We remember that the “sagacious and strong mind” of the poet “seizes” the skill of others. Throughout the period, this particular quality of possession was the object of great attention, even controversy, in the pages of American periodicals, where imitations were frequently exposed, with or without the accusation of plagiarism. Arguably the most famous of these was the “Little Longfellow War” over Edgar Allan Poe’s accusation that Henry Wadsworth Longfellow was a plagiarist. At the same time, a national question of possession ran parallel: the annexation of Texas and the Mexican-American War, sparking the possibility of Cuban annexation.

I would like to parallel these national anxieties of influence and possession around the annexation of Texas and the Mexican-American war with contemporary literary anxieties of influence and possession around imitation in American poetry and the “Little Longfellow War.” Bryant and Longfellow were the nation’s leading and most quoted poets in the nineteenth century, later forgotten as the original and national voice of Whitman became the hallmark of American poetry. They have been restored to critical attention, in the words with which one scholar has described Bryant, as “the reception historian’s ironic counterexample,” evidence that a nineteenth-century reading public prized what F.O. Matthiessen called “the fatal imitation of Europe.”³⁴⁴ Bryant and Longfellow’s relationship with European poetry and their particular interest in the Spanish language and poetry brought them in literary relationship with their American neighbors, the poets of Spanish America. Bryant translated the Mexican poet José Rosas Moreno, the Cuban poet José Maria Heredia, the Spanish novelist Carolina Coronado, and was a friend of the Colombian poet Rafael Pombo. Though Longfellow’s translations were

³⁴⁴ Ingrid Satelmajer, “Unbinding ‘The Book’: Bryant’s “The Fountain” in the Democratic Review,” *American Periodicals* 13.(2003): 31 and F.O. Matthiessen, *American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman* (London: Oxford University Press, 1941), 143.

almost exclusively of poets from the Iberian Peninsula, he had many contacts with Latin American authors and was the most translated Anglo-American poet in Latin America. As translators and Hispanophiles, the two poets have also been recovered by transamerican literary historians, most notably Kirsten Gruesz Silva whose seminal study *Ambassadors of Culture: The Transamerican Origins of Latino Writing* greatly informs this chapter.

Was it possible for North America to faithfully quote or translate Spanish America within the context of annexation and war? ‘No’ would not be a surprising answer. “Translated language,” Gruesz Silva argues, “follows, if not precedes, the accomplishment of *translatio imperii*, the movement of empire.”³⁴⁵ Her study begins on a Bryant translation of José María Heredia’s “Al huracán” and the juxtaposition of the poem and translation as parallel texts in Francis J. Amy’s *Musa bilingüe*. She argues that the English text in its naturalizing of the original Spanish “occludes all things behind its forceful presence.”³⁴⁶ While naturalization in the previous chapter emerged as a vehicle for national *entrée*, in the politics of empire, the assimilating power is further complicated, and indeed, what is at stake is presence. The politics of translation and its complicity with nationalist expansion jeopardizes the Romantic cosmopolitan ideal of Anglo-American and Latin American communion as the one threatens to erase the other.

In this problem of influence, we might return to the Homeric question, the identity of Homer and whether there be many Homers or the one. Bryant held to one Homer in his privileging of originality over imitation, even as he recognized their mutual constitution. Once the mutual constitution of originality and imitation is acknowledge, the dichotomy simply

³⁴⁵ Kirsten Silva Gruesz, *Ambassadors of Culture: The Transamerican Origins of Latino Writing* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 2.

³⁴⁶ Ibid, 3.

becomes a matter of emphasis. The nineteenth century has been read in the emphasis of originality, but as we have seen, another emphasis ran parallel. The controversies of imitation and quotation that ran through the period reveal a culture that did not value originality as much as we and even they maybe thought. For this culture, the paralleling of texts became a vehicle, not of occlusion, but of exposure. Paralleling Bryant and Longfellow's participation in the period's literary and national controversies of assimilation, I aim to expose a space for encounter between multiple American presences.

Parallel Passages: Tracing Imitations and Literary Exposé

"Homer is only entirely original, because we have lost the compositions of those bards who must have preceded him." So declares James L. Hunter, a planter in Eufala, Alabama, who in 1844 sent a "gossiping epistle" to the editor of *The Southern Literary Messenger*, published in the April issue, on "Poetical Similarities."³⁴⁷ James L. Hunter's "Poetical Similarities" presents a shift in emphasis, playing down Homeric originality to present his own work, not of literary production, but reproduction. Poetical similarities referred to the tracing of resemblances in language, thought, or style, between poems that could be either accidental or the result of deliberate imitation or...something else.

Introducing his collection of similar passages, he claims that his only objective is "amusing that class of your readers who are, like me, lovers of good poetry."³⁴⁸ He then proceeds to state what his purpose is not:

³⁴⁷ James L. Hunter, "Poetical Similarities," *The Southern Literary Messenger*, Apr. 1844, 233-240. <http://proquest.umi.com>. Quotation on 239.

³⁴⁸ To be sure, part of the modesty in which Hunter couches his attempt may have to do with the fact that he was not a writer or critic. Son of General John Lingard Hunter, a prominent slaveholding planter in Barbour County, Alabama, he married Sarah Elizabeth Shorter and managed his father-in-law's cotton plantation in Randolph County, Georgia from 1845 to 1846. He died in June 22, 1846 at the age of 29. Hunter's only published book is his gardening book, published by Catherine Howett in 1996. See Catherine Howett, *The Gardening Book of James L. Hunter, a Southern Planter* (Chillicothe, IL: American Botanist, 1996).

Farther than to amuse has not been attempted. It is still farther from my intention to arraign the authors here quoted, for the sin of literary larceny or plagiarism. The imitation, and still more, the similitude, either casual or intentional, between passages of different authors, is certainly not plagiarism. If it were, there is not an English author of my acquaintance, who could not be convicted of appropriating epithets, images, and sometimes entire passages, the property of others.³⁴⁹

Hunter denies plagiarism three times. He first denies that it is his intent to expose plagiarism or “literary larceny,” then denies that imitation or similitude—even intentional—is plagiarism, and finally denies the illicitness of plagiarism, emphasized as it is by the language of criminal procedure (“larceny,” “arraign,” “convicted”), by insisting on its ubiquity.

This denial is overturned shortly when in the next paragraph he proposes an outline for a more extensive investigation he would undertake had he the space and inclination. In this outline, he gives four headings: Plagiarism, Imitation, Similarity, and Coincidence. He defines plagiarism as the “intentional appropriating of something of value—such as an argument, an image, or some remarkable epithet belonging to another.”³⁵⁰ Imitation he classifies as either “casual,” meaning “usual or customary among authors,” or “servile,” meaning “mere reproduction.” Similarity he finds “needs no definition,” and coincidence is when two authors who could not be familiar with each other use the “exact image or expression.” While he proposes this more serious and exacting study, Hunter again denies that his essay is anything serious: “But I am not attempting anything so extensive; endeavoring merely to write something that will amuse in a light *gossiping* sort of way.” He places the quotations he will present under

³⁴⁹ Hunter, 233.

³⁵⁰ Ibid.

the heading “similarity”—the only heading for which he provided no definition—and advises his reader not to “look for much system.”³⁵¹

What is the real source of the amusement that Hunter proposes? It appears to be plagiarism. In recounting two instances where authors acknowledged the effects of influence, the second of which is an extended account of an accusation of plagiarism against Walter Scott, Hunter makes a strange segue:

I may as well observe, that though this amusement is not despicable, and is frequently resorted to by literary men, as is observed by the “*researching*” D’Israeli, [so my Lord Byron calls him] and therefore I am not ashamed of indulging in so elegant and intellectual an entertainment, still I have not set me down with pen and ink at my side for the sole purpose of detecting similarities. Those here offered, are such as have occurred to me, and are such remarkable passages, as fixed themselves in my memory, either by the beauty which they possess, or the obvious similarity they bear to each other. As soon as any passages occurred to me, I turned to the author, and have preferred generally to quote them entire, without marring their beauty by cutting them up, or abridging them in hopes that the splendid gems of poetry with which I have adorned my pages, would afford pleasure to those who may peruse them, should my own short observations fail to arrest or merit their attention.

The allusion to Isaac D’Israeli’s *Curiosities of Literature* refers to D’Israeli calling the tracing of similarities and imitations “one of the most elegant of literary recreations.”³⁵² Hunter brings in this authority to ratify an entertainment that might seem “despicable” and “shameful” were it not for the fact that great literary men “resort to” it. It would seem “despicable” and “shameful” to the extent that it is connected with carping charges of plagiarism, and while it is what Hunter has consistently tried to deny, it is also what is consistently suggested in the tracing of similarities.

³⁵¹ Ibid., 234.

³⁵² Isaac D’Israeli, *Curiosities of Literature, and the Literary Character Illustrated*. (Philadelphia: Thomas, Cowperthwait, & Co., 1841), 147. D’Israeli writes: “This kind of literary amusement is not despicable.”

Indeed, this tracing of literary similarities or imitation was popular in nineteenth-century periodicals, frequently citing the same D'Israeli reference. In 1848, there appeared in *Sharpe's London Magazine*, reprinted in the U.S. in *The Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature*, "Literary Imitations and Similarities," in which the author presents an extended quotation from D'Israeli on poetical imitations and proceeds, under that authority, to "confess" to, quoting D'Israeli, "the habit of marking parallel passages, or tracing imitation in the thousand shapes it assumes."³⁵³ In likening the project in "Literary Imitations" to D'Israeli's, the author intends to distance the project from, again quoting D'Israeli, "the petty malignant delight of detecting the unacknowledged imitations of our best writers."³⁵⁴ And similar to Hunter, the writer proceeds to use the language of criminality while diminishing the charge: "I have no ambition for the office of a mere policeman on Parnassus, peeping after stray goods, and apprehending suspicious characters."³⁵⁵ This move to suggest while at the same time denying is may be part of the quality of the gossip with which Hunter characterizes the amusement of identifying similarities. The amusement "in a light *gossiping* sort of way" results from the tickling of that "petty malignant delight" of catching a great author in the act of theft, while it tries to distinguish itself from it, claiming, as Hunter does, to be an entertainment without shame, "elegant and intellectual."

For Hunter, however, there is a higher entertainment intended in his project: the pleasure of quotation itself. The "remarkable passages...fixed...in [his] memory" are reproduced not just to show similarity, further still, according to Hunter, to whisper the gossip of plagiarism, but to

³⁵³ Ibid. Qtd. in "Literary Imitations and Similarities, &c.," *Sharpe's London Magazine*, Mar. 1848, 37. and "Literary Imitations and Similarities, &c." *The Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature*, Jul. 1848, p. 397.

³⁵⁴ D'Israeli, 147; *Sharpe's*, 37, *Eclectic Magazine*, 397. Another article, entitled "Literary Imitations" in *Putnam's* notes that "It is *pleasant* to our savage-minded critics to find out the conveyances of others" (emphasis mine). "Literary Imitations," *Putnam's Monthly Magazine of American Literature, Science, and Art*, Aug. 1856, p. 114.

³⁵⁵ *Sharpe's*, 37, *Eclectic Magazine*, 397.

show themselves, to give the reader the enjoyment of poetry in its memorable quotations.

Indeed, Hunter's "Poetical Similarities" ends with a defense of poetry. He argues that "there is *utility* in poetry" (original emphasis) and that "[p]oetry, so far from being *light reading*, is the utmost perfection of thought and language—the concentration of reason—the embodiment of ideality—the vehicle of religion and morality."³⁵⁶ If Hunter's project has been to get the reader to take "light reading" more seriously, we can question his own epistle as "light" reading and take the amusement more seriously.

Both the amusement of marking similarities and the delight in detecting plagiarism, though distinguished from each other, reveal the same thing: a reading public that enjoys, not original literary production, but literary reproduction. Even the policeman on Parnassus, in catching a plagiarist, is not defending originality, but reinforcing the ubiquity of imitation. The delight that comes from this exposure can only mean that what is valued is not originality but imitation. This is a different tradition from that of Rufus Wilmot Griswold's *The Poets and Poetry of America*, the 1842 anthology in which Griswold made the call for an American national literature "free from that vassalage of opinion and style which is produced by a constant study of the literature of that nation whose language we speak, whose manners we adopt, and which was the home of our ancestors."³⁵⁷ Griswold envisions an American poetical tradition of "true creator[s]" whose genius would forge poetic epics out of new, national themes.

If originality is not what is at stake, then, what is? It is exposure itself. Thus, we have Hunter's decision with respect to the "remarkable passages" to "quote them entire." That exposure was really the question in the debates on imitation and plagiarism common in

³⁵⁶ Hunter, 239.

³⁵⁷ Rufus W. Griswold, *The Poets and Poetry of America: with a Historical Introduction* (Philadelphia: Carey & Hart, 1842), v.

nineteenth-century periodicals can be seen in Virginian lawyer, poet, and critic Philip Pendleton Cooke's essay "Old Books and New Authors," published in the April 1846 issue of *The Southern and Western Literary Messenger and Review*. Cooke gives a reason for new writers' "extensive use of old books" that Irving had characterized in "The Art of Book-making" as "pilfering."³⁵⁸ This reason he suggests by imagining what it would take to have book-making otherwise:

He [the present author] is so much at disadvantage with the primitive author, in such a labor, that he has to work, not upon virgin tablets, but upon a surface already crowded with the lines and impressions of others. He must erase all of these, every faint trace of their existence, and then burnish the Palimpsest tablet back into its perfect glare and purity, before he can stand, in the rivalry of unaided creation, on the same level of advantage with his primitive competitor.³⁵⁹

The feasibility of original composition is in indirect proportion to the amount of lines and impressions crowding the "Palimpsest tablet." Thus Cooke concludes that second-generation originality ("going back from McAdam to Adam") is impossible and that the new author "becomes, in spite of himself, an imitator."³⁶⁰ That this is inevitable becomes the grounds of Cooke's apology for American Poetry, so frequently charged with "imitation."

Because, for Cooke, pure originality can only come through erasure, the problem with plagiarism is not the borrowing but the erasure. He writes at the end of his essay, "it is reprehensible where, in gathering hints from others, as in the case between Byron and Göethe, you do not work boldly and openly; but like Cacus with his beeves, seek to erase all marks of the taking."³⁶¹ Concluding with an example of true plagiarism—significantly, "in prose."—he

³⁵⁸ P. P. C., "Old Books and New Authors," *The Southern and Western Literary Messenger and Review*, Apr. 1846, 199-203. <http://proquest.umi.com>. Quotation on 199.

³⁵⁹ Ibid.

³⁶⁰ Ibid.

³⁶¹ Cooke, 203.

parallels passages from Benajmin D' Israeli's *Vivien Grey* and Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*, "a work now made common by republications, but little known to general readers when D' Israeli wrote *Vivien Grey*." The status of Browne's own exposure, or lack thereof, to the reading public at the time of *Vivien Grey*'s publication contributes to the plagiarism. In juxtaposing the two texts, Cooke highlights the "concealing care visible in the changes made by the pilferer."

But how is *concealing* visible? To look at the first sentence in each of Cooke's parallel passages may explain the paradox:

Darkness and light divide the course of time, and oblivion and memory share a great part even of our living being [...]—*Religio Medici*
Oblivion and sorrow share our being in much the same manner as darkness and light divide the course of time.—*Vivien Grey*

This same-but-different language from a *prose* source not yet made commonplace seems to suggest for Cooke that D' Israeli was making deliberate use of Browne's text and that concealment occurs as unacknowledged paraphrase, where perhaps D' Israeli should have "quoted entire." That it is not the borrowing of the language but the exposure that matters to Cooke can be seen in an earlier parallel passage Cooke gives in his essay, responding to Poe's accusation of his imitation by citing a similar imitation by Poe himself, where the "None sing so wildly well" of Poe's "Israfel" is compared to "a fine and well known passage of the Bride of Abydos": "He sings so wild and well."³⁶² Cooke attributes the resemblance to "unconscious appropriation" like in his own case, but affirms that even if it were conscious it is "innocent." He goes so far as to say that to avoid it would be "over dainty." The nature of the resemblance

³⁶² Ibid. 200.

between the plagiarism and the innocent imitation is similar. The difference is that Poe's resemblant passage is "well known" while the Browne passage at the time in question, was not.

Browne's *Religio Medici* owes its being "made common" by the time of Cooke's review to the popular imitation/plagiarism controversies of the time. Its reprinting in 1844, edited by John Peace, brought Browne's text directly into the line of fire through Peace's inclusion of "Resemblant passages from Cowper's Task," prefaced with the assertion that:

The Author of The Task was not one of those affectionate beings who have neither bosom-friends nor favourite pocket-companions. Although the fact is no-where recorded I am persuaded that *Religio Medici* was one of his darling books... Will it be thought that I mean to disparage dear Cowper by bringing forward these analogies? Far from it! They make me love him the more. There are but few books in the world, worth reading, which do not disclose their authors' acquaintance with the wisdom to be found in other books that were written before them.³⁶³

Peace here stages his own act of "exposé," that of "bringing forward" Browne's "no-where recorded" influence on Cowper. The edition inspired an 1847 article in *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, "Literary Imitations, No. II."³⁶⁴ Taking Peace's resemblance as an insinuation of plagiarism (for as previously shown, the tracing of imitations was always connected to the suggestion of plagiarism), the author quarrels with the parallel passages on the grounds that no resemblance is visible: "Will some senior wrangler do us the favor to point out the resemblance?"³⁶⁵ Indeed, the same can be said of many of the similarities and imitations identified in Hunter's letter and in *Sharpe's*.³⁶⁶ But if the resemblance is not clearly visible,

³⁶³ See Sir Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici, Its Sequel Christian Morals, With Resemblant Passages from Cowper's Task and a Verbal Index*, Ed. John Peace (Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard, 1844).

³⁶⁴ See S.M.S., "Literary Imitations, No. II," *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, Sep. 1847, 121-124. This was the sequel to "Literary Coincidences, No. 1" in the previous month's issue, which followed like Hunter and *Sharpe's* tracing imitations to deny "plagiarism." I have not yet been able to identify S.M.S.

³⁶⁵ S.M.S., 121.

³⁶⁶ For example, Hunter points out this similarity between Shakespeare and Shelley:

Peace's exposé still has its effect. It brings Browne's text into popular exposure and circulation. The writer of "Literary Imitations, No. II" proceeds to expose Browne's own possible influences, further paralleling his quotations to quotations from the classics and Browne's contemporaries.

Edd Winfield Parks in his *Ante-Bellum Southern Literary Critics* contends "almost certainly" that Poe's charge of imitation against Cooke's poem was the motivation behind "Old Books and New Authors."³⁶⁷ But the year before Cooke's essay, in 1845, a more prominent controversy came of one of Poe's charges of imitation that sparked a war: the "little Longfellow War." It commenced with Poe's review of Longfellow's *The Waif*, a collection of magazine poems by "some humbler poet[s]."³⁶⁸ Poe perceives in Longfellow's collection the dynamics of exposure and erasure:

Obviously, this volume is a collection of some few of the prettiest shells that have been thrown ashore by the poetic ocean; but, looking behind this idea, we see that Mr. Longfellow's real design has been to make a book of his "waifs," and his own late compositions, conjointly; since these late compositions are not enough in number to make a book of themselves:—an ingenious thought, too, with which no one can possibly quarrel.³⁶⁹

According to Poe, what Longfellow is concealing, the "real design" accessed by "looking behind" the stated idea of the collection, is an act of his own poetic exposure. The exposure,

"But look, the morn, in russet mantle clad, / Walks o'er the dew of yon eastern hill." —*Hamlet*.

"The grey morn/ Dawns on the mournful scene! The sulphurous smoke / Before the icy wind slow rolls away, / And the bright beams of frosty morning dance / Along the spangling snow." —*Queen Mab*. Quotations on 235.

In *Sharpe's* "Literary Imitations" this imitation is noted between Euripides and Shakespeare:

"Behold, this boy silently supplicates thee, O Father!" —Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis*

"Speak thou, boy, / Perhaps thy childishness will move him more / Than can our reasons." —*Coriolanus*, Act v. sc. 3. Quotations on 398.

³⁶⁷ Edd Winfield Parks, *Ante-bellum Southern Literary Critics* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1962), 147.

³⁶⁸ Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, *The Waif* (Cambridge, MA: John Owen, 1845). Quotation from Longfellow's "Proem" on p. x.

³⁶⁹ Edgar Allan Poe, *Essays and Reviews*, Ed. G.R. Thompson (New York: Literary Classics of the United States, 1984), 696.

however, happens through an erasure of authorial identity, as Poe contends that the seventeen anonymous poems belong to Longfellow, which would seem to suggest that Longfellow seeks only to expose his poems but not his authorship.

This reading would place Longfellow in the culture of literary reproduction over literary production, and in this reading, Poe's accusations of imitation and plagiarism against Longfellow represent Poe's insistence on originality and authorial production, against a poetic scene that, as Cooke saw it, was necessarily imitative. It is in this line that Parks reads Poe, equating his "demanding originality" with Rufus Wilmot Griswold's "demanding nationalism" in *The Poets and Poetry of America*—a correlation Cooke himself makes in his essay, connecting the charge of "imitation" waged against American poetry with the charge that it is "un-national."³⁷⁰

Another reading of Poe's critique of Longfellow positions Poe and Cooke on the same side. Poe suggests that Longfellow's dissociation from his own poems forms part of his attempt to appropriate authorial control over all the poems in the volume. He questions: "How does it happen—not, we trust, through affectation—that the name of each author in this volume is carefully omitted from its proper place, at the head of his poem, to be carefully deposited in the index?"³⁷¹ Meredith McGill reads Poe's question as suggesting that Longfellow's editorial decisions create of the collection "a false orphan" whereby divorcing the texts from their paternity, he can claim authority over them. She notes Longfellow's epigraph to the collection,

³⁷⁰ Parks, 149 and Cooke, 200-201, respectively. See Rufus W. Griswold, *The Poets and Poetry of America: with a Historical Introduction* (Philadelphia: Carey & Hart, 1842). Cooke quotes from Griswold's Preface "the vassalage of opinion and style, which is produced by a constant study of the literature of that nation whose language we speak" (Cooke 200-201; Griswold 6). Griswold thus includes in his preface a call for "Reciprocal Copyright," thereby positioning his text within the debate on international copyright discussed in the previous chapter. Cooke, on the other hand, who wrote "I love the verse of England" in his poem "The Power of the Bards" argues in "Old Books and New Authors" that American literature "sprung into existence like Minerva" and must look to England for its history (Cooke 201). He resists Griswold's suggestions of national subjects in poetry, stating "Poets must be let alone in the choice of their subjects. Force them to be patriotic—and *voilà* Barlow's Columbiad" (Parks, 139).

³⁷¹ Poe, 698.

taken from Spenser's *Faerie Queen*: "A waif the which by fortune came / Upon your seas, he claimed as property / And yet nor his, nor his in equity, but / Yours the waif by high prerogative." Noting that Longfellow disowns property, both authorial and editorial, giving ownership instead to the reader, "Yours," she nevertheless contends that this rejection of property is a device to "[conceal]" his repositioning of textual ownership.³⁷² In McGill's reading, Poe does not object to Longfellow's lack of originality, "but [to] Longfellow's emergence as an author against a backdrop of undifferentiated and unacknowledged fellow poets. Here Longfellow's crime isn't theft, but a crucial act of erasure figured as theft."³⁷³ It is a question of exposure vs. erasure, where Poe concludes his review charging Longfellow with the "moral taint" of concealing: a "careful avoidance of all American poets who may be supposed especially to interfere with the claims of Mr. Longfellow. These men Mr. Longfellow can continuously *imitate* (is that the word?) and yet never even incidentally commend."³⁷⁴

When an anonymous acquaintance of Longfellow publishes a reply to Poe's review in the *Evening Mirror* under the name "Outis" ("Nobody"), Poe launches a five-part dissection of Outis's reply in the *Broadway Journal* where he goes from "remark[ing], as quietly as we can, that *somebody is a thief*" (original emphasis), to an outright defense of the charge of plagiarism. The emphasis, again, is on the concealing where "authors of established reputation...plunder recondite, neglected, or forgotten books." But whereas Cooke emphasized the "concealing care *visible*" Poe sees resemblance where none is visible. This, for Poe, is part of the radical concealing. In addressing Longfellow's own imitation, or plagiarism, he reprints in his reply to

³⁷² McGill, *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting*, 324, n. 50.

³⁷³ Ibid, 209.

³⁷⁴ Poe, 702.

Outis a portion of his review of Longfellow's *Voices of the Night*, published in *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine* in 1840, where he paralleled Longfellow's "Midnight Mass for the Dying Year" with Tennyson's "The Death of the Old Year." Though there is no resemblance in language of the kind Cooke points out between D'Israeli and Browne, Poe insists that the plagiarism is

too palpable to be mistaken; and which belongs to the most barbarous class of literary robbery; that class in which, while the words of the wronged author are avoided, his most intangible, and therefore least defensible and least reclaimable property, is purloined...there is nothing of a visible or palpable nature by which the source of the American poem can be established.³⁷⁵

While Poe begins by asserting that the plagiarism is "too palpable" he concludes that there is nothing "palpable" by which the source can be established. In one sense, this contradiction can be resolved by equivalency. As McGill notes, what is so palpable about the theft for Poe is precisely its lack of palpability, its invisibility.³⁷⁶ She writes, "Poe constructs a narrative in which the absorption of one text by another is done with ease, and the detection of the crime seems all but impossible."³⁷⁷

This contradiction, however, can also be resolved by parallel. Poe's conception of this "barbarous class of literary robbery" where the concealing is so complete it cannot be "visible" should remind us of Peace's "resemblant passages" between Browne and Cowper, where no resemblance was visible. Remembering Peace and Hunter and all the tracing of similarities,

³⁷⁵ [Edgar Allan Poe], review of *Voices of the Night*, by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, Feb. 1840, 102-103. Quotation on 103. For the reprinting in the "Longfellow War" see Poe, *Essays and Reviews*, 745-749. Notable differences are the change from the "we" of the review to the "I"—McGill notes in Poe's earlier dismissal of "the editorial 'we'" Poe's "[emergence] as a full authorial subject" (209)—and the replacement of the concluding question of how Tennyson might respond to the plagiarism with the additional charge that whatever Longfellow did not crib from Tennyson, he "made up mosaically, from the death scene of Cordelia, in 'Lear.'" (749).

³⁷⁶ McGill, 211. "For Poe, the immorality of the plagiarism is linked to the invisibility of the theft."

³⁷⁷ Ibid.

imitations, and plagiarisms of the time occurring in the periodicals, we remember that in the nineteenth-century reading public the detection of the source where no connection was visible was all too possible. They identified sources through the tracing and publishing of quotations in parallel passages. While the passage on its own suggests nothing, there is something palpable about the parallel itself. The rampant tracing of imitations, collating parallel passages, exposed the Palimpsest tablet on the page. The quotations showed themselves, and their reproduction and circulation brought authors into the vision of the reading public. Thus Poe is a participant in, rather than opponent of the culture of imitation and literary reproduction. As in Hunter's letter, Poe's taking plagiarism more seriously demands that we take the "amusement" of imitation more seriously as the exposure of American Poetry and the value of its influence.

It demands we take quotation seriously, too. In these parallels, the distinction is not between original and copy but between practices of quotation or literary reproduction, between Hunter's alternatives "to quote entire" or "cutting them up, or abridging them." Like Hunter, Poe quotes entire. He reproduces Outis's text completely and quotes it repeatedly in his dissection. He even castigates Outis for not quoting entire himself when Outis suggests Poe liable to the charge of plagiarism (a suggestion that, of course, is at the same time denied) by paralleling quotations from Poe's "The Raven" with passages from Coleridge's *Rime of the Ancient Mariner* and excerpts from an anonymous poem "The Bird of the Dream." Poe refutes the first parallel by "[giving] the verses of Coleridge as they *are*" revealing Outis's manipulation in quotation. In response to the second parallel, Poe forms his own parallel: that he demonstrated his similarities by "[printing] the poems together and in full."³⁷⁸ Poe indicates from Outis's

³⁷⁸ Poe, *Essays and Reviews*, 728, 731.

decision not to quote entire, in light of his manipulation of Coleridge, the possibility that he is once again “*forcing* a similarity.”

Of course, forcing the similarity can be said as much of Outis’s manipulation of the visible resemblance of the cut-up texts as Poe’s manipulation of the invisible resemblance of the texts in full, which suggests quotation’s ambivalence. McGill highlights the moment in Poe’s response to the possibility of his own plagiarism where he playfully backs away from charging Outis with “carping littleness” so as to avoid the plagiarism of “employing Outis’ identical words.” She, quite rightly I think, takes the amusing moment seriously as “an acknowledgement of the dangerous indistinguishability of their positions.”³⁷⁹ She locates in this indistinguishability, Poe’s final defense of the practice of plagiarism. In his postscript to his reply to Outis, Poe states:

the poetic sentiment (even without reference to the poetic power) implies a peculiarly, perhaps an abnormally keen appreciation of the beautiful, with a longing for its assimilation, or absorption, into the poetic identity. What the poet intensely admires, becomes thus, in very fact, although only partially, a portion of his own intellect. It has a secondary origination within his own soul—an origination altogether apart, although springing, from its primary origination from without. The poet is thus possessed by another’s thought, and cannot be said to take of it, possession. But in either view, he thoroughly feels it as *his own*—and this feeling is counteracted only by the sensible presence of its true palpable origin in the volume from which he has derived it—an origin which in the long lapse of years it is almost impossible *not* to forget—for in the mean time the thought itself is forgotten. But the frailest association will regenerate it—it springs up with all the vigor of a new birth—its absolute originality is not even a matter of suspicion—and when the poet has written it and printed it, and on its account is charged with plagiarism, there will be no one in the world more entirely astounded than himself.

Poe’s defense of the practice of plagiarism equates the poetic sentiment with “a longing for [the beautiful’s] assimilation, or absorption, into the poetic identity. McGill discusses this passage in

³⁷⁹ McGill, 212.

terms of Poe's rescripting of plagiarism, no longer as authors taking possession, but as authors possessed—the "radical dispossession" of the authorial subject. This assimilation is thus embroiled in acts of possession and dispossession. Through one of the century's most commonplace poets, Poe exposes the period's anxieties of influence and possession as anxieties of assimilation, the ambivalent relation between possessing and being possessed.

But if Poe defends the practice of plagiarism, it is on the condition of the period's popular past-time: paralleling. What "counteract[s]" poetic assimilation and possession, the feeling that the assimilated object is "*his own*," is "the sensible presence of its true palpable origin in the volume from which he has derived it." Poe references that palpable encounter of Poetic similarities in parallel. This parallel, even as "the frailest association" has a regenerative effect, the "new birth" of forgotten, an erased text. Following Poe and those other tracers of imitations (is that the word?), I intend to use the literary and national parallel to expose how these anxieties of assimilation spoke to the anxieties of annexation and locate in reciprocal acts of translation a parallel that allows for a palpable encounter of the Americas.

Stealing from the Spanish: Bryant, Mexico, and Cuba

In May 1836, Catherine Maria Sedgwick told William Cullen Bryant a piece of literary gossip: Harriet Martineau, in her tour of the United States, has been hearing rumors about the country and means to repeat them in her book. Bryant himself passed on the rumor in a letter to his wife:

I have been told by Miss Sedgwick that she [Miss Martineau] has got some queer notions about this country and some strange stories about our people, and that these are likely to get into the book she is going to write about us. Among her stories is one about General Jackson's cheating somebody in a most outrageous manner. She will come out with this story at a very bad time for the success of her book in this country. The prejudices against the old man are very much softened already, and the moment he withdraws from public life, he will be, by general consent, one of the best men that ever lived. She has

also a story about a plot formed by Jackson and [Thomas Hart] Benton to steal Texas from the Mexicans, in order to keep up the power of the slave-holding states. Besides these, she has picked up various facts as she called them relating to the abolition question, some of which are exceedingly improbable. While at Boston she fell in with Dr. Follen and his wife—Follen is a German; he came to this country with high expectations, they were disappointed, and he has become exceedingly discontented. Miss Martineau has adopted his views about the country, which are quite unfavorable and in some instances grossly mistaken, and when she has once taken up an opinion, which she often does very hastily, there is no reasoning her out of it. At Boston, the abolitionists took possession of her, and the abolitionists in that city are narrow minded and fanatical.³⁸⁰

Bryant's use of the word "got" has the quality of disease, where Martineau seems to *get* "queer notions" and "strange stories" the way one might "get," or catch a cold, the kind of getting that simultaneously means being taken with. That these notions and stories "are likely to *get* into the book" suggests the anxiety that this contagion might spread, an anxiety Bryant immediately dispels by predicting that her book won't take with the public. The rumors that Martineau has "picked up" are also rumors of taking, of theft: Andrew Jackson's "cheating somebody" and "a plot...to steal Texas from the Mexicans." Bryant, however, is more concerned with another type of dispossession: influence. He focuses on Martineau's "adopted" views from a discontented immigrant and on how the abolitionists in Boston "took possession" of her.

This possession, I would argue, is not unrelated to the story of possession Martineau intends to tell and does tell in *Society in America*. Bryant, himself, is not immune to the book's influence as can be seen in the evolution of his view on annexation and involvement in the question through his *Evening Post* editorials.³⁸¹ In his 1837 editorial on the question of annexation in *The Evening Post*, he seems to echo Martineau's epithet "the most high-handed

³⁸⁰ William Cullen Bryant, *Letters of William Cullen Bryant*, vol. 2, 1836-1849, ed. William Cullen Bryant II and Thomas G. Voss (New York: Fordham University Press, 1977), 18.

³⁸¹ For a discussion of Bryant's involve in the annexation question see Parke Godwin, *A Biography of William Cullen Bryant with Extracts from his Private Correspondence*, vol. 1 (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1883), 410-423.

theft in modern times” calling it “high handed public robbery,” and comes to acknowledge the abolitionist point.³⁸² Previously, in his editorial for the *Evening Post* on June 17, 1836, he did not mention abolition at all. He opens the editorial stating that the question of annexation is “premature”:

If Congress, under the present circumstances, were to pass a law acknowledging the independence of that country, receiving it into our confederation, our government would lose its character for justice and magnanimity with the whole world, and would deserve to be classed with those spoilers of nations, whose example we are taught as republicans to detest.³⁸³

Annexation of Texas would only class the U.S. among “those spoilers of nations,” however, only “under the present circumstances.” The Texas colonists were still engaged in conflicts with Mexico, and the independence of Texas was still unacknowledged. Without Mexico’s recognition of Texas as independent, the U.S. was still bound by a treaty of limits to respect Mexican territory. In 1836, Bryant was even willing to entertain the possibility of Texas annexation as a measure of “disinterested sympathy with the fortunes of the colonists,” but he saw the American advocacy of annexation as the desire of “speculators” looking to make money in a time of peace by selling Texas lands to U.S. emigrants. “These men,” he writes, “pollute with their sordid motives and hollow professions a cause otherwise noble and generous.”

Still, we find Bryant in 1836 uncommitted on the annexation question. He did not advocate at that point in time, the recognition of Texas independence, until it would be independent “in fact,” calling such premature recognition “a fraud both upon Mexico and the world.” Even imagining the acknowledgement of its independence when it would come to pass, he leaves the question of annexation open: “But an acknowledgement of its independence for the

³⁸² Harriet Martineau, *Society in America*, vol. 1 (London: Saunders & Otley, 1837), 106; William Cullen Bryant, “The Proposed Annexation of Texas, August 4, 1837,” in *Power for Sanity, Selected Editorials of William Cullen Bryant, 1829-1861*, ed. William Cullen Bryant II (New York: Fordham UP, 1994), 69.

³⁸³ *The Evening Post*, June, 17, 1836, 2.

sake of commercial intercourse, is a very different thing from such a recognition of its separate existence and its right to a separate existence, as would entitle us to receive it into the Union.”

Bryant sets out these two very different courses for U.S.-Texas relations, but seems to leave the decision on the matter for a time when it would no longer be premature.

By August 4, 1837, his position against the annexation of Texas was more firmly stated, and this is because he had come to acknowledge Martineau’s point. He writes, “If the independence of Texas had been acknowledged by Mexico herself ten years ago, we should still oppose her annexation to the republic.”³⁸⁴ This introduces his discussion of “other considerations” connected to the annexation question “of higher importance to the welfare of the nation” than the avaricious speculators in Texan land: the issue of slavery. With the publication of her *Society in America* that year, Martineau’s “strange stories” came to wider knowledge. She identifies in her *Autobiography* another American reader with whom her book did take, positioning William Ellery Channing’s *Letter on the Annexation of Texas to the United States* in a chain of influence, starting with David Lee Child’s article “Texas” in the *The Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine*, on which Martineau based her own treatment of the subject in *Society in America*.³⁸⁵ Bringing that part of her book to the “especial attention” of Channing, she tells that he was “so moved” that he wrote his “Letter,” the influence of which, according to Martineau, staved off the annexation question for two years.

In his “Letter,” Channing casts the seizing of Texas as a crime of possession—“the robbery of a realm”—and a problem of influence, the extension of slavery and the south’s

³⁸⁴ William Cullen Bryant, “The Proposed Annexation of Texas, August 4, 1837,” 69-70.

³⁸⁵ Harriet Martineau, *Autobiography*, ed. Linda H. Peterson (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2007), 365. See David Lee Child, “Texas,” *The Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine*, Jan. 1836, 193-205.

“disproportionate share of influence on the confederacy.”³⁸⁶ Viewing Texas as “the first step to Mexico,” he reads in manifest destiny its imperialist project and argues for the substitution of imperial possession with cultural influence: “We might have conquered her by the only honourable arms,—by the force of superior intelligence, industry, and morality. We might silently have poured in upon her our improvements; and by the infusion of our population have assimilated her to ourselves.”³⁸⁷ Channing means “the substitution of reason and moral principle for the sway of brute force,” but what interests me in the prior quotation is how cultural assimilation and imperial assimilation can be paralleled.³⁸⁸

Bryant, too, despite his strong opposition to the annexation of Texas after 1837 was not opposed to the acquisition of the territory in itself. He added to the condition that Mexico acknowledge Texas’s independence, the condition that the slavery question be addressed. The issue of Texas came more to a head with the election of 1844 and the nomination in May of annexation proponent James K. Polk to the Democratic candidacy. Bryant in his July 25, 1844 editorial in the *Evening Post*, attempted to reconcile his opposition to annexation with the party’s position at the Baltimore convention “ ‘that the annexation of Texas at the earliest practicable period’ was a cardinal feature in modern democracy.”³⁸⁹ He picks up on the ambiguity of “earliest practicable period” to argue for an interpretation of that period as one in which Mexico’s claim to the territory would be resolved and the extension of slavery avoided at which

³⁸⁶ William Ellery Channing, *A Letter on the Annexation of Texas to the United States* (London: John Green, 1837), 15, 34.

³⁸⁷ Channing, *Letter*, 18, 19.

³⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 20.

³⁸⁹ William Cullen Bryant, “Texas-July 25, 1844,” in *Power for Sanity*, 231.

point, he writes, “we abandon our opposition to the annexation of Texas.” Like Channing, Bryant imagines the annexation accomplished under different circumstances:

[I]f this question had been committed at the outset to men of mind large enough to take in all the interests of this great nation, Mexico would be satisfied, the question of slavery avoided, and Texas annexed with honor and satisfaction to the entire people. But for our shame and misfortune the matter fell into the hands of a few fanatics...and by these slave-holding fanatics was the question of Texas, a great question of extension of empire, dwarfed into one of enlarging the influence of that pernicious institution which defaces and disgraces our otherwise glorious country.

For Bryant, the expansion is not the problem. Narrowness is the problem. The “few” slave-holding fanatics, are in Bryant’s opinion, like the Boston abolitionists narrow-minded, not the “men of mind large enough” as should have handled the question. These narrow-minded fanatics, he claims, “dwarfed” the Texas question from what it should have been—“a great question of extension of empire.”

It is probably not surprising to find Bryant participating in the rhetoric of nationalist expansion. We already saw this expansionist vision codified in his Mississippi analogy in the “The Translators of Homer.” But if Bryant envisioned conditions under which the annexation of Texas might have been accomplished not “at the risk of war and with war if it cannot be got without,” he also envisioned the conditions under which territorial expansion might never have occurred.³⁹⁰ In his New Year’s Eve editorial of 1847 at the conclusion of the Mexican-American war, he writes:

If Mexico had been, in a moderate degree, a commercial country, and in that constant, frequent and free intercourse with the United States, to which the different occupations followed by the inhabitants of the two countries, and the diversity of their products, would seem naturally to lead; if the wants of the Mexican population had been those of a civilized nation, and the policy of its government, enlightened and liberal, there would long ago have been formed, between that republic and ours, ties which it would have

³⁹⁰ Ibid.

been hard to break, and when broken easy to unite. We should without question at this moment have been at peace with Mexico.³⁹¹

Bryant here contends that if Mexico had been a compatible republic with the United States, a commercial ally with social and governmental institutions on the level, there would have been no war with Mexico, and in this erasure of the Mexican-American War, we can only assume an erasure of annexation and the Mexican Cession.

This vision, of course, is still caught in assimilationist dynamics, the civilizing mission that mirrors American treatment of the Native Americans upon whom the same standard of civilization was imposed. We see this most clearly in his response to Webster's objection to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Bryant objects to Webster as "an enemy to all further acquisitions of territory in the Southwestern quarter."³⁹² The grounds for Webster's opposition were two: that the addition of these states with low population would throw off the balance between the two branches of the legislature and that the people of this territory were ignorant and depraved and would degrade the character of the Union. After eliminating the first point on several counts, Bryant takes on the second.

The morals of the people who are to be taken into the Union, if the treaty with Mexico goes into effect, occasion Mr. Webster much anxiety. The Boston Cato certainly does well to be vigilant in this matter, and we applaud the zealous severity with which he exercises his censorship. We do not think much of the authority he has quoted, the book of the traveller Ruxton, but we are willing to admit that the morals of the people of that country are not what they ought to be. Under better institutions they will doubtless improve—those of the whites at least—while for the Indian portion of the population, we see nothing to prevent the gradual waste and early extinction of their race, a fate which has fallen upon the Northern tribes. Both New Mexico and California will shortly be as fully Americanized as Florida has been.

³⁹¹ William Cullen Bryant, "The Year 1847- December 31, 1847" in *Power for Sanity*, 255-56.

³⁹² Bryant, "Mr. Webster's Speech- March 30, 1848" in *Power for Sanity*, 257.

Bryant, after applauding Webster for his zeal to protect American character, proceeds to argue for the expansion of territory on the grounds that on the one hand, the moral character of the people—importantly, “the whites”—will improve through Americanization, while predicting the same “extinction” for the Native Americans there as in the United States.

Territorial expansion in this view becomes part of the same progress of civilization within which Bryant had, at the beginning of the 1830s and his editorship in the *Evening Post*, supported Indian Removal. Bryant then argued that the Indian race “could not exist in contact with a civilized community.”³⁹³ In his January 7, 1830 editorial, giving an overview of a *North American Review* article on the subject that claimed something inherent in Native American completely resisted civilization, Bryant further theorizes justification for Indian Removal. He does so by first depicting community relations between civilized nations, one governed by “general principles of reason and international law.” Disputes between these civilized nations are settled by discussion and only when discussions fail is war “the necessary consequence.” Nevertheless, Bryant contends that few claims are fought in war that are well reasonable because among civilized nations there exist “powerful restraints” that impede the motion to war instead of reason. He argues that the Indians know no such restraint and have an indomitable “propensity for war.” Bryant therefore considers only two portraits for life with the Indians: wars of extermination or assimilating them under the sovereignty of a civilized nation. Since the first is undesirable and the second is unfeasible, removal, for Bryant, is the only option. We can see that this same logic applies in the case of territorial expansion into Mexico. Did Mexico

³⁹³ [William Cullen Bryant], “Removal of the Indians.” Editorial. *The Evening Post*, Jan. 7, 1830, 2. For discussion of Bryant’s Indian Removal editorials and the civilizing mission, see Carl Ostrowski, “‘I stand upon their ashes in thy beam’: The Indian Question and William Cullen Bryant’s Literary Removals” *ATQ* 9, no. 4 (December 1995): 299-312 and Andrew Galloway, “William Cullen Bryant’s American Antiquities: Medievalism, Miscegenation, and Race in *The Prairies*” *American Literary History* 22.4 (2010): 746.

qualify, according to Bryant, as an equally civilized nation, war would be avoided, but considered a lesser civilization, in the progress of civilization it has two paths: war or assimilation as annexation.

Civilization is the determinant, and this is what makes Bryant's expansionist ideology with its attendant interests in empire and Indian Removal consistent with his interest in Latin American culture and politics and his support of its struggles for independence. Indeed, when Bryant visited Mexico in 1872, he was lauded not only as a poet but for his work as editor of *The Evening Post* wherein "ha defendido no pocas veces los fueros del honor mexicano" [he has defended no few times the rights and privileges of Mexican honor].³⁹⁴ The reference is likely to Bryant's defense of Mexico's claim to Texas until that nation had itself recognized the territory's independence as well as his support of Benito Juárez's fight against and execution of Emperor Maximilian.³⁹⁵ He praised the Colombian republic and eulogized Simón Bolívar.³⁹⁶ He celebrated and commemorated Spanish American struggles for independence in his poems "The

³⁹⁴ "La Sociedad de Geografía, Estadística, e Historia—Recepcion de Bryant," *El Siglo Diez y Nueve*, March 17, 1872, 1. Major George W. Clarke, a Confederate residing in Mexico who edited an English-language journal there, *Two Republics*, also praised Bryant in his description of Bryant's visit: "To no extrinsic influences can be attributed the honors and hospitality which were so lavishly conferred upon him. They were the spontaneous outpourings of a grateful people, who never forget an act of kindness and justice, and who had not forgotten that, when Mexico was friendless, Mr. Bryant became her friend." See Parke Godwin, *A Biography of William Cullen Bryant with Extracts from his Private Correspondence*, vol. 2 (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1883), 321-322.

³⁹⁵ See William Cullen Bryant, "Mexico and Maximilian" in *Prose Writings of William Cullen Bryant*, ed. Parke Godwin, vol. 2, *Travels, Addresses, and Comments* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1884), 237-241.

³⁹⁶ See Review of *Notes on Colombia, taken in the Years 1822-3*, *The United States Review and Literary Gazette*, March 1827, 418-32. Stanley Williams attributes this review to William Cullen Bryant. The eulogy for Simón Bolívar appeared in *The Evening Post*. Williams also places this editorial under the authorship of Bryant. See [Death of Bolívar], *The Evening Post*, Feb. 14, 1831, 2. It should be noted that Bryant's praise of Bolívar came only after his death. While Bolívar was living, Bryant was cautious and tempered in his assessment. Though he commended Bolívar's government, he refused to compare him with George Washington, a popular comparison at the time, due to Bolívar's vanity and thirst for attention that he seemed to fear might lead to despotism. He wrote of Bolívar in his review of the *Notes on Colombia* "no man, with his character and in his situation, can be pronounced good before his death" (426). And so he held his praise until Bolívar's death.

Damsel of Peru,” “The Lament of Romero,” and “El 2 de Mayo.”³⁹⁷ As Gruesz Silva has observed, Bryant “seems relieved at having southern ‘neighbors’ in the overwhelming task of ‘civilizing’ America.”³⁹⁸ And so Bryant’s civic vision when he looked to the South had two versions, one of the expansion of U.S. civilization and another of the U.S. and Latin America as a pan-American community of civilized nations.

As evident in Bryant’s imagining of an equally civilized Mexico and when he imagines the civilizing of the New Mexican and Californian population, civilization for Bryant is, in either case, Americanization and, as such, is an assimilating project, caught in the same dynamics of possession and dispossession, exposure and erasure that we find in the period’s literary controversies of imitation and plagiarism. Bryant did not shake criticism of imitation and plagiarism, either. Thomas Holley Chivers, a minor poet from Georgia and friend of Poe, wrote of William Cullen Bryant in 1851, that the “only thing he ever wrote that may be called *Poetry* is ‘Thanatopsis,’ which he stole *line for line* from the Spanish. The fact is, he never did anything but steal—as nothing he ever wrote is original.”³⁹⁹ Though Chivers’ claim about the origins of “Thanatopsis” are essentially groundless since the composition predates Bryant’s learning the Spanish language, we should investigate the dynamics of possession in Bryant’s literary engagements with Spanish America.

Anna Brickhouse has noted “a certain metaphorical slippage between ‘poetical’ and historical ‘butchery’” in Bryant’s work in the context of Indian Removal, contending that Bryant

³⁹⁷ See Silva Gruesz, 36. I have not been able to locate “El 2 de Mayo.”

³⁹⁸ Ibid., 56.

³⁹⁹ Parks, 175.

enacts his own “literary removal project.”⁴⁰⁰ She identifies in his writing on Spanish America a “broader Anglo-Saxonist and expansionist ideology in which a glorious US paragon of democracy and civilization would encroach... ‘south as far as the grim Spaniard lets thee.’”⁴⁰¹ Brickhouse ultimately contends that his writings are reflective of both the “hemispheric ideals” and “the transamericanist senses of unease” that would erupt in the 1840s. Kirsten Silva Gruesz, who reads Bryant’s expansionist participation as a sort of last resort to combat the slavery issue, nevertheless locates in Bryant’s 1860s public and private writing two visions of the national borders: “sacred enough to guard to the death” but at the same time “an open door, or a swinging gate” that envisions “a reconciliation of the U.S. national family within a foreign—but neighborly—space.”⁴⁰² In each case the tension is between national and cosmopolitan or international affiliation, the drive toward exposure and the threat of erasure.

Bryant’s translations and quotations of Spanish America provide us a parallel with which to understand Bryant’s vision of American nationalist expansion and assimilation. Translation was another term pitted against original, and linked with imitation’s concerns of assimilation. Silva Gruesz notes that “modernist literary history poses translation as *imitatio*, plain and simple:

⁴⁰⁰ Anna Brickhouse, *Transamerican Literary Relations and the Nineteenth-Century Public Sphere* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 151, 147.

⁴⁰¹ Brickhouse, 142.

⁴⁰² Silva Gruesz, 185-86. I do not agree with Silva Gruesz’s notion that Bryant ever had any “politico-ethical convictions against expansion” (61) that he found himself forced to abandon due to Free-Soil sympathies. Bernard Weinstein traces Bryant’s shifting editorial position on the annexation of Texas, attributing his muted protest to “party loyalty and the assurance of some abstract betterment of American society.” Bernard Weinstein, “Bryant, Annexation, and the Mexican War,” *ESQ* 63 (1971): 23. My own position combines Silva Gruesz’s and Weinstein’s readings: that Bryant, who could generally support annexation so long as it was done under the right circumstances, had to go along with his party accomplishing it under the wrong circumstances with the assurance that the betterment of American Society would be the eventual elimination of slavery. In his *Evening Post* editorial on his visit to Mexico he writes: “Here is a monument to the American soldiers who fell in the war of our country with Mexico, a war in which I take no pride, though its result was the acquisition of California, and the acquisition of California finally led to the abrogation of slavery.” William Cullen Bryant, *The Letters of William Cullen Bryant*, Vol. 6, 1872-1878, Ed. William Cullen Bryant II & Thomas C. Voss (New York: Fordham University Press, 1992), 36.

the antithesis, and enemy, of poetic originality and the genuinely critical sensibility assumed to go with it.”⁴⁰³ In *Palimpsests: Literature in the second degree*, Gérard Genette discusses the nineteenth-century notion of poetry’s untranslatability which he locates in Mallarmé and Valéry. He quotes Maurice Blanchot who explains that “[t]he meaning of the poem is inseparable from all the words, all the movements, all the accents of the poem. The poem exists only in that total structure, and it disappears as soon as one attempts to separate it from that form it has received.”⁴⁰⁴ For poetry, assimilation in this reading means disappearance. Focusing on Bryant’s writings of Cuba, another space that in the nineteenth century faced the two paths of annexation or national self-determination, I uncover in his translation of Cuban poetry and his Cuban story quotations a space of exposure, where two nationals can mutually express through the language of an other their concern with a rising nation.

Though “Thanatopsis” was not stolen from the Spanish, there was a poem by Bryant that did find its source in Spanish: “The Hurricane,” a translation of José Maria Heredia’s “En una tempestad.”⁴⁰⁵ The poem frequently gets attributed to Bryant as an original production throughout the nineteenth century. When the poem appeared in Bryant’s 1832 collection,

⁴⁰³ Kirsten Silva Gruesz, *Ambassadors of Culture: The Transamerican Origins of Latino Writing* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 81.

⁴⁰⁴ Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the second degree*, trans. Channa Newman & Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 215. Instead of distinguishing between prose and poetry as translatable and untranslatable, Genette argues a better formulation of distinction: “between those texts that are adversely affected by the inevitable flaws of translation (literary texts) and those that are unharmed by them: i.e., all other texts.” Even this distinction between literary and practical use of language, he notes as problematic considering the artistry even in practical language. See 215-217.

⁴⁰⁵ “Thanatopsis” was first published in September 1817 by Bryant’s father in the *North American Review*, though Bryant claimed to have written it in 1812. William Cullen Bryant II, however, tracing the inconsistencies in Bryant’s recollections dates the composition in 1815. See William Cullen Bryant II, “The Genesis of Thanatopsis,” *The New England Quarterly* 21.2 (1948): 163-148. Though Stanley Williams notes that Bryant’s interest in Spain dates at least as early as 1817, citing his desire to enlist in the army to visit Spanish America, his learning of the language is generally placed in the 1820s. See Stanley T. Williams, *The Spanish Background of American Literature*, vol. 2 (New Haven: Yale UP, 1955), 127-128 and Parke Godwin, *A Biography of William Cullen Bryant with Extracts from His Private Correspondence*, vol. 1 (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1883), 220.

Poems, its reviewers seemed to have missed the notes in the back that identified it as “nearly a translation.”⁴⁰⁶ A review in *The Metropolitan* cites “The Hurricane” as an example of Bryant’s “love of the wild and natural [that] made his writings exhibit a feeling of the presence of a superior power in the scenes he describes.”⁴⁰⁷ George Pope Morris and Nathaniel Parker Willis attributed the poem to Bryant in their collection *The Prose and Poetry of Europe and America*. It continued to be attributed to Bryant in the readers and samplers throughout the century—though it was acknowledged as a translation in Gertrude Fairfield Vingut’s *Gems of Spanish Poetry* (1855) and *Selections from the Best Spanish Poets* (1856). John Russell Bartlett (not to be confused with John Bartlett of *Familiar Quotations*) cited Bryant in his quotation from the poem for his entry on “hurricane” in his *Dictionary of Americanisms, A Glossary of Words and Phrases Usually Regarded as Peculiar to the United States* (1859).⁴⁰⁸

It should be noted that at least one reviewer across the Atlantic did acknowledge the Hurricane as a translation and may help explain why the Bryant attribution stuck with his North American readers. The review of Bryant’s *Poems* in *The Foreign Quarterly Review*, remarked:

There are some pretty translations, chiefly from the Spanish; but we cannot counsel Mr. Bryant to pursue this branch of composition. Not only is it secondary to that in which he is capable of excelling, but he is not possessed of those qualities which would enable him to be distinguished as a translator. He wants versatility and pliancy of style. He can not

⁴⁰⁶ Bryant refers to “The Hurricane” as “nearly a translation from one by José Maria de Heredia, a native of the island of Cuba” in the notes to his *Poems* (1832). I cite the 1862 edition unless otherwise stated. William Cullen Bryant, *Poems: Collected and Arranged by the Author in Two Volumes*, vol. 1 (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1862), 294.

⁴⁰⁷ *The Metropolitan*, Apr. 1832, 113.

⁴⁰⁸ John Russell Bartlett, *Dictionary of Americanisms, A Glossary of Words and Phrases Usually Regarded as Peculiar to the United States*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1859), 209. The Bryant quotation does not appear in the first edition (1848). The attribution of the poem to Bryant can also be found more recently in literary scholarship. Koppenhaver reads it as emblematic of Bryant’s “kindred spirit” with painter Thomas Cole, comparing it to his “Tornado” (1833). See Allen J. Koppenhaver, “The Dark View of Things: The Isolated figure in the American landscapes of Cole and Bryant,” in *Views of American Landscapes*, ed. Mick Gidley and Robert Lawson-Peebles (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 187.

invest himself easily in a foreign garb, and dismiss all marks of individual manner. The translations are very pleasing, but they differ scarcely at all from his original poems, except in having less force. They do not enable us to forget the identity. They are still evidently from the hands of Mr. Bryant.⁴⁰⁹

The reviewer here critiques Bryant for a kind of deficiency in “the translator’s invisibility” as Lawrence Venuti termed the “translator’s situation.”⁴¹⁰ Only, Bryant’s problem is not a problem of fluency in the text, but his inability to erase “all marks of individual manner.” His translations look like *his* originals, not the originals.

The translation was, in fact, born in misattribution. It first appeared in 1827 in *The Talisman*, an annual miscellany composed by Bryant, Gulian Verplanck, and Robert Sands for the Christmas book market. It does not appear as a translation but contains the descriptive blurb “Written in the West Indies.”⁴¹¹ The works in *The Talisman* are all presented under the authorship of “Francis Herbert” in a preface that constantly plays with questions of anonymity, literary appropriation and circulation, and misattribution. Francis Herbert does not count himself as a “professional author,” though, as a traveler, he keeps a traveler’s journal. This journal is borrowed by his traveling companions so that “I have afterwards had the pleasure of seeing what I thought my finest passages, published under great names, printed on hot-pressed wire-wove paper, illustrated in superb plates, praised and quoted in the reviews, and circulated in the newspapers wherever the English language is spoken.”⁴¹² Herbert says his poetry and plays run “a similar fate.” His words here also possibly describe Heredia’s experience if he could see how

⁴⁰⁹ *The Foreign Quarterly Review*, review of *Poems*, by William Cullen Bryant. Aug. 1832, 136. The reviewer proceeds to critique Bryant’s rendition of “Hurricane” for not “adapt[ing] his metre to his subject,” describing the hurricane in a “dancing sing-song” in the opening stanza. (137).

⁴¹⁰ Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility* (London: Routledge, 1995), 1.

⁴¹¹ *The Talisman* (New York: Elam Bliss, 1827), 114.

⁴¹² *Ibid.*, iv.

Bryant's translation circulated throughout the century. Thus while *The Talisman* puts Heredia's poem in Herbert's voice, we can also read it as voicing Heredia in Herbert's preface.

Discussing another *Talisman* contribution by Bryant, "A Story of the Island of Cuba," Brickhouse describes Herbert's function as narrator as highlighting linguistic *crossing*, a crossing that is effected through quotation. She describes, "Herbert's *modus operandi*; in Bryant's contributions in *The Talisman*, is to introduce a native informant midway through the tale who then narrates much of the ensuing text"⁴¹³ Indeed, most of "Story of the Island of Cuba" is an extended quotation of the words of Herbert's host Counsellor Benzon.⁴¹⁴ Brickhouse notes Parke Godwin's suggestion that the tale may have been an actual story told by Cuban guests at the Salazar house, where Bryant was living in 1828, and considers the double meaning of the "of" in the title as possibly meaning both *about* and *from*. Brickhouse links this quotation to the "*aire*," disease, Herbert fears catching in Havana. As with Bryant's description of Martineau's rumors, the transmission of "tales" is linked with disease and, as Bryant's Mississippi analogy, it reflects the anxiety of influence.

The tale in quotation marks that takes over the narrative is itself concerned with hemispheric transmission in Brickhouse's reading, "the disastrous consequences of the project of assimilation."⁴¹⁵ Benzon's tale is in response to Herbert's question whether he feared slave revolt. Benzon dismisses the suggestion, arguing that "the different classes of our colored population hate each other too cordially ever to concert together to plan a rebellion."⁴¹⁶ The "different classes" reflect varying degrees of miscegenation, the "negro of Africa...born a free

⁴¹³ Brickhouse, *Transamerican Literary Relations*, 144.

⁴¹⁴ In *Prose Writings*, vol. 1, the quotation extends from pp. 267-296.

⁴¹⁵ Brickhouse, 147.

⁴¹⁶ Bryant, "A Story of Cuba," in *Prose Writings*, vol. 1, 267.

man,” the “mulatto” and the “quadroon” who regards himself “almost a white man.” In contrast, Benzon tells of American Indians imported from Florida, or, as some believe, from Mexico, to Cuba to be “instructed in the learning of the white.”⁴¹⁷ Instead, they embark on a murderous rampage until they are executed.

The counter-example, however, is challenged when the Indians, after imprisonment at the Arsenal, settle in Guanés, where they blend with the herdsmen, who share the region with tobacco planters. Benzon says, “No part of Cuba is naturally finer than this, and none is peopled with a worse race.”⁴¹⁸ In Guanés, the “dingy mulatto” passes himself off as a white man (suggesting the lack of distinction between the mulatto and the aforementioned “quadroon”) and sells a stolen horse to Benzon, whose horse was stolen. Runaway sailors pirate merchant vessels coming to the port. In all of this scene, the Indians find a home, as Benzon notes: “I never heard that they did any harm while they remained in this part of the country, at all events, I believe they behaved themselves quite as unexceptionally, to say the least, as the rest of the inhabitants.”⁴¹⁹ It is only a government policy to clear out “vagabonds who can give no account of themselves” that unsettles the Indians.

While Benzon endorses this policy for keeping “a rogue...in the place where he was born and where his character is known,” this nativist policy is what really has the disastrous consequences as the Indians’ second imprisonment after not being native to the place and able “to show no passport of any other,” produces rancor. Benzon states: “The indignities with which they had been treated aroused in their bosoms all the spirit of their race, and filled them with an

⁴¹⁷ Brickhouse, 147; Bryant, “A Story of Cuba,” 268.

⁴¹⁸ Bryant, “A Story of Cuba” 270.

⁴¹⁹ Ibid, 271.

intense thirst for revenge.”⁴²⁰ The violence of the Indian arises, then, when this sordid deregulated space comes under nativist regulation. This is in keeping with Bryant’s position on Indian Removal, where the Indian must either assimilate with civilization, or, should civilization be resisted, must move to the deregulated spaces outside of it, spaces that are themselves only temporary as civilization continues to regulate space.

What is perhaps unique in the Guanes moment of the “Story of Cuba” is that we do not get an American ideal of Indian pastoral in a pre-civilized past purity threatened by the march of civilization that demands its removal, but instead a non-ideal of Indian assimilation in the miscegenated present of civilization’s outskirts, still threatened by the march of civilization that demands its removal. “A Story of Cuba” thus represents Bryant’s consideration of what happens when there is no longer anywhere to be removed to, when there is no place outside of the nation. Paradoxically, he has to go outside of the nation to imagine this space. It is in the space of Cuba and Mexico where Bryant can entertain anxieties of American influence. Bryant’s dialogic quotation thus entails an act of translation, or *transplantation*, in which we can read the ambivalent anxieties of national influence.

Traductor a Traductor: Bryant and Heredia, A Case Study

Bryant’s *Talisman* poem-in-translation paralleled with his tale-in-quotation, might bring the quotation home. Heredia wrote his “En Una Tempestad” in Matanzas in 1822, but it was first published during his exile in the United States due to his involvement with the secret organization *independentista* called *Caballeros Racionales*, affiliated with *Soles y Rayos de Bolívar*.⁴²¹ Heredia’s exile, as Gruesz notes, was “lifelong,” despite a brief and disappointing

⁴²⁰ Ibid, 272.

⁴²¹ Raimundo Lazo, “Heredia, El Gran Poeta Cubano de La Naturaleza y de La Patria,” in *José María Heredia, Poesías Completas : Estudio Preliminar*, ed. Raimundo Lazo (Toluca, Méx: Editorial Porrúa, S.A., 1985), xi.

return to Cuba in 1836.⁴²² He published his collection *Poesías de José María Heredia* in New York in 1825; the same year, he relocated to Mexico, where he would publish its second edition in 1832. Heredia's poems were thus born in transnational migration, much like Heredia himself, whose life is characterized by Raimundo Lazo as “un intricado ir y venir” [an intricate coming and going] between Cuba, Venezuela, Jamaica, the United States, and Mexico.⁴²³ “En Una Tempestad” contrasts with another Heredia poem associated with Bryant in translation: “Niágara.” While Bryant tried to identify “The Hurricane” as a translation though it was taken to be his own poem, Bryant never exactly claimed the translation of “Niágara” as his own, never publishing it in his collected poems, and wrote of it that “The translation from Heredia is not *wholly* made by myself and therefore I have not felt justified in putting my name to it.”⁴²⁴ And though Heredia wrote “En Una Tempestad” at home, Heredia wrote “Niágara” in 1824, looking at the North American natural monument and thinking of Cuba.

Questioning the place of North America in Heredia's poetics, Silva Gruesz argues that the Niagara voyage marks a transformation of Heredia's perception of the U.S. from “utter void” to “presence.” She grounds this transformation in Heredia's cultural ambassadorship and translations from English, but nowhere specifically in Heredia's poems. Bryant's translation of “En Una Tempestad,” I propose, helps us to locate that presence. Reading “Niágara,” the translation of “Niágara,” as a representative of “what U.S. readers were prepared to accept from the other America,” Silva Gruesz uncovers what is lost in translation: Heredia's protest of the

⁴²² Gruesz, 37; Lazo, xvii.

⁴²³ Lazo, x.

⁴²⁴ Silva Gruesz, 45. Héctor Orjuelas investigates the controversy over the translation's attribution and finally attributes the translation to Thatcher Taylor Payne, whose manuscript Bryant revised. See “Revaloración de una Vieja Polémica Literaria: William Cullen Bryant y la Oda ‘Niágara’ de José María Heredia,” *THESAURUS* 19.2 (1964): 248-273.

political situation that has forced his exile, his wounded longings for home, and his healing through the sublime.⁴²⁵ These features of Heredia's poem, she demonstrates, are muted by the translation "to better suit an audience either uninterested in or unable to imagine the full ramifications of its message."⁴²⁶ Though she distinguishes Bryant's translation of "En Una Tempestad" as the more accurate, citing "errors in both literal and figurative meanings, and unexplained excisions" in "Niagara," Bryant's "The Hurricane" shares some of the same errors of translation.⁴²⁷ These errors, I argue, are fitting for the figuring of Bryant's own wandering exile within Heredia's poem, where he seems to see North America in the Cuban natural phenomenon. To see this, we must look in parallel.

⁴²⁵ While Silva Gruesz's reading of Heredia's "Niágara" takes her definition of the sublime as part of the Romantic tradition Heredia and his English translator share, describing it as "a perfect bilingual homonym" (45), Keith Ellis makes a distinction between the 1825 version of "Niágara" and its edited form in the 1832 Toluca version, a distinction centered around the Spanish *sublime* that does not bear the negative connotations of the Kantian sublime, allied as it is with terror, but locates a parallelism in the 1825 version in "faz sublime" and "faz serena," where he argues that sublime must be read in its Spanish definition. In the 1832 Toluca version, "faz sublime" is replaced by Menéndez y Pelayo (Héctor Orjuela considered the revisions in the Toluca version Heredia's own) with "sublime terror"—the Kantian sublime. Ellis, however, notes that Heredia had been reading John Howison's *Sketches of Upper Canada* on his Niagara voyage, where Howison describes the Falls in the language of the sublime. Thus, it is possible that his 1825 version also meant to invoke the Kantian sublime, and that the revision in the 1832 Toluca version meant to clarify the Anglicized use of the term. After all, as Silva Gruesz notes, Heredia's 1825 edition was addressed to his North American audience, for whom the Romantic definition of the term would have needed no emphasis. See Keith Ellis, "Translating José María Heredia's 'Niágara' into English," *Translation Review* 77/78 (2009): 7-19.

⁴²⁶ Silva Gruesz, 47.

⁴²⁷ Ibid., 45.

<p>En Una Tempestad</p> <p>Huracán, huracán, venir te siento, y en tu soplo abrasado respiro entusiasmado del señor de los aires el aliento.</p> <p>En las alas del viento suspendido vedle rodar por el espacio inmenso, silencioso, tremendo, irresistible en su curso veloz. La tierra en calma siniestra; misteriosa, contempla con pavor su faz terrible. ¿Al toro no miráis? El suelo escarban, de insoportable ardor sus pies heridos: La frente poderosa levantando, y en la hinchada nariz fuego aspirando, llama la tempestad con sus bramidos.</p> <p>¡Qué nubes! ¡Qué furor! El sol temblando vela en triste vapor su faz gloriosa, y su disco nublado sólo vierte luz fúnebre y sombría, que no es noche ni día... ¡Pavoroso calor, velo de muerte! Los pajarillos tiemblan y se esconden al acercarse el huracán bramando, y en los lejanos montes retumbando le oyen los bosques, y a su voz responden.</p> <p>Llega ya... ¿No le veis? ¡Cuál desenvuelve su manto aterrador y majestuoso...! ¡Gigante de los aires, te saludo...! En fiera confusión el viento agita las orlas de su parda vestidura... ¡Ved...! ¡En el horizonte los brazos rapidísimos enarca, y con ellos abarca cuanto alcanzó a mirar de monte a monte!</p> <p>¡Oscuridad universal!... ¡Su soplo levanta en torbellinos el polvo de los campos agitado...! En las nubes retumba despeñado el carro del Señor, y de sus ruedas brota el rayo veloz, se precipita, hiere y aterra a suelo, y su lívida luz inunda el cielo.</p> <p>¿Qué rumor? ¿Es la lluvia...? Desatada cae a torrentes, oscurece el mundo, y todo es confusión, horror profundo. Cielo, nubes, colinas, caro bosque, ¿Dó estáis...? Os busco en vano:</p>	<p>The Hurricane</p> <p>Lord of the winds! I feel thee nigh, I know thy breath in the burning sky! And I wait, with a thrill in every vein, For the coming of the hurricane!</p> <p>And lo! on the wing of the heavy gales, Through the boundless arch of heaven he sails; Silent and slow, and terribly strong, The mighty shadow is borne along, Like the dark eternity to come; While the world below, dismayed and dumb, Through the calm of the thick hot atmosphere Looks up at its gloomy folds with fear.</p> <p>They darken fast; and the golden blaze Of the sun is quenched in the lurid haze, And he sends through the shade a funeral ray— A glare that is neither night nor day, A beam that touches, with hues of death, The clouds above and the earth beneath. To its covert glides the silent bird, While the hurricane's distant voice is heard, Uplifted among the mountains round, And the forests hear and answer the sound.</p> <p>He is come! he is come! do ye not behold His ample robes on the wind unrolled? Giant of air! we bid thee hail!— How his gray skirts toss in the whirling gale; How his huge and writhing arms are bent, To clasp the zone of the firmament, And fold at length, in their dark embrace, From mountain to mountain the visible space.</p> <p>Darker—still darker! the whirlwinds bear The dust of the plains to the middle air: And hark to the crashing, long and loud, Of the chariot of God in the thunder-cloud! You may trace its path by the flashes that start From the rapid wheels wh'er they dart, As the fire-bolts leap to the world below, And flood the skies with a lurid glow.</p> <p>What roar is that?—'tis the rain that breaks In torrents away from the airy lakes, Heavily poured on the shuddering ground, And shedding a nameless horror round. Ah! well known woods, and mountains, and skies,</p>
--	---

<p>Desaparecisteis... La tormenta umbría en los aires revuelve un océano que todo lo sepulta... Al fin, mundo fatal, nos separamos: El huracán y yo solos estamos. ¡Sublime tempestad! ¡Cómo en tu seno, de tu solemne inspiración henchido, al mundo vil y miserable olvido, y alzo la frente, de delicia lleno! ¿Dó está el alma cobarde que teme tu rugir...? Yo en ti me elevo al trono del Señor: oigo en las nubes el eco de su voz; siento a la tierra escucharle y temblar. Ferviente lloro desciende por mis pálidas mejillas, y su alta majestad trémulo adoro.</p>	<p>With the very clouds!—ye are lost to my eyes. I seek ye vainly, and see in your place The shadowy tempest that sweeps through space, A whirling ocean that fills the wall Of the crystal heaven, and buries all. And I, cut off from the world, remain Alone with the terrible hurricane.</p>
--	--

As he does in “Niágara,” Heredia uses the *silva*, a less restrictive form than Bryant’s rhyming couplets.⁴²⁸ Described in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* as “dancing sing-song,” Bryant’s couplets certainly do not match the more casual rhyme of Heredia’s verse. But the different metrical compositions perhaps clue us into the different hurricane conditions each author is describing. Heredia’s *huracán* is greeted with clear enthusiasm. The speaker is “abrasado” (embraced) by the hurricane’s blow, and breathes enthusiastically [“respiro entusiasmado”] its breath. There is an immediate spiritual communion in Heredia’s lines. Bryant’s opening lines are marked by ambivalence. Instead of breathing the hurricane’s breath, Bryant’s speaker “knows” it which can suggest spiritual intimacy but can also suggest a mental distance, moving from “feel[ing]” to knowing. The opening stanza seems to conclude on distance as the speaker is left “wait[ing].” How to read this waiting is also rendered ambiguous as enthusiasm is rendered “a thrill in every vein,” speaking more of the physical sensation of thrill, either to pleasure or to fear.

⁴²⁸ For a description of the *silva* see Ellis, 11-12.

In the second stanza it becomes more apparent that Bryant is re-membering a different landscape than the one Heredia paints. Heredia describes the hurricane as “silencioso, tremendo, irresistible / en su curso veloz.” [“silent, terrible, irresistible in its rapid course”]. Bryant renders this passage “silent and slow, and terribly strong.” Despite the rapid dancing movement of Bryant’s meter, he reads Heredia’s swift hurricane as “slow.” Bryant includes a description nowhere located in Heredia’s poem: “The mighty shadow is borne along, / Like the dark eternity to come.” This description of the hurricane gives to the storm the qualities Heredia gives to the earth that meets the hurricane, “la tierra en calma siniestra; misteriosa, contempla con pavor su faz terrible” [“the land in sinister calm, mysterious, views its terrible face with dread”]. The hurricane’s “mighty shadow” assumes the mystery Heredia ascribed to the land, while “dark eternity” gives the storm its sinister quality. Bryant’s “world,” then, is translated as “dismayed and dumb” not before a sublime “terrible” hurricane but before a “gloomy” one. He eliminates Heredia’s description of the bull, an ambivalent sentence where we can read the bull as both figuring the violence of the hurricane or violently responding to the impending hurricane. The bull, I would argue, suggests too much the atmosphere of the Spanish territory. We notice that Bryant avoids not only “sublime” in this poem as well as in “Niágara”—what Silva Gruesz notes is a “perfect bilingual homonym,” but all perfect bilingual homonyms in Heredia’s text: *irresistible, terrible, universal*. This signals that Bryant is not calling on us to see what Heredia sees, but something different.

It is the fifth stanza where we can most clearly see Bryant remembering the North American landscape. Heredia writes: “¡Su soplo / levanta en torbellinos / el polvo de los campos agitado...!” [“Its blow raises in whirlwinds the dust of the stirred fields”]. Bryant translates *campo* as though it were *llano*, but this is not mistranslation. This is exactly translation. He

reads in the Cuban fields the North American plains he would later describe in “The Prairies” where “the bison feed no more”—another possible explanation for the omission of the bull. Bryant ends his translation a stanza before Heredia’s ending, omitting the emphatic celebration of the hurricane. Heredia envisions the hurricane as a mother or lover, at whose breast the speaker forgets the miserable cruel world and is filled with inspiration and delight. His exile was most painful in the separation from the women of his life, with whom home becomes equated, as depicted in the “Sin patria, sin amores” of “Niágara.”⁴²⁹ But while Heredia’s speaker finds himself at home in the hurricane, Bryant’s speaker finds himself “cut off from the world,” exiled.

The changed characters of the hurricane and the world between Heredia’s original and Bryant’s translation, I argue, come from the fact that the two are describing different hurricanes. Heredia’s hurricane, in its freer form and in the dread it instills in a miserable, cruel, and fatal world, I read as the nationalist movement of colonial liberation. Bryant’s hurricane, in its more restrictive, subduing form and in the sinister, mysterious slow shadow it casts, represents possibly the national movement of civilization and progress. Again, Bryant must go outside of the nation to entertain anxieties about its influence. We remember that Bryant’s speaker was Francis Herbert, whom Bryant places in West Indies, composing this poem, seeing the Cuban sublime natural landscape and thinking of home. Bryant’s translation of “En Una Tempestad” is “Niágara,” translated.

Bryant, translating Heredia, becomes the translator of a translator. Silva Gruesz notes Heredia’s translation of Daniel Webster’s First Bunker Hill Monument Oration, of Lord Tytler’s *Lessons of Universal History* and Walter Scott’s *Waverly*.⁴³⁰ Jenny Pérez Carrasco has also

⁴²⁹ See Silva Gruesz, 42-43 for a discussion of the lost love in Niágara and Heredia’s “eroticized nationalism.”

⁴³⁰ Ibid, 44.

examined Heredia as a translator recently. In her study of Heredia's "El mérito de las mujeres," a version of Ernest Wilfrid Legouvé's "Le mérite des femmes," she characterizes Heredia's translation as "intervención deliberada del traductor, entendida como apropiación del texto original, alejada de la literalidad del texto" [the translator's deliberate intervention, understood as appropriation of the original text, removed from the literality of the text].⁴³¹ Paralleling the original and translation, she reveals in Heredia's translation practice, much of the same features we saw in Bryant's: change in meter, elimination of lines and stanzas, additions of lines, "mistranslations" of words, and the insertion of new location. Heredia inserts his Emilia in Legouvé's poem and relocates Legouvé's French text to the agricultural Cuban landscape, and finally his own political plight in Cuba and exile, "Cuando fatal persecución en Cuba / Turbó la dulce paz con sus furores" [When fatal persecution in Cuba disrupted the sweet peace with its rages].⁴³² Heredia was not alone in this translation practice; Pérez Carrasco locates him in a tradition of Cuban translators, who, not by virtue of profession, but by virtue of exile, lived in other cultures, learning other languages, and imitated foreign verses to convey their own patriotism and ideal of freedom.

Heredia's appropriation of foreign verses not only functioned, however, to envision the national in his hemispheric migrations, but also to envision other nationals as hemispheric. In his poem "A Washington: Escrita en Monte Vernon" he translates the famous quotation of General Henry Lee's *Resolutions Presented to the House of Representatives, on the Death of General Washington* (1799): "first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen." Heredia renders it: "Primero en paz y en guerra, / primero en el afecto de tu patria / y en la

⁴³¹ Jenny Pérez-Carrasco, "La poesía intervencionista de José María Heredia," *Meta: journal des traducteurs* 50.4 (2005). <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/019927ar> This article appears in the CD-ROM accompanying the special issue.

⁴³² Ibid.

veneración del Universo.”⁴³³ Combining the war and peace of Lee’s triptych, Heredia translates the national hero for universal veneration. In his “En el Aniversario del 4 de Julio de 1776,” written the year before the nation would celebrate its 50th anniversary, Heredia seems undoubtedly infected by the national fervor. He translates the rhetoric of manifest destiny and American influence, not as a civilizing mission but a liberating mission: “De mar a mar, del norte al mediodía, de libertad el árbol se ha plantado. / América feliz bajo él adora / de la santa igualdad el dulce imperio, y los vientos de oriente al hemisferio llevarán su semilla bienhechora” [From sea to sea, from north to south, the tree of liberty has been planted. Happy beneath it, America adores the sweet rule of holy equality, and the eastern winds will carry its beneficial seed to the hemisphere.]⁴³⁴ Even in Mexico, Heredia transplants his appropriation of American independence translating in his own miscellany Chateaubriand’s parallel between Washington and Bonaparte. In a letter written on June 2, 1824 from New York, he noted that the only thing he disliked about the Military Garden in Brooklyn was seeing the bust of Bonaparte paired with Washington. Chateaubriand’s parallel that contrasts Washington as the humble servant of liberty to Bonaparte as liberty’s traitor in the ambition for empire perhaps allows us to see in Heredia’s translation in Mexico a prescient critique of the US politics of empire in the coming decades.⁴³⁵

Heredia’s exile, translated in the figure of Francis Herbert, provides a space for the national poet to contemplate with dread the mighty shadowing storm cloud of the progress of civilization. But if Francis Herbert can be said to speak for the Cuban, the native informant, he

⁴³³ José María Heredia, *Poesías Completas*, ed. Raimundo Lazo, (Toluca, Méx: Editorial Porrúa, S.A., 1985), 47.

⁴³⁴ Ibid, 49.

⁴³⁵ José María Heredia, “Paralelo Entre Washington y Bonaparte: de *Viajes* de Chateaubriand,” in *Miscelanea: Periodico Critico y Literario* (Tlalpam: Imprenta del Gobierno, 1829), 8-12 and “Cartas de José María Heredia,” *Revista de Cuba*, Tomo IV (1878), 617. The former is for the most part a faithful translating, though Heredia omits the first paragraphs where Chateaubriand temporally and geographically positions himself to set up the parallel.

also provides a context in which to doubt hemispheric ideals of universal and beneficial influence. Taken on their own, each translator only selects to reproduce what suits his own purposes, much the same way Silva Gruesz argues these poems were read by contemporary US and Cuban readers. It is in the translation of the translation, the translator of the translator, that the ambivalent river of influence becomes a more fruitful tree.

There's another story of the influence of Bryant's Homeric vision rooted in the reciprocal exchange between the United States and Latin America. In 1879, Dom Pedro II of Brazil travelled to the U.S. where he met the North American to whom he had sent his photograph thirteen years before with praises of his poetry. He travelled on to the East and in Smyrna he gathered from a grotto by the river Melee, called Homer's Grotto, an oak leaf and acorn that he sent to Bryant: "I offer the translator of Homer in homage to his talent and in remembrance of the happy hours the reading of his translation has given me...and of the brief moments in which I enjoyed his company." Bryant planted the acorn at his Long Island country home.⁴³⁶

Longfellow's Inverted Tree, Known By Its Hemispheric Fruit

Paralleling the translation of a translation might have been what ended the Little Longfellow War. In his review of *Voices of the Night* before the Longfellow War, Poe writes off the translations that formed a large part of the collection because "so many of its [poetry's] more spiritual attributes and properties—lie *beyond* the scope of translation."⁴³⁷ Poe does, however, discuss a Longfellow translation in his reply to Outis. He exposes Longfellow's translation as plagiarism more literally, arguing that Poe's translation "The Good George Campbell" from the German of O.L.B. Wolff is not a translation but the plagiarism of the Scottish William

⁴³⁶ Clara Cutler Chapin, "Bryant and Some of His Latin American Friends," *Bulletin of the Pan-American Union* 78, no. 11 (1944): 612.

⁴³⁷ review of *Voices of the Night*, 100.

Motherwell's "The Bonnie George Campbell." He parallels the two to show the visible resemblance. Poe finds dubious Longfellow's defense that he did translate from Wolff who must have imitated Motherwell: "In the first place, how is it that in the transmission from the Scotch into German, and again from German into English, not only the versification should have been rigidly preserved, but the rhymes and alliterations?"⁴³⁸

Kent Ljungquist and Buford Jones find in this moment of translation, as McGill found in the moment of quotation, the key to Poe's postscript defense of plagiarism, which they read as recanting.⁴³⁹ Investigating the identity of Outis, they discuss a letter by C.C. Felton in which he certifies that Longfellow came upon the German poem in a collection during his European tour. Felton collates the German passage with Longfellow's translation to reveal that Longfellow even translated a misprint in the German, proving the German as his source. The letter is reprinted by Lawrence Labree (whom the scholars believe to be Outis), editor of *The Rover*, in his article "The Proof." Ljungquist and Jones imagine that Poe, in the face of this solid proof, recants his accusations in his defense of Longfellow in the postscript. But how does the proof of Longfellow's translation translate to Poe's radical defense of plagiarism? He does not have to defend plagiarism just because Longfellow in this case did not plagiarize.

I would argue that if Poe has a conversion, it is not in his estimation of Longfellow's poetic character but of translation's poetic character. Felton's letter proves that poetic attributes and properties can translate. Through this letter, translation shifts from being the kind of assimilation Poe devalues—the kind that hides, erases, or loses—to the kind of assimilation he values, the kind that is visible, that exposes. Indeed, Gérard Genette calls translation "the most

⁴³⁸ Poe, *Essays and Reviews*, 750.

⁴³⁹ See Kent Ljungquist and Buford Jones, "The Identity of 'Outis': A further chapter in the Poe-Longfellow War," *American Literature* 60.3 (1988): 402-415.

visible form of transposition.⁴⁴⁰ Longfellow's translation of a translation reveals both the Scottish source and the German source. It figures the Palimpsest tablet.

If Longfellow fell under the criticism of imitative poetics that had written him off for ripping from other authors, notably European authors, there was another way in which he fit into literary nationalism—his cosmopolitan quotability and translatability. W. Sloane Kennedy's 1882 biography of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow presents an anecdote of British politician, poet, and biographer Lord Houghton's 1875 visit to the US from *The Philadelphia Ledger and Transcript*: "Lord Houghton, when in this country, was delighted, but somewhat surprised, to hear a gentleman at a social gathering quoting something from his own favorite Keats: but no American would be surprised to hear Longfellow quoted anywhere in the world."⁴⁴¹ Indeed, Longfellow's influence was in the nineteenth century about as wide as Bryant depicted Homer's influence. Sumner wrote Longfellow about an old classmate who encountered his "Psalm of Life" "on a scrap of newspaper, in the hands of two Irishwomen, soiled and worn."⁴⁴² Longfellow's *Poems on Slavery* was translated in Russia by Mikhail Mikhailov in March 1861 and in November of that year he received a nearly 12-hour visit from Mikhail Bakunin, escaped from prison.⁴⁴³ Tung-Tajen of China wrote a translation of Longfellow's "Psalm of Life" on a

⁴⁴⁰ Genette, 214. Not only "the most visible" but also "the most widespread."

⁴⁴¹ W. Sloane Kennedy, *Henry W. Longfellow: Biography Anecdote, Letters, Criticism*. (New York: Haskell House, 1882, rpt. 1973). Lord Houghton was Keats's biographer.

⁴⁴² Ibid., 63-64.

⁴⁴³ See David Hecht, "Longfellow in Russia," *The New England Quarterly* 19.4 (1946): 531-534. For Bakunin's visit to Longfellow see Paul Avrich, *Anarchist Portraits* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988), 21-22. Aleksandr Nikolaevich Nikoliukin notes that the same issue of the *Sovremennik* in which Mikhailov's translation appeared published also the announcement of the abolition of serfdom and that the Longfellow translations passed censorship on the condition that the title be altered to *Songs about Negroes*, suggesting at once the relationship between the abolitionist poems of Longfellow, in translation, to the Russian context of abolition and the denial of relationship. See Aleksandr Nikolaevich Nikoljukin, *A Russian Discovery of America* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1986), 233.

fan he sent to the poet.⁴⁴⁴ The Chinese translation was then re-translated by an Englishman on of the staff of the American minister to China. In 1871, Longfellow's "The Village Blacksmith" was translated in Japan, and in 1882 his poems made four of the fourteen Western poems translated in the *Shintai Shi-shō*.⁴⁴⁵ Longfellow was also the most translated North American poet in Spanish America and received visits from and corresponded with Latin Americans, most notably the Eusebio Guiteras of Cuba, Emperor Dom Pedro II of Brazil, Domingo Faustino Sarmiento of Argentina, and Rafael Pombo of Colombia.⁴⁴⁶ In this manner he served as what Silva Gruesz terms an "ambassadorial [icon] of national culture."⁴⁴⁷

Longfellow served in this ambassadorial capacity not only through translations of his own work abroad but in making foreign works familiar in the US. In 1845, he published *The Poets and Poetry of Europe*, a volume he meant specifically to parallel Rufus Wilmot Griswold's *The Poets and Poetry of America*. On November 24, 1843, in a letter to German poet and translator Ferdinand Freiligrath, he wrote:

I am just beginning the publication of a volume of Specimens of foreign poetry, being a selection from the best English translations now existing from the Anglo-Saxon, Icelandic, Danish, Swedish, German, Dutch, French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese. The object of the book is to bring together in one volume what is now scattered through a

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid, 64. Kennedy identifies Tung-Tajen as a "Chinese translator and noted scholar...a great admirer of Mr. Longfellow." William Seward also mentions Tung-Tajen in *William H. Seward's Travels Around the World* where he identifies him as the president of the Board of Revenue and a poet. See William Seward, *William H. Seward's Travels Around the World*, ed. Olive Risley Seward (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1873), 203.

⁴⁴⁵ The other 10 poems were English. See Shunsuke Kamei, "Japanese Reception of American Literature until World War II," *Comparative Literature Studies* 13.2 (1976), 143-159. Longfellow's firstborn Charley Longfellow, a notable globe-trotter, visited Japan also in 1871, where he would live for two years. I have not yet been able to ascertain whether the Japanese attention to Longfellow's literature had to do with the arrival of his son. See Christine Guth, *Longfellow's Tattoos: Tourism, Collecting and Japan* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2004).

⁴⁴⁶ For an account of Longfellow's translation in Spanish America see John Englekirk, "Notes on Longfellow in Spanish America," *Hispania* 25.3 (1942): 295-308. Englekirk notes that "Of American poets, however, Longfellow has earned the distinction of being the one who has had the largest number of his poems translated by the greatest number of translators" (295).

⁴⁴⁷ Silva Gruesz, *Ambassadors of Culture*, 15.

hundred and not easily got at. The volume will be the same size and appearance as Griswold's *Poets and Poetry of America*.⁴⁴⁸

Longfellow's editorial decisions to give *Poets and Poetry of Europe* a similar aspect to Griswold's anthology signals his announcement as a re-rendering of the nationalist project. Helga Eßmann notes that while the two share a similar objective to collect in one volume scattered verses to facilitate public access, they differ on visions for a national literature. She contrasts Griswold's nationalist aim from Longfellow's "alternative concept." She writes: "In keeping with the idea that an American literature—as well as an American national consciousness—must grow (as he would put it) and coalesce from literary and cultural heterogeneity, he aimed at the internationalization of American national pride. In doing so, he made *The Poets and Poetry of Europe* give a different slant to the motto, *E Pluribus Unum*."⁴⁴⁹ Longfellow's internationalism remained part and parcel of his nationalism; it was for him an alternative approach within the nationalist project that maintained that the poets and poetry of Europe were in some way synonymous with the poets and poetry of America.

Eßmann's parentheses that put virtual quotation marks around the word "grow" alludes to Longfellow's discussion of universality in his 1849 novel *Kavanagh* where the teacher and frustrated poet Mr. Churchill prefers universality to the nationalism promoted by a visitor, Mr. Hathaway, and imagines national literature in the form of a tree.

⁴⁴⁸ Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, *The Letters of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*, vol. 2, 1837-1843, ed. Andrew Hillen (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1966), 551.

⁴⁴⁹ Helga Eßmann, "Literary 'Universality': Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and American National Literature" in *The Internationality of National Literatures in Either America: Transfer and Transformation*, ed. Armin Paul Frank and Helga Eßmann (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 1999), 98. Eßmann's study considers Longfellow's "universality" as practiced in his translations, his anthologies, his professorship in Modern Languages, and in his poetry and prose and uncovers in Longfellow a tradition that links the nineteenth-century to the twentieth century, placing him in her concluding remarks in a line with Pound and T.S. Eliot, and even Robert Lowell and Robert Bly. While Eßmann sees this line in terms of translation, in the intertextual relationship between translation and quotation, the line also functions to link nineteenth century culture of imitation and quotation to modernist aesthetics of poetic quotation.

Nationalism is a good thing to a certain extent, but universality is better. All that is best in the great poets of all countries is not what is national in them, but what is universal. Their roots are in their native soil; but their branches wave in a the unpatriotic air, that speaks the same language unto all men, and their leaves shine with the illimitable light that pervades all lands. Let us throw all the windows open ; let us admit the light and air on all sides ; that we may look towards the four corners of the heavens, and not always in the same direction.⁴⁵⁰

We can read Longfellow's tree as an inversion of Bryant's river. Instead of the national flowing out into the universal, it branches out into "unpatriotic air" and this universal air is taken into the national, it "speaks...unto" and its light "pervades." Churchill calls for the national to "admit" this light. International influence comes into the national instead of national influence flowing out internationally.

The reversed direction of influence causes Longfellow to mix his metaphors a couple of pages later when he discusses the American tree of national literature. Hathaway has all the while been trying to win Churchill's contribution and endorsement of his plan for a magazine of national literature called *The Niagara* and speaks the voice of the Young America brand of national literature. Churchill's universal tree leads Hathaway to question whether Churchill thinks "nationality a good thing" to which Churchill responds "Let us be natural, and we shall be national enough." Naturally, Churchill concludes, the American is "English under a different sky" and Hathaway interprets Churchill's position as consigning American literature to "imitation," rescripted by Churchill as "continuation."⁴⁵¹

The "different sky" of America takes on a more crucial aspect when in response to Mr. Hathaway's query into his opinion of national literature, Churchill states,

a national literature is not the growth of a day. Centuries must contribute their dew and sunshine to it. Our own is growing slowly but surely, striking its roots downward and its

⁴⁵⁰ Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, *Kavanagh* (Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields, 1849), 115.

⁴⁵¹ *Kavanagh*, 115-116.

branches upward, as is natural; and I do not wish, for the sake of what some people call originality, to invert it, and try to make it grow with its roots in the air.⁴⁵²

If originality insists on an inversion of the national tree where it must grow from roots in the air, then the sky is no longer that “unpatriotic air” into which other trees of national literature extend their branches, but the patriotic air in which nationalists insistent on originality try to make it grow.

For Longfellow, the tree of American literature takes in international influence from the ground up to grow into the national air. Thus for the project of American nationalism, branching out does not mean extending to other climes but coming into its own. Churchill addresses this national development as international *influence* more specifically in his concluding remarks on universality where he argues for the development of national literature through a kind of cultural “mingling”:

I was about to say also that I thought our literature would not be wanting in a kind of universality. As the blood of all nations is mingling with our own, so will their thoughts and feelings finally mingle in our literature. We shall draw from the Germans tenderness; from the Spaniards, passion; from the French, vivacity, to mingle more and more with our English solid sense. And this will give us universality, so much to be desired.⁴⁵³

The American “draw[s] from” or *in* “thoughts and feelings” from the various foreign nations.

The repetition of “mingling” designates the American nation as a contact zone that makes this universality particularly possible.

Contact is precisely the grounds on which notions of hemispheric cultural ambassadorship and transamerican relations have been challenged as haunting specters against

⁴⁵² Ibid., 117.

⁴⁵³ Ibid., 117-118.

the “the bigger reality” of non-encounter.⁴⁵⁴ Carl Good notes Longfellow’s biographical “non-encounter” with Latin America in the sense that he never visited Latin America despite the interest it showed in him. He notes, too, that Rafael Pombo does not find him at home when he attempts to visit him.⁴⁵⁵ Pombo’s visit to Longfellow becomes comparable to the opening non-encounter and centerpiece of Good’s essay, Federico García Lorca’s visit to Hart Crane. As Good points out the 1920s Latin American interest in the North, unreciprocated by the North, noting that “Lorca went looking for Crane; it was not Crane who went looking for Lorca,” we note that Pombo went looking for Longfellow; it was not Longfellow who went looking for Pombo.⁴⁵⁶ Stanley Williams referenced Longfellow’s “rather mild interest in Spanish America” and contrasted him (along with Ticknor and Lowell) to Bryant “who made use of Spanish-American ‘leaves’.”⁴⁵⁷ Robert McKee Irwin asserts that Longfellow’s oeuvre “exhibits no interest at all in Latin American writing.”⁴⁵⁸ Indeed, so far as is presently known, Longfellow published no translation of his own of Latin American authors.⁴⁵⁹ Sarmiento had asked

⁴⁵⁴ Robert McKee Irwin, “The American Renaissance and the Mexican *Renacimiento*: The Long Critical Disconnect in the Americas,” *The New Centennial Review* 8.1 (2008): 235-251. Quotation on 237. Following Carl Good’s notion that increased interaction between the U.S. and Latin America was matched by a greater sense of non-encounter between their respective national and literary traditions, Irwin contends that Bryant and Longfellow’s celebrity in Latin America, the fact of their being translated and popular had more to do with the friendships made with Latin American literati like Guillermo Prieto and José Agustín Quintero than with the appeal of their verses per se. He notes Bryant’s claim in his visit to Mexico that he “[knew] but little yet” as evidence of the fact that neither Bryant nor Prieto were interested in the other’s national literature.

⁴⁵⁵ Carl Good, “A Chronicle of Poetic Non-Encounter in the Americas,” *The New Centennial Review* 3.1 (2003): 238-239.

⁴⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 242.

⁴⁵⁷ Williams, *The Spanish Background*, vol. 2, 152.

⁴⁵⁸ Irwin, 244.

⁴⁵⁹ Some scholars have attributed translations of Latin American authors to Longfellow. Good himself refers to Longfellow’s “substantial labor of translation of Portuguese, Spanish, and Latin American writers,” citing the introductory note to Ernest Moyne’s “The Origin and Development of Hiawatha” entitled “Longfellow and Latin America” by Robert S. Ward (though Good attributes Ward’s introduction to Moyne). Ward refers to the translation of Heredia’s “Niagara,” already discussed, and a translation of Portuguese Conde da Barca, who emigrated to Brazil,

Longfellow in 1866 to translate a poem by Juana Manso on Lincoln and to publish it in the *Atlantic Monthly*. Longfellow, in his reply, translated only one stanza, claiming of the rest that its principal qualities “it would lose in translation.”⁴⁶⁰ Good takes Longfellow’s deathbed poem “The Bells of San Blas,” which Robert S. Ward notes in his “Longfellow and Latin America” for its “inter-American theme,” as representative of North-South American non-encounter, viewing in Longfellow’s meditation on the ruins of Spanish empire in Mexico, a nostalgia for the colonial past.

The nostalgia for a colonial past that Good attributes to Longfellow is based on what is actually presented in the poem as quotation. Longfellow’s poem opens with the question “What say the Bells of San Blas / To the ships that southward pass / From the harbor of Mazatlan?” He identifies the sound of the bells with “the voice of the Past” and hears the lament of the bells as they remember their glory days in quotation marks that run for half of the poem. But the quotation marks end and the speaker of the poem responds: “O Bells of San Blas, in vain / Ye

both included in Longfellow’s *Poets and Poetry of Europe*. Neither of these translations, however, are Longfellow’s. Kirsten Silva Gruesz credits Longfellow with translations of two poems by Rafael Maria Mendive. The translation of the poem “The Virgin Smile”/ “La Sonrisa Virginal” in the 1849 article “The Poetry of Spanish America” in *The North American Review* was commonly attributed to Longfellow as the article itself was attributed to Longfellow. The article was, in fact, written by William Henry Hurlbert. Max Henríquez Ureña doubts Longfellow’s authorship of the translation noting that the translation does not appear in the authorized editions of Longfellow’s poetry. See Max Henríquez Ureña, *Panorama histórico de la literatura cubana* (Habana: Editorial Arte y Literatura, 1978), 332. Francisco Javier Vingut in his 1855 *Gems of Spanish Poetry* does not attribute it to Longfellow but simply to “N.A. Review.” I have not been able to identify the other of the poems Silva Gruesz says Longfellow translated from Mendive. That Longfellow knew and admired Mendive’s poetry is certain. In his biographical introduction to *Poesias de Don Rafael Maria de Mendive*, Dr. D. Vidal Morales y Morales records Mendive’s receiving from Longfellow a copy of his own poems with a dedication. Morales quotes Cirilo Villaverde’s description of the event, in which Villaverde concludes “La circunstancia de no haberse conocido el obsequiador y el obsequiado, arroja la halagüeña prueba de que nuestra naciente literatura no es del todo desconocida entre los extranjeros” [That the giver and the recipient did not know each other shows the encouraging proof that our nacent literature is not completely unknown among foreigners].

⁴⁶⁰ See Michael A. Rockland, “Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and Domingo Faustino Sarmiento,” *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 12.2 (1970): 275-277. Rockland also tells us that Mary Mann solicited Longfellow’s help in translating some paragraphs of Sarmiento’s *Facundo*, but could not determine which paragraphs she sent him. Pombo, too, sought Longfellow’s help in translating his poem “Cadena” into English. Longfellow sent back some suggestions in the margin. See John Englekirk, “El Epistolario Pombo-Longfellow,” *Thesaurus* 10 (1954): 1-58. The correspondence is reprinted therein.

call back the Past again! / The Past is deaf to your prayer; / Out of the shadows of night / The world rolls into light; / It is daybreak everywhere.” The speaker valorizes the progress of the world that “rolls into light.”

It would be wrong, though, to dismiss the nostalgia because of the quotation marks. Instead, I would argue that the quotation marks need to be read by the light of that daybreak in the final stanza. Ward noted that Longfellow’s poem was inspired by an article in *Harper’s*, W.H. Bishop’s “Typical Journeys and Country Life in Mexico.” Towards the end of his article, Bishop discusses the Bells of San Blas and Mazatlán. Mazatlán, he notes, is an active port city, more wealthy than the Mexico he has seen on his travels from south to north. He writes, “It is surprising, until the large demand from the country tributary is understood, how a city of but fourteen thousand people can be justified in having stocks of goods so elaborate.”⁴⁶¹ Bishop proceeds from Mazatlán up the coast, concluding “[w]e have lost Mexico, but we have gained California, which was once her province. It is singular to remember that on the accession of the Emperor Iturbide, before the American conquests, Mexico could boast of being, with the exception of Russia and China, the largest empire in the world.”⁴⁶² Bishop’s narrative ends with Mexico’s lost empire to the United States and the progress exemplified by Mazatlán in its status as country tributary to a new American empire.⁴⁶³ Longfellow’s poem runs counter to Bishop’s and imagines passing Mazatlán *southward*, where the story is not one of progress as the traveler comes close to the US, but one of decline, hence, nostalgia. If we are to take the nostalgia in quotation marks seriously, by the new light of American progress, we read not just a nostalgia

⁴⁶¹ [W.H. Bishop], “Typical Journeys and Country Life in Mexico,” *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine*, March 1882, 553.

⁴⁶² Ibid.

⁴⁶³ Above the conclusion of the article, the header of the page reads the title of the next article “An American King.”

for a colonial past of the Spanish empire, but a nostalgia for a Mexico “before the American conquests.”

Longfellow’s encounter with Latin America is a story that must be translated within quotation marks. Ivan Jaksic in *The Hispanic World and American Intellectual Life, 1820-1880*, gives a comprehensive picture of Longfellow’s “contacts,” Latin Americans that visited and corresponded with Longfellow.⁴⁶⁴ In *Kavanagh*, Mr. Churchill, like Longfellow, receives visitors distracting him from his own poetic production. Hathaway is one of these. Hathaway the visitor figures Alexander H. Smith the correspondent, who wrote Longfellow in July of 1844 to contribute to “Poet’s Magazine,” dedicated to publishing exclusively American poets. Longfellow, in his reply, declines to take part in the magazine as he is already committed to *Graham’s* but also because he objects to its nationalist premise. Longfellow indirectly quotes his response to Smith in Churchill’s response to Hathaway, a parallel from which is revealing:

<p>Longfellow to Smith: Vast forests, lakes, and prairies cannot make great poets. They are but the scenery of the play, and have much less to do with the poetic character, than has been imagined. Neither Mexico nor Switzerland has produced any very remarkable [sic] poet.⁴⁶⁵</p>	<p>Churchill to Hathaway: Mountains, lakes, and rivers are, after all, only its [literature’s] scenery and decorations, not its substance and essence. A man will not necessarily be a great poet because he lives near a great mountain. Nor, being a great poet, will he necessarily write better poems than another, because he lives nearer Niagara...Switzerland has produced no extraordinary poet ; nor, as far as I know, have the Andes, or the Himalaya mountains, or the Mountains of the Moon in Africa.</p>
---	---

⁴⁶⁴ See Ivan Jaksic, *The Hispanic World and American Intellectual Life, 1820-1880* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), 100-104.

⁴⁶⁵ Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, *The Letters of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*, vol. 3, 1844-1856, ed. Andrew Hillen (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1972), 40-41. It should be noted that this was not always Longfellow’s position. In “The Literary Spirit of Our Country,” part of a series of essays called “The Lay Monastery” he published in 1825, he voiced the nationalist rhetoric of Hathaway and Smith. In the space of the ellipsis in the selection of Churchill’s response to Hathaway, Hathaway asks “you do not certainly mean to deny the influence of scenery on the mind?” indirectly quoting Longfellow’s earlier essay where he writes, “It is upon the poetic mind, where sensibility to natural beauty is more exquisite than elsewhere, that the influence of natural scenery is most evident.” See [Henry Wadsworth Longfellow], “The Literary Spirit of Our Country,” *United States Literary Gazette* April. 1825, 26. Eßmann discusses Longfellow’s change in position in the essay before cited.

Mexico disappears in Churchill's quotation from Longfellow's letter, but it reappears in Hathaway, who, after Churchill's prophesy of universal mingling, responds with eagerness at a prospect he feels he shares with Churchill: "If this is your way of thinking...you will like the work I am engaged upon now." He proceeds to detail a "great national drama, the scene of which is laid in New Mexico" where a Don Serafin, the Marquis of the Seven Churches" loses his entire wealth in a bet on a cock-fight.

Churchill "demand[s], rather than ask[s]" what Hathaway knows about the subject of cock-fighting, and Hathaway makes an appeal, instead, to Churchill's own knowledge. Churchill only knows of an essay on cock-fighting in Ancient Greece and Rome "and I hardly see how you could apply that to the Mexicans."⁴⁶⁶ He himself supplies the link later in the conversation, stating, "But how this is to help you in Mexico I do not see, unless you introduce Santa Anna, and compare him to Caesar and Themistocles." Hathaway takes the suggestion, but Churchill still doubts that Hathaway can pull off his design: "The subject is certainly very original; but it does not strike me as particularly national." Hathaway responds "with a penetrating look": "Prospective, you see!" The US had acquired New Mexico as a territory after the Mexican-American war through the 1848 treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and by 1849 its population was still considered, as Churchill denominates, Mexican.

In Hathaway's plan for a national drama, he becomes Longfellow as well. Longfellow wrote in his "Book of Suggestions," notes for projects never written, in 1846: "A Mexican drama, 'Don Serafin, or the Marquis of the Seven Churches.' The heroine's name Deseada. Scene, The Mexican town of San Luis Potosi, or Queretaro. The cock-pit; The Marquis ventures

⁴⁶⁶ *Kavanagh*, 119.

the remnant of his fortunes, his lands and hacienda on a favorite cock, and loses.”⁴⁶⁷ What happens in the transformation of Longfellow’s “Mexican drama” to Hathaway’s “national drama” as the scene changes from San Luis Potosí to New Mexico? It would appear that nation is not mere scenery.

Longfellow seems to satirize his own idea when it is put within the national context, with Churchill’s “astonished and half-laughing” questioning of Hathaway’s knowledge of cock-fighting, while his participation in the idea through his suggestions of ancient and contemporary connections renders Longfellow strangely equivocal on the Mexican-American drama. Quoting his 1846 plan within the context of the Mexican-American War and the New Mexico territory, Longfellow’s alternative nationalism speaks the same voice as the nationalist project he rejects. Eßmann sees the potential for weakness in Churchill’s internationalist position in the fact that he is a failed poet and that he ultimately agrees to join Hathaway’s nationalist organ. She recuperates the internationalist ideal however in Longfellow who is a successful idealist in theory and in practice. Yet Eßmann finds Longfellow’s internationalism limited in its Old World focus, and finds in Whitman’s *Leaves of Grass* “Churchill and Hathaway rolled into one” and “Longfellow writ large”—Longfellow with a New World internationalism.⁴⁶⁸ But reading Longfellow’s self-quotation in both Churchill and Hathaway also gives us Longfellow as Churchill and Hathaway rolled into one in the New World context.

Longfellow, however, does not sit so comfortably in this New World order. The dialogic quotation marks here, as much as the quotation marks of the bells, highlight the tension of how

⁴⁶⁷ See Robert S. Ward’s “Introductory Note: Longfellow and Latin America” in Ernest J. Moyne, “The Origin and Development of Longfellow’s Song of Hiawatha,” *Journal of Inter-American Studies* 8.1 (1966), 161. The language is nearly identical in Hathaway’s: “The Marquis stakes the remnant of his fortune—his herds and hacienda—on a favorite cock, and loses” (118).

⁴⁶⁸ Eßmann, 89-90. Quotations on 90.

to act or speak for Mexico. After all, Hathaway's project is a play. Both exhibit a curious use of quotation, not claiming the words of another but, as Marjorie Garber describes, the othering of the author's own words. Speaking of Emerson's "Quotation and Originality" in which he mentions "the device of ascribing their own sentence to an imaginary person" as a "gesture of othering or displacement," Garber nevertheless pairs this with the converse appropriative quotation, since both appeal to quotation marks for authority.⁴⁶⁹ In Longfellow's case, to be sure, the quotation marks, not being literary quotation or citation, do not make the same claim to authority as Cardinal de Retz attributing his own phrase of self-description to a classic author, but Emerson himself notes a connection in the "curious reflex effect" of "dramatizing talent," or writing "under a mask."⁴⁷⁰ Within these dialogic quotation marks, Longfellow attempts to speak an other America, and reading the hidden citations within these quotation marks, we find another Longfellow struggling with the ideals of universal nationalism within the reality of empire. Longfellow, as Eßmann notes, is not like his dramatic counterpart in Churchill. Churchill never realizes his literary ambition. Then again, Longfellow never realizes any of his plans to write Latin America.

As the Latin American context complicates Longfellow's ability to fit his 1846 suggestion into the international nationalism of *Kavanagh*, it disrupts his ability to fit translation into the international nationalism of his *Poets and Poetry of Europe*. Discussing his anthologies in terms of Longfellow's theory of translation, Silva Gruesz positions them within Schleiermacher's division of "foreignizing" the domestic language or "domesticating" the foreign text, discussed in Lawrence Venuti's *The Translator's Invisibility*. Longfellow, Silva

⁴⁶⁹ Marjorie Garber, *Quotation Marks* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 22.

⁴⁷⁰ Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Quotation and Originality" in *Letters and Social Aims* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co., 1904), 196.

Gruesz notes, “[a]s the high priest of poetic translation in the United States and one of its most accomplished Germanists...had assimilated not only Schleiermacher’s theory of translation, but those of Goethe, Schlegel Novalis, and the rest of the German Romantic school.”⁴⁷¹ Thus, Silva Gruesz locates Longfellow’s theory of translation in the foreignizing line of the German tradition, known as the Germans were in the 1840s for “their power of complete self-transplantation.”⁴⁷² Colleen Glenney Boggs concurs with Silva Gruesz positioning of Longfellow in translation, identifying his aim as “not to familiarize what was foreign, but to engage with difference.”⁴⁷³ Longfellow himself said of his translation of Dante in 1867, “The only merit my book has is that it is exactly what Dante says and not what the translator imagines he might have said if he had been an Englishman. In other words, while making it rhythmic I have endeavoured to make it also as literal as a prose translation.”⁴⁷⁴

The foreignizing project of Longfellow’s 1845 anthology, however, is problematized by its insertion of a text at once foreign and not foreign, the “Niagara” translation from Heredia. This inclusion allows Longfellow’s readers to see the North American “Niagara” in an extra-national context, while simultaneously equating the New World with the Old World, as the New World poet is foreignized, identified with “Europe.” This foreignizing comes at a high price for Heredia as, within the political context of Latin America, it positions Heredia as a representative

⁴⁷¹ Silva Gruesz, *Ambassadors of Culture*, 82.

⁴⁷² Sarah Austin, *Fragments From German Prose Writers* (New York: D. Appleton & Co, 1841), vi. Austin contrasts the Germans with the English who lack the “plasticity” of mind of the Germans to enter into other thoughts and expression. Longfellow, according to Mrs. James T. Fields, shared this opinion, putting Americans in the same line as the Germans. See Silva Gruesz, *Ambassadors*, 85-86.

⁴⁷³ Colleen Glenney Boggs, *Transnationalism and American Literature: Literary Translation 1773-1892* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 118.

⁴⁷⁴ Quoted in Boggs, 119. Longfellow continues further, “The business of the translator is to report what the author says, not to explain what he means; that is the work of the commentator. What an author says, and how he says it, that is the problem of the translator.”

of the colonial power his resistance to which resulted in the exile that produces his poem. In a peculiar way, foreignizing Heredia domesticates him, canceling his exile and making translation impossible. As a European representative, Heredia's poem ceases to exist. The translation of Heredia that should have been the hallmark of the international nationalism Longfellow sought to promote instead renders itself, both its nationality and universality, impossible.

That Longfellow's translation of Heredia produces a foreignizing and domesticating tangle might be a sign of the times, the context of U.S.-Latin American relations. Domesticating translation, as Venuti noted in his discussion of Schleiermacher, meant "ethnocentric violence."⁴⁷⁵ Though foreignizing translation aimed to resist this ethnocentrism, Venuti notes that it in the context of nationalist project, foreignizing translation, too, is problematic. He argues that for Schleiermacher foreignizing translation was still part of Prussian nationalism, liberating Germany from French domination while establishing the conditions for German global domination.⁴⁷⁶ In this respect, Venuti concludes that "[h]ere nationalism is equivalent to universalism."⁴⁷⁷ We see this equivalence in the American context explicitly in William Henry Hurlbert's "The Poetry of Spanish America." Published in 1849 in the *North American Review*, it was perhaps one of the most comprehensive journalistic efforts of the period to survey the literature of Spanish America, "with whom it is the 'manifest destiny' of our country to be more and more closely connected" and supplied the North American population with an anthology in miniature of its translations.⁴⁷⁸ Silva Gruesz in her reading of Hurlbert's essay credits him with an "unusual respectful attentiveness to a Latin American cultural presence" but notes that

⁴⁷⁵ Lawrence Venuti, *Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, (Florence, KY: Routledge, 1994), 20.

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid., 99.

⁴⁷⁷ Ibid., 109.

⁴⁷⁸ [William Henry Hurlbert], "The Poetry of Spanish America," *North American Review* Jan. 1849, 131.

Hurlbert's pretensions to "discovering the presence" are upset by his falling into "the same language of the South as an exotic, feminine space...a local Orient."⁴⁷⁹

Hurlbert's 1849 essay was reprinted in revised and condensed form in his travelogue *Gan-Eden* (1854) where the domesticating and foreignizing division becomes difficult to parse in Hurlbert's Cuban situation. He writes in *Gan-Eden*:

I know how apt we are to overestimate any thing which has any flavor of "caviare." Superiorities of all sorts are sad snares. "Those oysters we had at Venice," have spoiled the appetite of many an untravelled friend, who was beginning to be ignorantly jubilant over the choicest products of Prince's Bay. And the oldest thoughts, clothed in foreign tongue affect us like a familiar landscape seen through stained windows. But after all deductions made, and judging them in the most impartial spirit, some of the Cuban authors deserve, it seems to me, this high praise, that they have been thinkers and artists in a land indifferent to thought and to art, true lovers of liberty in an atmosphere of oppression.⁴⁸⁰

If the transparency of the domesticating translation is problematic in its ethnocentric violence, the alternative vision of foreignizing is also problematic for Hurlbert. The cosmopolitan who values the foreign and can only appreciate what comes "clothed in a foreign tongue" sees "through stained glass windows." The "stained windows" suggest the Catholic "language of occlusion" Silva Gruesz observes in his "Poetry of Spanish America" that he shares with Melville.⁴⁸¹ The language of occlusion of the Spanish American space in its Catholic darkness, in *Gan-Eden* is transposed onto the domestic viewer in his catholicism, or universalism.

Hurlbert critiques a domestic cosmopolitanism that "overestimates the foreign" in its cosmopolitan taste at the expense of its local products; nevertheless, he endorses the value of the foreign authors for contrasting with their foreign space in the universal values shared by the

⁴⁷⁹ Silva Gruesz, 72.

⁴⁸⁰ [William Henry Hurlbert], *Gan-Eden: Or, Pictures of Cuba* (Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., 1854), 203.

⁴⁸¹ Silva Gruesz, *Ambassadors*, 72.

north. For Hurlbert, this domesticating valuation of the foreigner is particularly necessary in the *light* of Cuban independence. He constantly stresses the censorship of Catholic Spain. If in 1849, he could assert that “much agreeable poetry can be found in the Cuban journals” by 1854 he closes his chapter on Cuban literature in *Gan-Eden* asserting that “[t]he Cuban press is indeed no transcript of the Cuban, but only of the ‘Peninsular’ world.”⁴⁸² Hurlbert’s domesticating universalism highlights the need to bring the Cuban voice into the North American space as it is increasingly silenced in the censorship of the colonial situation. When in *Gan-Eden* he insists that there are Cuban poets of merit “numerous enough to furnish some future Dr. Griswold with ample matter for one grand division of the ‘Poets and Poetry of Spanish America’,” it must indeed for Hurlbert be a Griswold, an American nationalist.⁴⁸³

Though for Hurlbert the Cuban needs the American literary space to be heard, much is lost in the translation. Even within his earlier 1849 essay, we find him struggling with the untranslatable. He writes: “it is only on those of his poems which appeal to universal feelings that a foreign judgment of Placido’s poems can be fairly founded. Whenever he treats of local subjects, his thoughts assume forms which to American eyes would seem strangely fantastic.”⁴⁸⁴ Again we see that Hurlbert’s universal is a domestic one, and in translating the Cuban to this domestic American universal, the local color of the Cuban national space is lost. This appears more explicitly in Hurlbert’s conclusion to his discussion of Mexico where its “incorporat[ion] into our glorious confederacy” is a “when” and not an “if.”⁴⁸⁵ What gets lost in translation in

⁴⁸² “The Poetry of Spanish America,” 156; *Gan-Eden* 224.

⁴⁸³ *Gan-Eden*, 217-218.

⁴⁸⁴ “The Poetry of Spanish America,” 151.

⁴⁸⁵ “The Poetry of Spanish-America,” 135. “When Mexico shall be fairly incorporated into our glorious confederacy, we may perhaps feel it to be a patriotic duty to fill up the *lacunae* of our information; at present, however, the

Gan-Eden we can see through its translation in a review published in the *Revista de la Habana* by Cirilo Villaverde, author of *Cecilia Valdés*. Villaverde had been editor of *La Verdad*, the pro-independence and annexationist organ, but by the time he was writing his review in Philadelphia in 1854, he had broken with *La Verdad* to establish *El Independiente*, an organ that sought independence, not through “the purchase of Cuba either by Cubans or by Americans” but through Cuban armed revolution.⁴⁸⁶ In his review of Hurlbert’s *Gan-Eden*, we can read the struggle to locate Cuba in U.S.-Cuban translation.

Discussing Hurlbert’s title, Villaverde notes that the “*jardin de delicias*” [“garden of delights”] of Hurlbert’s titular epithet for Cuba extends only so far to natural Cuba and not Cuba as a civilization, a split in perception that form in Hurlbert’s text the quixotic experience of the island. Recounting his description of his arrival in Cuba and to his lodgings and noting Hurlbert’s many criticisms of the standard of living, Villaverde presents as direct quotation from Hurlbert’s text what is actually Hurlbert’s direct quotation from *Don Quixote*:

En suma, de la primer posada en que estuvo, cuyo nombre no da, nada ménos dice sino que á no haber sido por dos negras que fumaban tabaco á tiempo que aplanchaban bajo un cobertizo de tejas coloradas, se hubiera creído en la misma “venta que por su mal pensó D. Quijote que era castillo.” Tales son sus palabras. Y si me es dado meter en este punto mi cuarto á espadas, admitiendo que el viajero exagere algo, á no ser que mucho hayan cambiado las cosas en los años que hace falta de la patria, parecíame que, sean cuales fueren las causas del atraso, en achaque de posadas y baratez de subsistencias no esta nada adelantado el país ese que digamos, y que mucho se pasará antes que un “La

indefinite boundaries of our country forbid the prosecution of such a purpose, and we therefore pass to Yucatan, which may possibly be electing her representatives at Washington while we are inditing these words.”

⁴⁸⁶ Rodrigo Lazo, *Writing to Cuba: Filibustering and Cuban Exiles in the United States* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 175. Though Lazo identifies the transition in Villaverde’s position from *La Verdad* to *El Independiente*, he notes that Villaverde did not have a complete about-face and that his position on Cuban independence and annexation in the 1850s was not consistent. By the 1860s he would take a strong anti-annexationist stance, but this as well as his anti-slavery position were gradual formations, according to Lazo, through his time in the United States throughout the Civil War.

Pierre House” ó un “Saint-Nicholas Hotel” se alce en las angostas y torcidas calles de la Habana.⁴⁸⁷

[All in all, of the first lodgings in which he dwelled, the name of which he does not give, he says nothing less than that were it not for two black women smoking while ironing beneath a red-tiled shed, he would have thought himself in the same “inn that Don Quixote mistook for a castle.” Those are his words. And if I can give my own two cents on the matter, admitting that the traveler exaggerates some, unless things have changed much in these years away from the homeland, it seems to me that, whatever be the reasons for the backwardness, in the poor quality of the inns and of the provisions that country is not at all advanced and that much will happen before a “La Pierre House” or a “Saint-Nicholas Hotel” is erected in the narrow and twisted streets of Havana.]

In *Gan-Eden*, the passage here referred to uses the Don Quixote reference as a hint to the reader that the beauty of the scene is not what it seems, and the single black woman ironing (Villaverde puts two in his recounting) suggests a deeper ill than the uncomfortable bed and exorbitant prices Hurlbert will complain of later. Before we get Hurlbert’s complaints, however, the description of the lodging appears highly favorable, a veritable castle indeed, with pillars and arches, curtains stirred by the breeze, and the sound of tropical birds “all conspire[ing] to perfect this scene of warm and indolent delight.”⁴⁸⁸

In detailing Hurlbert’s criticism’s first, when he comes to describe this initial description of Hurlbert’s and makes Cervantes’s words Hurlbert’s own, Villaverde changes the quixotic rendering so that it is not the romanticized exotic Cuba that deludes the North American traveler from recognizing the realities of Cuban life, but the North American hotels in Philadelphia and New York respectively that cause the North American traveler to “exaggerate” by comparison the poor conditions in Cuba. When treating Hurlbert’s discussion of public education in Cuba,

⁴⁸⁷ V.[Cirilo Villaverde], review of *Gan-Eden*, by William Henry Hurlbert, *Revista de la Habana* Tomo. IV (1855): 5.

⁴⁸⁸ *Gan-Eden*, 25.

which again pales by comparison to education in New York, Villaverde complains that “[p]ara juzgar del estado de la educacion pública en la isla de Cuba el autor...debió de haber comparado, en fin, cosas comparables, ó que tienen alguna afinidad, por ejemplo, el estado de la educacion pública en España con el de la de su Colonia, ó con el de Méjico, Perú, &.”⁴⁸⁹ [“in order to judge the state of public education in the island of Cuba, the author should have compared comparable things, or things that have some affinity, for example, the state of public education in Spain with that of its colony, or with that of Mexico, Peru, etc.”]. It is impossible to see Cuba through North American standards, according to Villaverde. There is no comparison, no affinity between the two Americas.

Villaverde’s assertion, however, belies the fact that he has throughout been able to follow Hurlbert’s comparisons between the US and Cuba through his own exile, as well as make his own comparisons, and his desire that Cuba be recognized not as objectified nature but as a civilized subject. The comparison and affinity emerge when he discusses Hurlbert’s chapter on Cuban literature. Villaverde laments Hurlbert’s remark that it should come as a surprise to his North American readers that Cuba has literature:

Lo que se me figura á mí es la sorpresa que causará á ustedes el oír semejantes asertos de boca de un hombre que vive, como el otro que dice, á la otra puerta de casa. ¿De qué, pues, han valido los esfuerzos de tanto escritor así en prosa como en verso, algunos de mérito eminente, que de principios de este siglo acá ha producido Cuba? De nada por lo visto.⁴⁹⁰

[What I imagine is the surprise that it will cause you to hear such an assertion from the mouth of a man who lives, like the other says, at the other door of the house. For what good have been the efforts of so many writers in prose as well as verse, some of high merit, whom Cuba has produced from the beginning of this century to now? For nothing, it seems.]

⁴⁸⁹ [Villaverde], 7.

⁴⁹⁰ Ibid., 8.

Hurlbert's American audience and Villaverde's Cuban audience are linked in mutual surprise. Villaverde positions all of the Cuban writers of the century as seemingly failed ambassadors, whose sole purpose for writing was to be read and recognized outside. He consoles his audience that again Hurlbert has been exaggerating in another quixotic moment "ansioso de darse los aires de descubridor" ["anxious to give himself airs of the discoverer"], assuring his readers that other writers in the US have made known the state of Cuban literature.

Concluding his review, he positions his own writing in ambassadorship. While Villaverde presents himself as ambassador, his ambassadorship is couched in non-encounter, that Hurlbert will never see his lines just as the majority of Cubans would not have had an opportunity to read Hurlbert's book.

No me propuse pues corregirle la palmeta al extranjero, quien tal vez jamas verá estas lineas, sino dar allá una idea de lo que acá se dice de nosotros, suponiendo que por estar el libro en ingles la mayoría de los cubanos no tendrá oportunidad de leerle y enterarse de la zurra que nos pega en medio del "Jardin de delicias."⁴⁹¹

[I did not intend to rap the knuckles of the foreigner, who will maybe never see these lines, but to give there an idea of what here is said about us, supposing that since the book is written in English, the majority of Cubans will not have the chance to read it and find out about the beating that we receive in the middle of the "Garden of delights."]

This non-encounter is surprising considering that Villaverde is a Cuban in the US reviewing a book by a North American about Cuba, but as with North American and Cuban surprise earlier, it reveals a quixotic moment, not non-encounter, but encounter in quotation marks. Villaverde sets himself and his Cuban audience as a Sancho Panza, following the quixotic Hurlbert and his North American civilization: "he seguido paso a paso el autor de *Gan-Eden*" [I have followed step by step the author of *Gan-Eden*]. If Hurlbert suffers a switch on the hand, so to speak, with the Cuban's ruler, the Cubans like Sancho Panza take a beating in the illusory castle, or in this

⁴⁹¹ Ibid.

case, the garden. Debra Fried refers to quotations' "double status as exiles and natives," or what Herman Meyer calls the "unique tension between assimilation and dissimulation."⁴⁹² The North American could not have read the Cuban. The Cuban could not have read the North American, but the Cuban exile in Philadelphia, the exiled native, could read the quotation marks around the encounter, inverting or reversing the foreignizing translation that nationalizes its object to restore the object as subject by seeing itself through the other's eye. Quotation becomes the mechanism for dialectical recognition, a national self-determination within competing nationalisms.

Longfellow seems to have come upon a similar way around the problem of translatability, a form of recognition through inverse translation. In his correspondence with Ferdinand Freiligrath his enthusiasm for the German's poems is matched by his confounding by their untranslatability. He writes on January 6, 1843: "I have been trying to translate some of your poems into English but find them too difficult" and tells of his repeated reading, both to himself and to others, of Freiligrath's "*Nacht im Hafen*" "that wondrous, untranslatable poem!"⁴⁹³ While Longfellow struggles to translate Freiligrath, he finds in Freiligrath's translations of his own work a curious translation of translation that restores the original. Colleen Glenney Boggs discusses his response to Freiligrath's translation of the "Skeleton in Armor." He writes to Freiligrath that "The old Berserk seems now to speak his native tongue." Boggs accounts for this "native tongue" in the Germanic roots of Longfellow's "Skeleton," the Viking, but observes that if Longfellow positions Freiligrath's translation as the "native tongue" his own poem becomes translation. She concludes, "If translation produces a 'native tongue,' then deracination

⁴⁹² Debra Fried, "Valves of Attention: Quotation and Context in the Age of Emerson" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1983; Ann Arbor, Mich.: ProQuest Dissertations and Theses), 242.

⁴⁹³ Longfellow, *Letters*, vol. II, 497.

is at the very core of performances of American linguistic nativism and originality.”⁴⁹⁴ It is no wonder, then, that Longfellow’s “American epic” *Evangeline* was a tale of exile.

That exile was a crucial part of Longfellow’s poetics is not only evident in *Evangeline* but in his interest in Dante, his own Homeric vision, whom he translates and about whom he wrote in his journal “I have been trying to follow Dante in his exile—a hopeless task.”⁴⁹⁵ In response to Freiligrath’s letter where he discusses the painful separation from his family in his exile in England, Longfellow writes, “I cannot bear to think of you as an exile,—though it is the greatest compliment to the power of your song.”⁴⁹⁶ Silva Gruesz observes Longfellow’s desire to “think himself into exile.”⁴⁹⁷ She considers, too, that *Evangeline*’s plot of the timelessness of exile and the catholicity countering the forward progress of expansion and nationalism spoke to those in Latin America who would then translate and read Longfellow to work out their own questions of modern nation-building.

Spanish American translations of Longfellow might be read as part of Longfellow’s desire to “think himself into exile.” Longfellow was, after all, greatly interested in translations of his work. Having sent Freiligrath a copy of his *Hiawatha*, he wrote in 1856, in response to the news that Freiligrath was translating it, “I did not dare to hope so much—still less to suggest it; but I had a secret wish in my heart that it might be so; and lo! it is, and I am very very grateful to you.”⁴⁹⁸ Longfellow may have harbored this same secret wish when he sent Mendive an

⁴⁹⁴ Boggs, 121.

⁴⁹⁵ Kirsten Silva Gruesz, “El Gran Poeta Longfellow and a Psalm of Exile,” *American Literary History* 10.3 (1998): 395.

⁴⁹⁶ Longfellow, *Letters*, vol. III, 302.

⁴⁹⁷ Kirsten Silva Gruesz, “El Gran Poeta Longfellow and a Psalm of Exile,” 398.

⁴⁹⁸ Longfellow, *Letters*, vol. III, 517.

inscribed copy of his poems or when he sent Sarmiento his *Ultima Thule*. If Longfellow's foreignizing translation and universal nationalism were problematized in the context of Spanish America by an imperial American assimilating nationalism at work in the events of Texas annexation, the Mexican-American war and the Cuban filibustering missions spurred by the prospects of Cuban annexation—events Longfellow was clear in deploring—Longfellow translated provides a form of encounter out of American empire through American exile.

Rainy Day Men: Longfellow and Quintero, A Case Study

In the same issue that Villaverde translated Hurlbert, José Agustín Quintero translated Longfellow, the other Hispanophile to whom “The Poetry of Spanish America” was attributed. Three translations appear of Longfellow's poems: “Excelsior,” “The Arrow and the Song,” and “The Rainy Day.”⁴⁹⁹ Quintero, son of a Cuban father and British mother, left Cuba to be educated at Harvard around the same time that Longfellow would have been teaching there. He developed friendships with the Boston literary elite, including Longfellow, with whom he sustained a long correspondence. On return to Cuba, he had worked with Villaverde in *El Club de la Habana*, an independence organization, and, like him, was arrested for his involvement in the filibustering missions of Narciso López and escaped to the United States, possibly with Villaverde.⁵⁰⁰ If Villaverde became increasingly critical of the US and its involvement with Spanish America, Quintero became increasingly complicit, to the point of serving as a

⁴⁹⁹ William Delgado at the Hispanic Society of America found these translations for me.

⁵⁰⁰ For a biographical summary of Quintero see Silva Gruesz, *Ambassadors of Culture*, 152-160 and Darryl E. Brock, “José Agustín Quintero: Cuban Patriot in Confederate Diplomatic Service,” in *Cubans in the Confederacy: José Agustín Quintero, Ambrosio José Gonzales, and Loreta Janeta Velazquez*, ed. Philip Thomas Tucker (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 2002).

Confederate agent during the Civil War to garner allies for Cuban independence, either through annexation with the U.S. or through Juarez's Mexico.⁵⁰¹

Quintero wrote Longfellow of his translations published in the *Revista* seeing in Longfellow's poem "un órgano de civilización" [an organ of civilization] and described his intention to "abrir a los que se dedican a las letras en aquel país algunas de las fuentes en que beben los poetas americanos" [to open to those who dedicate themselves to letters in that country (Cuba) the fountains from which the American poets drink] and to prepare them for "ese grande y gloriosa unión que espero ver realizada entre ambos pueblos en un día no lejano" [that grand and glorious union that I hope to see realized between both peoples in the not distant future].⁵⁰² Silva Gruesz reads this as Quintero's endorsement of annexation, but what is important about Quintero's translation for Longfellow's American nationalism is that in Quintero's translation we don't have an American assimilation of Cuba but a Cuban assimilation of an American. For himself he writes that Longfellow is "la sombra de un árbol frondoso, en un día de sol, para aquel que abrumado de cansancio desfallece a la mitad de su jornada" [the shadow of a leafy tree on a sunny day for him who overwhelmed by weariness flags in the middle of his workday].⁵⁰³

Lourdes Arencibia Rodríguez characterizes Quintero as one of the "traductores de la evasion," referring to the poetic tradition of aesthetic escapism, and certainly the image of Longfellow as tree under which the workman can rest on a sunny day fits in with this tradition.⁵⁰⁴ But within the Longfellow translations Quintero published in the *Revista de la Habana*, instead of Longfellow on a sunny day, we get Longfellow on a rainy day or Quintero's Longfellow on a

⁵⁰¹ Silva Gruesz, *Ambassadors*, 158.

⁵⁰² *Ibid.*, 155.

⁵⁰³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰⁴ Lourdes Arencibia Rodríguez, "Apuntes Para Una Historia de la Traducción de Cuba," *Livius* 3 (1993):11.

rainy day. Though Quintero's translations are unimpeachably faithful to Longfellow's literal meaning, we note in "The Rainy Day" some interesting formal changes in translation. It is worth looking at "The Rainy Day" and "El Dia de Lluvia" in parallel:

El Dia de Lluvia	The Rainy Day
El dia está frio, lóbrego y nublado, Llueve y el raudo viento no ha cesado, La vid aun trepa, la pared desierta, Mas á cada turbion cae la hoja muerta Y el dia está frio, lóbrego y nublado.	The day is cold, and dark, and dreary; It rains, and the wind is never weary; The vine still clings to the mouldering wall, But at every gust the dead leaves fall, And the day is dark and dreary.
Mi existir está oscuro, frio, nublado, Llueve y el raudo viento no ha cesado, Mi mente al tiempo que pasó se lanza, Mas en flor cae marchita la esperanza Y el dia está triste, lóbrego y nublado.	My life is cold, and dark, and dreary; It rains, and the wind is never weary; My thoughts still cling to the mouldering Past, But the hopes of youth fall thick in the blast, And the days are dark and dreary.
Cálmate, Corazon, tu duelo cese, Tras las nubes el Sol aun resplandece, Tu suerte es la de todo lo creado, Cada vida con llanto se humedece Algún día ha de ser triste y nublado. ⁵⁰⁵	Be still, sad heart! And cease repining; Behind the clouds is the sun still shining; Thy fate is the common fate of all, Into each life some rain must fall, Some days must be dark and dreary.

Part of the force of Longfellow's poem is the repetition of "cold, and dark, and dreary" that gives the poem its somber monotone. In Quintero's translation, we see resistance to this repetition. He tries, in albeit small ways, to change it up. In the second stanza when the adjectives are applied to the speaker's life, Quintero's original translation "frio, lóbrego, y nublado" (cold, gloomy, and cloudy) changes to "oscuro, frio, y nublado" (dark, cold, and cloudy) and then again in the last line to "triste, lóbrego, y nublado" (sad, gloomy, and cloudy). The adjectives do not substantially change the meaning, but the deliberateness of these substitutions when the simple

⁵⁰⁵ H.W. Longfellow, "El Dia de Lluvia." [Trans. José Agustín Quintero] *Revista de la Habana*, Tomo Cuatro, (1855), p. 212. The issue was actually composed in November 1854 but not released until 1855. I have reproduced the poem exactly as it appears in the *revista*, therefore omitting some of the accentuation standard today.

repetition would have done just as well speaks to Quintero's resistance to Longfellow's monotone. There's a stir in this "Rainy Day."

A more radical change in Longfellow's form occurs in the final stanza where Quintero alters the rhyme scheme—or he alters Longfellow's alteration of the rhyme scheme. In Longfellow's first two stanzas, we find straightforward aabba aacca. In the last stanza, Longfellow renders the rhyme scheme ddbba. The new sound that breaks into the poem heralds a day of sun that ends the monotone, where the return of the "dark and dreary" is rendered out of rhyme. In this stanza, the "dark and dreary" rainy day that had set the tone of the previous two stanzas now becomes the anomaly, a lone dissonant sound, as the speaker takes in the bigger picture.

Quintero refuses to reduce the rainy day to a moment in time, a singularity through which the sun still shines. In the final stanza, the rhyme scheme is rendered ddada. The sound that formed the monotone is not thrown out of the rhyme of the stanza as the new sound and the old sound weave into harmony. In the change of the rhyme scheme, the new sound that marked the moment of sun is linked with the penultimate: "Cada vida con llanto se humedece" [Every life is watered with tears]. That rhyme connects the lines of the end of sorrow and sun with this line of the nourishment of tears signals the valorization of the proverbial rainy day. The last line also signals a more subtle shift in valorization. "Algún día ha de ser triste y nublado" [Some day must be sad and cloudy]. The rendering of the plural "some days" to the singular "algún day" adds a potential for wistfulness for the rainy day.

Why wistfulness? In Longfellow's poem the rainy day signifies an autumnal sadness. In the second stanza, the speaker nostalgically recalls "the mouldering Past" while his youth's hopes are dashed by the winds of the season. George Thornton Edwards tells that the poem was

composed in the den of the Wadsworth mansion, where Longfellow reminisced on the scenes of his childhood on an autumn day of 1841 while he was still mourning the death of his first wife.⁵⁰⁶ Quintero's rainy day is not quite so aged. "Mi mente al tiempo que pasó se lanza/ Mas en flor cae marchita la esperanza" [My mind leaps onto the time that passed /But hope in bloom falls withered]. The youthfulness is transferred from the speaker to the hope itself, and no sooner is that hope in bloom, "en flor," than it falls withered, "cae marchita," directly after. There is no sense of the long passage of time here, the meditations of an older man mourning the loss of youth. What characterizes the hope of Quintero's speaker? It's left rather ambiguous unless we do take the final line with a certain wistfulness, as something akin to Heredia's "Huracán, huracán, venir te siento"—waiting for the hurricane.

If we read Quintero's "El Día de Lluvia" as ending with a wistfulness for the hurricane, Heredia's hurricane of national liberation, this gives some sense to some of the formal changes. The resistance to the monotone that, paralleled with the clearer repetition of Longfellow's, gives a sense of unease to the movement of this rainy day, a restless rustle. Quintero refuses to reduce the rainy day in the final stanza to an instance because the answer for Quintero isn't to reduce the rain but to expand it. Read in the key of wistfulness, the last line that looks forward to the "algún día" ["someday"] that must be "triste y nublado" ["sad and cloudy"] isn't referring to the dreary and cloudy day in which the poem is set. The speaker is presumably referring to a greater rainfall.

Interestingly, these lines from Quintero were recalled on a rainy day of July 1898, in the middle of the Spanish-American War over Cuba. Andrés Clemente Vázquez, a Mexican consul sent to survey the situation in Cuba, recorded a visit to a Havana cemetery where he recalled

⁵⁰⁶ George Thornton Edwards, *The Youthful Haunts of Longfellow* (1907; Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, rpt. 2005), 187-188.

Quintero's lines.⁵⁰⁷ Vázquez was to look out for the nation's economic interests in Cuba, sustained while Cuba was a colony of Spain but jeopardized by the conflict and its outcome. Vázquez lamented that Mexico had no role in the conflict. He saw that the United States was encroaching and predicted that "Cuba y Puerto Rico marchaban a pasos precipitados a caer desvanecidos ante el águila de las estrellas" [Cuba and Puerto Rico were quickly advancing to fall vanished before the eagle of the stars, (i.e., the US)].⁵⁰⁸ Fearing the increased U.S. power by expansion into the Antilles and what this meant for Latin America, he had hoped that Mexico could broker a deal satisfactory to both Cuba and Spain of granting Cuba an autonomous status *à la* Canada, but the government was unwilling to get politically involved.⁵⁰⁹

Visiting the cemetery in Havana during an American blockade, he finds himself conversing with the dead: "La lluvia cae, la noche llega. Mas ¿qué importa? Quedo solo, conversando con los espíritus de mis antepasados, al lado de un grosellero que tiene las hojas secas" [The rain falls, the night comes. But, what does it matter? I remain alone, conversing with the spirits of those gone before me, beside a gooseberry bush the leaves of which have dried.]⁵¹⁰ As Vázquez entertains these cemetery thoughts, a procession of spirits occurs in his mind, of figures including Morelos, Juárez, Bolívar, figures of Latin American independence, as well as Savonarola, the Florentine friar killed by Pope Alexander VI for his radical ideas, Robespierre, the biblical prophets, and lastly, the Redeemer on the Cross, "como trono del

⁵⁰⁷ For descriptions of Vázquez work as consul in Cuba at the time, see Laura Muñoz M. "Dos Cónsules Mexicanos en La Habana: Su Visión Geopolítica y la Defensa del Interés Nacional," *Historia Mexicana* 49, no. 2 (1999): 253-277 and Rafael Rojas, "La Política Mexicana Ante la Guerra de Independencia de Cuba (1895-1898), *Historia Mexicana* 45, no. 4 (1996): 783-805.

⁵⁰⁸ Quoted in Laura Muñoz M, 269.

⁵⁰⁹ Rafael Rojas, 787-788.

⁵¹⁰ Andrés Clemente Vázquez, *Entre Brumas: Reminiscencias Americanas y Europeas* (Havana: Tipografía del Avisador Comercial, 1899), 87.

Apocalipsis.”⁵¹¹ Vázquez’s own thoughts of the past reflect on revolutionary figures who fought for independence, republicanism, and justice, and finally come to the image of the Christ on the cross. The appositive phrase here is important because the cross as the throne of the Apocalypse suggests the moment of Jesus’ death when the sky erupts in a mighty storm.

Indeed, at this point, the Cuban sky itself erupts in thunder and lightning: “De súbito, la luz irradia en la atmósfera. Sobre el magnífico monument levantado á la memoria de los estudiantes fusilados en 1871, estalla breve relámpago, y entre las brumas mágicas del infinito, parece que se difunden la flores de la verdad, estrellizando el ocaso. [Of a sudden, light illumines the atmosphere. Above the magnificent monument erected in memory of the students shot down in 1871, lightning flashes, and through the magical mists of the sky, it looks as though the flowers of truth spread, filling the twilight with stars.]”⁵¹² But Vázquez focuses on one star in particular, the “Estrella Solitaria” [lone star] of the Cuban flag, as he salutes the independence and liberty that will come, must come, to the “la tierra de [land of] Plácido y Heredia,” two famous Cuban poets of independence, one discussed in this chapter. But Vázquez is having these thoughts in a cemetery and he remembers that all that procession of revolutionary heroes died in the end, of repressed anger, of overwhelming bitterness, and of hunger. Finally, turning from the cemetery and going back into the world, he remembers a final quotation:

he vuelto á penetrar en los salones, en las calles y en los paseos, en donde se agita y medra la eternal comedia humana, repitiendo el quejido sublime de José Agustín Quintero:

Cada día con llanto se humedece...

¡¡Algún día ha de ser triste y nublado!!⁵¹³

⁵¹¹ Vázquez, 87-88.

⁵¹² Ibid., 89.

⁵¹³ Vázquez, 90.

[I have returned to navigate rooms, streets, and walks, where the eternal human comedy is agitated and goes on, repeating that sublime groan of José Agustín Quintero]

Vázquez attributes the lines of the translation to Quintero, but this is perhaps not a misattribution. He, too, seems to read in these lines the lightning flash, the hurricane that brings about independence. The ellipses he adds to the penultimate line convey anticipation, and the exclamation marks on the last line certainly would not fit with Longfellow's matter-of-fact acceptance of the rain that must come "some days." The ellipses and the exclamation points together speak of the expectation of "algún día," the rain to end all rains.

Longfellow's poem, read this way, may have allowed Quintero to write his own "En la tempestad," giving a different emphasis to the indistinguishability of cosmopolitanism and nationalist assertion.⁵¹⁴ What looked like literary evasion in cosmopolitan, international exchange might turn out to be just as well an expression of political resistance and a literary tradition of nationalist vision. This is a vision occluded in translation but exposed in parallel. It was on a rainy day that Paul Flemming examined Mary Ashburton's sketch of Homer, the chapter itself called "A Rainy Day." After declaring Ashburton's conception of Homer a finer conception than the bust she sketched, he praises her "true feeling" of Art, and quoting Chapman's Homer, declares:

[T]o quote one of this poet's verses, 'high prospects and the brows of all steep hills and pinnacles thrust up themselves for shows,'—so under the twilight and the star-light of past ages, do we hear the voice of man, walking amid the works of his hands, and city walls and towers, and the spires of churches thrust up themselves for shows...As vapors from the ocean, floating landward and dissolved in rain, are carried back in rivers to the ocean, so thoughts and the semblance of things that fall upon the soul of man in showers, flow out again in living streams of Art, and lose themselves in the great ocean, which is

⁵¹⁴ Silva Gruesz, 155-156.

Nature. Art and Nature are not, then, discordant, but ever harmoniously working in each other.⁵¹⁵

Flemming here discusses nature and art as revelation, manifestations, each desiring to show themselves. There is a tension in this desire for exposure, the competition for space, as the towers and spires take over the hills. This resonates with the contest for space in national expansion, the waters of influence that flow through the American sphere of influence, as in Bryant's Mississippi analogy, where "thoughts and the semblance of things...lose themselves." But Longfellow introduces another element that like Irving's literary ecology, renders the flow of influence ambivalent and potentially reciprocal. The rivers of the nation's influence may flow into the ocean, but from the same ocean comes the rain. That rain can translate to the hurricane, and that hurricane's manifestation can turn the tide.

⁵¹⁵ Longfellow, *Hyperion*, 194.

CHAPTER FOUR-ANTIQUARIAN MODERNITIES: THE FRAGMENTS OF A TRADITION

Floating Fragments: Emerson and the Sources of Transcendental Originality

Broken Vessels and Dismembered Deities: Quotation as Emersonian Originality

Translation, Walter Benjamin writes in “The Task of the Translator,” should expose both the original and the translation as fragments of the vessel of pure language, the result of which renders “the great longing for linguistic complementation.”⁵¹⁶ In the previous chapter, I argued that translation in parallel could have an effect of exposure, both the original and the translator, that allows us to imagine and long for a stronger sense of encounter between multiple American presences. This chapter focuses on the quotation’s place in the attempt to assemble fragments in a time when the nation was building up to its own fragmentation, culminating in the Civil War.

Benjamin’s notion of pure language corresponds with Transcendentalist thought. For Emerson, language is another emblem of the universal soul. In his discussion of language in “Nature,” he contends that “[e]very word...if traced to its roots, is found to be borrowed from some material appearance.”⁵¹⁷ The language where word and natural fact are synchronous is what Emerson identifies as the “first language.” Tracing the root still further, he argues that the material appearance is a manifestation of the spirit. Because of this, Emerson, like Benjamin, finds that all languages share in some primordial union: “The same symbols are found to make the original elements of all languages. It has moreover been observed, that the idioms of all languages approach each other in passages of the greatest eloquence and power.”⁵¹⁸ That languages share original elements and “approach each other”—the expression gives the sense of

⁵¹⁶ Walter Benjamin, “The Task of the Translator,” in *Illuminations* (New York: Schocken Books, 1968), 78-79.

⁵¹⁷ Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Nature and Selected Essays*, Ed. Larzer Ziff (New York: Penguin, 1982), 48.

⁵¹⁸ Emerson, *Nature and Selected Essays*, 51.

coming together—in eloquence resonates with the fragmented vessel. Colleen Glenney Boggs in her comparison of Emerson’s and Margaret Fuller’s views on translation attributes to Emerson “a metaphysical model that ultimately disavowed linguistic difference.”⁵¹⁹ Likening Emerson’s “first language” to Benjamin’s “pure language” as well, Boggs argues that these conceptions of language represent a “rejection of multilingualism.”⁵²⁰ For Emerson, then, according to Boggs, translation is not the reciprocal dialogue of encounter between self and other. Translation in Emerson’s earliest usage in “Nature,” she points out, means “similitude.”⁵²¹ No matter the language, people think and express “the same *things*” in Emerson’s understanding. The result is that the self and other are poles in a unity, a dialectic in which self and other collapse.

In this light, quotation would seem to be the best word with which to pronounce the unity of expression, particularly if we recall George Dillon’s sense of my words of an other. Emerson himself was an avid collector of quotations. He kept commonplace books and poetry notebooks. The commonplace book he shared with Henry David Thoreau he would later edit into the 1874 *Parnassus*.⁵²² Emerson’s penchant for quotations is also clearly visible in his own published writing. Oliver Wendell Holmes, in a tribute to Emerson written shortly after his death, described Emerson as “[a]n author whose writings are like mosaics.”⁵²³ He counted in Emerson’s published writings 3,393 instances of quotation and reference to 868 different

⁵¹⁹ Boggs, *Transnationalism and American Literature*, 101.

⁵²⁰ Boggs, 103.

⁵²¹ Ibid. Boggs writes: “Emerson’s theory of translation is precisely in this vein [Benjamin’s notion of translation to reinstate pure language]. In ‘Nature,’ when Emerson imagines texts as collectively authored, he uses the word ‘translate’ to inscribe the practice in his philosophy of similitude.”

⁵²² See Meredith McGill, “Common Places: Poetry, Illocality, and Temporal Dislocation in Thoreau’s *A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers*,” *American Literary History*, 19, no. 2 (2007): 357-374.

⁵²³ Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Ralph Waldo Emerson, John Lothrop Motley: Two Memoirs*, (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1892), 293.

authors.⁵²⁴ “His mind,” Holmes writes, “was overflowing with thought as a river in the season of flood, and was full of floating fragments from an endless variety of sources. He drew ashore whatever he wanted that would serve his purpose.”⁵²⁵

The “floating fragment” I find to be a particularly apt choice of words. Melville had written of Emerson in a letter to Evert Duyckinck, “I love all men who *dive*. Any fish can swim near the surface, but it takes a great whale to go down stairs five miles or more; & if he don’t attain the bottom, why all the lead in Galena can’t fashion the plummet that will.”⁵²⁶ To understand Emerson’s diving, what he sought at the bottom, his journal entry of January 2, 1833 seems illuminating. Recounting his voyage to Malta, the storm that shut them in on the second day at sea, he gives a catalogue of preoccupations which culminate in “the ugly ‘sound of water in mine ears,’ anticipations of going to the bottom, and the treasures of the memory.”⁵²⁷ What I find interesting here is how the watery deep is two times connected to quotation. In the first instance, the “sound of water in mine ears” is rendered for the reader, not primarily the sign of the material fact of water, but the literary referent to Shakespeare.⁵²⁸ The “treasures of the memory” reads almost as an appositive phrase for “going to the bottom.”

Immediately following, Emerson says, “I remembered up nearly the whole of *Lycidas*, clause by clause, here a verse and there a word, as Isis in the fable of the broken body of Osiris.” From Shakespeare to Milton, Emerson tells of his own collecting of fragments, his response to

⁵²⁴ Holmes, 295.

⁵²⁵ Holmes, 297.

⁵²⁶ Quoted in Perry Miller, *The Raven and the Whale*, 265.

⁵²⁷ Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson, With Annotations*, Vol. 3; 1833-1835, Ed. Edward Waldo Emerson and Waldo Emerson Forbes, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1910), 3.

⁵²⁸ Emerson is slightly off here as the line from *Richard III*, I. iv. is “dreadful noise of water in mine ears.”

the storm at sea. He compares himself to Isis, likely having in mind as he thinks of *Lycidas*, Milton's portrait of truth in *Areopagitica*, where the Truth that came into the world is, like Osiris, "hewed...into a thousand pieces and scattered...to the four winds" leaving its disciples to "imitat[e] the careful search that Isis made for the mangled body of Osiris,...gathering up limb by limb still as they could find them."⁵²⁹ Osiris's body is, like Benjamin's broken vessel, a story of the assembling of fragments, but in Emerson's own imitation of the careful search that Isis made, the fragments are cast not as translations or "truth" language in general but as quotations.

I would like to posit that quotation really stands at the heart of Emersonian Truth. While for Milton, Truth was the Gospel truth of Jesus Christ, Emerson, in another passage in his journal, declares, "Make your own Bible. Select & Collect all those words & sentences that in all your reading have been to you like the blast of trumpet out of Shakspear, Seneca, Moses, John, & Paul."⁵³⁰ Given that three of the five authors recommended for selection into "your own Bible" are already in the Bible, we must understand this Emersonian revision of the Biblical canon not in terms of content but form. The Emersonian bible is no longer a canon of books, but it is a selection and collection of "words & sentences."

If the collecting of quotations was so central and sacred to Emersonian practice, it is a center that cannot really hold. Immediately, the problem arises—everything else we know about Emerson. Though Emerson is clearly as much a participant as anybody in the intertextual and transnational culture of quotation we have examined thus far, he is also the touchstone of original genius. While in Wai Chee Dimock's reading a transnational Emerson finds the "national" Jesus

⁵²⁹ John Milton, *Areopagitica*, In *The Major Works*, Ed. Stephen Orgel and Jonathan Goldberg. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 263.

⁵³⁰ Emerson, *Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Vol. 5, 1835-1838, Ed. William H. Gilman, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 186.

unsuitable for assimilation in Western countries and translates and imitates the Persian poet Hafiz in his private notebook, Perry Miller charts the reactions to Emerson in the Young American circle, wherein “there is no denying Emerson is original, and in an American way.”⁵³¹ Patrick Keane provides a most useful overview of the Emersonian tension: the debate on influence.⁵³² The representative of the one side is Harold Bloom, for whom Emerson is the model of genius. Bloom’s *Genius*—which takes as its subtitle the very word Oliver Wendell Holmes used to describe Emerson’s writing, “a mosaic”—rescues Emerson’s originality from the problem of influence by taking influence as a matter of course instead of a matter of anxiety.⁵³³ Bloom writes, “Fierce originality is one crucial component of literary genius, but this originality itself is always canonical, in that it recognizes and comes to terms with precursors.”⁵³⁴ The other camp is represented by Frank Thompson, whose focus is on Emerson’s indebtedness, specifically to Coleridge and Wordsworth, a British Romantic tradition that connects Emerson to German Idealism.⁵³⁵ And though Keane primarily sides with Thompson, he still admits that “Emerson really *is* as original as he claims.”⁵³⁶

We could, then, take quotation and originality as two halves of the Emersonian coin and accept that the difference between Bloom and Thompson is only really one of emphasis.

⁵³¹ Wai Chee Dimock, *Through Other Continents*, 39, 45-46; Perry Miller, 263.

⁵³² See Patrick Keane, *Emerson, Romanticism, and Intuitive Reason: The Transatlantic “Light of All Our Day.”* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005).

⁵³³ Oliver Wendell Holmes bears this point out. He observes that Emerson “would never have taken the trouble to [defend himself from the charge of plagiarism]” (296-97). Keane, too, notes that with respect to the charges made against Coleridge, Emerson “wondered why Coleridge could not have said, ‘generously like Goethe,’ that he owed all” (32).

⁵³⁴ Quoted in Patrick Keane, *Emerson, Romanticism, and Intuitive Reason: The Transatlantic “Light of All Our Day.”* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005), 29.

⁵³⁵ Keane, 30-31.

⁵³⁶ Keane, 32.

Emerson was, of course, imitative, but he was really original. Emerson was, of course, original, but he was really imitative. The claim of emphasis is one I have, no doubt, made in this paper, but here I would like to take the point beyond emphasis. What if we really took Emerson's quotation, not as a practice in the service of the greater Emersonian truths of self-reliance, originality, and the particular relation to the universe, but as the embodiment of Emersonian Truth. Meredith McGill notes with regard to the lack of a scholarly edition of Emerson's commonplace books that it is likely due to our focus on Emerson as an original thinker. "This exclusion from the corpus," she argues, "says more about what critics value in Emerson than what Emerson himself valued."⁵³⁷ What critics have valued in Emerson is originality, but what Emerson valued was quotation. When scholars have paid careful attention to Emerson's quotations, it turns out that quotation bears out Emersonian principles. Debra Fried in her dissertation "Valves of Attention: Quotation and Context in the Age of Emerson," refers to Emerson's essays as "anthologies with a plot" as a way to introduce the story that Emerson's quotations tell.⁵³⁸ In her reading, Emerson's quotations dilate and render occlusion as transparency—participating in Emerson's signature optics.

We have to now check the impulse to object and cite "imitation is suicide," as he wrote in "Self-Reliance" (1841) or his "still worse, the parrot of other men's thinking" as he wrote in "The American Scholar" (1837).⁵³⁹ Quotation for Emerson was not imitation, nor was it parroting. If, as Boggs argues, Emersonian translation was marked by the sameness or similitude of the self and other because of the unity of pure language, quotation's insistent fragmentation—

⁵³⁷ McGill, "Common Places," 360.

⁵³⁸ See Debra Fried, "Valves of Attention: Quotation and Context in the Age of Emerson." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1983; Ann Arbor, Mich.: ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

⁵³⁹ Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Nature and Selected Essays*, Ed. Larzer Ziff (New York: Penguin, 2003), 176, 85.

for in Milton's rendering of the Osiris myth, the body of Truth remains broken and "ever shall be"—is where Emerson relocates, or re-members a dialectic. Fried describes Emersonian citation as "between the status of transparent net and intrusive footprint, or artifact impeccably camouflaged to fit into the contextual stream in which it is inserted, and imprint showing the pressure of another presence and telling in an instant the awful truth that one is not alone."⁵⁴⁰ Simply put, Emersonian citation is quotation *par excellence*. It is quotation understood as assimilation and dissimulation, a dialectic between the self and not self.

In his 1859 lecture, "Quotation and Originality," Emerson reconciles quotation and originality, quotation and authorship, through a stamp of self that comes in by assimilating power. He writes,

Original power in men is usually accompanied with assimilating power, and we value in Coleridge his excellent knowledge and quotations perhaps as much, possibly more, than his original suggestions...Genius borrows nobly. When Shakespeare is charged with debts to his authors, Landor replies: "Yet he was more original than his originals. He breathed upon dead bodies and brought them into life."...So Voltaire usually imitated, but with such superiority that Dubucq said: "He is like the false Amphitryon; although the stranger, it is always he who has the air of being master of the house." Wordsworth, as soon as he heard a good thing, caught it up, meditated upon it, and very soon reproduced it in his conversation and writing. If De Quincey said, "That is what I told you," he replied, "No : that is mine—mine, and not yours." On the whole, we like the valor of it. 'Tis on Marmontel's principle, "I pounce on what is mine, wherever I find it"...It betrays the consciousness that truth is the property of no individual, but is the treasure of all men.⁵⁴¹

First, we can note the value of Coleridge's quotations "possibly more" than his originals. But at this point, we are only speaking to the question of emphasis. But in the example of Voltaire, we can perhaps understand the dialectics of Emerson's quotation, where the stranger is rendered the

⁵⁴⁰Fried, 53.

⁵⁴¹ Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Quotation and Originality," *The North American Review*, Apr. 1868, 550.

host.⁵⁴² In the imagined dispute between De Quincey and Wordsworth, the battle between mine and yours is important. The value of quotation for Emerson hinges on the assimilation of the self into the not-self.

Though “Quotation and Originality” is a later essay, Emerson had expressed this assimilating power earlier in “The American Scholar” (1837) as well as “Self Reliance” (1841). In “The American Scholar,” noting the proper use of books, he continues, “On the other hand, instead of being its own seer, let it receive from another mind its truth, though it were in torrents of light, without periods of solitude, inquest, and self-recovery, and a fatal disservice is done.”⁵⁴³ Receiving another mind without the assimilating of the self, “self-recovery” is where Emersonian true quotation reduces to imitation. What he describes as “the character of the pleasure we derive from the best books” is “the conviction that one nature wrote and the same reads.”⁵⁴⁴ In “Quotation and Originality,” Emerson declared that “[w]hatever we think and say is wonderfully better for our spirits and trust in another mouth.”⁵⁴⁵ This echoes his statement in “Self Reliance” that “[i]n every work of genius we recognize our own rejected thoughts; they come back to us with a certain alienated majesty.”⁵⁴⁶ But if in “Self-Reliance” Emerson finds us “forced to take with shame our own opinion from another,” by the time we get to “Quotation and Originality” there is no shame.

The union of the self and the other, however, does not erase the other, as Boggs deduces from Emerson’s first language—at least not in quotation. In a journal entry on May 10, 1839,

⁵⁴² See J. Hillis Miller, “The Critic as Host,” *Critical Inquiry* 3, no. 3 (1977), 439-447, discussed in Ch. 2.

⁵⁴³ Emerson, “The American Scholars,” in *Nature and Selected Essays*, 89.

⁵⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 90.

⁵⁴⁵ Emerson, “Quotation and Originality,” 559.

⁵⁴⁶ Emerson, “Self-Reliance,” *Nature and Selected Essays*, 176.

Emerson writes: “I hate to quote my friend who, with all his superiority, still thinks like me. In quoting him, I am presently reduced to defend his opinion. Then I find it not only hard but impossible to separate his view from mine...Hence came the *Pereant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt*.”⁵⁴⁷ The Latin text, “May those who have said our ideas before us perish,” might seem to go against all that Emerson affirms in “Quotation and Originality,” but it must be understood within the context of self and other. An other who says the “same *things*” as the self is not quotable for Emerson. This is where we see most clearly that Emersonian quotation is dialectical, that the unity of all things does not presuppose the extinction of the other. It is also where we see that though Emerson never speaks of a “dissimilating power,” this, too, is as much a part of his vision of quotation.

An Other Problem: The National Failure of Quotation

This dissimilating power may be seen as the nonconformity of self-reliance, paradoxically suggesting that self-reliance is not simply the protection of the self from subjugation of the tyranny of others, but also a protection of the self from tyranny of the self. Still, since quotation is the mechanism for the unification of original truth, once the other-self is quoted, the extrication of the self from other-self, or the “[separation] of his view from mine,” as Emerson observes, becomes impossible even as it is what he most desires in this instance. In fact, Emerson, just before the cited passage, goes so far as to say that “I wish to hear the thoughts of men which differ widely in some important respect from my own...not one who only gives me in a varied garb my own daily thoughts. I think it is better to sever & scatter men of kindred genius than to unite them.”

⁵⁴⁷ Emerson, *Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Vol. 7, 1838-1842, Ed. A. W. Plumstead & Harrison Hayford (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), 194.

According to Robert Weisbuch, the severing and scattering of kin is what Emerson deliberately intends when we talk of national genesis.⁵⁴⁸ It is the national question that splits the central practice of quotation in Emersonian and transcendentalist thought. Weisbuch contends that Emerson strategically rejects an artistic identification with Europe, erases the European romanticism that he is so highly indebted to, not out of an individual anxiety of influence, but a national. He argues that “Emerson could praise and particularize Europe only when he took his eye from the central and tyrannical notion of the idea of Europe in relation to an imitative America that, despite some bluster, agreed by its indebtedness to its inferiority...”⁵⁴⁹ The problem of national imitativeness in the context of British cultural imperialism placed America as post-colonial nation in the position of quoting the friend who thinks alike. In order for quotation to work as it should, America and Europe would have to be severed so that the nation could develop a self distinct from its other.

The solution, however, poses just as much a problem to the transcendental ideal of quotation. If the severing of the nation from the tyranny of European tastes requires the articulation and defense of national difference, the refusal to quote or to assimilate for the sake of difference simultaneously rejects true quotation even as it tries to preserve it. This conundrum is seen more clearly in the Transcendentalist calls for a national literature. William Ellery Channing attempts in his 1830 “Remarks on National Literature” to make the call for a national literature not just a nationalist move but a humanist one: “We love our country, but not blindly. In all nations we recognize one great family, and our chief wish for our native land is, that it may

⁵⁴⁸ See Robert Weisbuch, “Post-Colonial Emerson and the Erasure of Europe,” In *The Cambridge Companion to Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Ed. Joel Porte & Sandra Morris (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 192-217.

⁵⁴⁹ Weisbuch, 195.

take first rank among the lights and benefactors of the human race.”⁵⁵⁰ He defines literature as “the concentration of intellect for the purposes of spreading itself abroad and multiplying its energies.”⁵⁵¹ If it is a concentration in the national, it is for the purpose of spreading through distances. The literary space, after all, can span distances, or, as Channing himself puts it, “Books penetrate everywhere.”⁵⁵² Why, then, must it be concentrated? What is the purpose of the national in national literature?

Channing’s vision of a national literature is a kind of internationalism, which does not conflict with Emerson’s ideals of universalism in thought, even if, cast as an act of international outreach, it conflicts with Emerson’s strategic national position. “We want those lights,” he states, “which make a country conspicuous at a distance.”⁵⁵³ It would seem, then, that the national dimension of the literary space is meant to give the nation an international identity, to solve the problem of physical distance in the international community, the manipulation of physical space through that of literary space. He continues in much the same vein further on, “We want great minds to be formed among us,—minds which shall be felt from afar, and through which we may act on the world.”⁵⁵⁴

But Channing shares Emerson’s concerns on the excess of influence. To the argument that America can rely on a foreign literature, he responds, “Books are already among the most powerful influences there are. The question is, shall Europe, through these, fashion us after its

⁵⁵⁰ William Ellery Channing, “Remarks on National Literature,” In *The Works of William Ellery Channing*, Ed. William Henry Channing (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1894), 125.

⁵⁵¹ Channing, 126.

⁵⁵² Ibid.

⁵⁵³ Ibid., 127.

⁵⁵⁴ Channing, 128.

pleasure? Shall America be only an echo of what is thought and written under the aristocracies beyond the ocean.”⁵⁵⁵ Channing then transitions into “another view”:

A foreign literature will always, in a measure, be foreign. It has sprung from the soul of another people, which, however like, is still not our own soul. Every people has much in its own character and feelings which can only be embodied by its own writers [...].⁵⁵⁶

To combat the problem of an American echo, where American quotation of Europe is caught in a fatal similitude, Channing’s turn to “another view” makes the case for American and European difference in terms that break down the logic of transcendental thought. This is where the relationship between literary and physical space gets tricky. The foreign literature springs from the soul, which reads almost as soil, but isn’t. I imagine that Channing is playing on the lexical illusion, so to speak. His argument rests, I think, on the identification of soul and soil.

Considering that most Americans, if not all of the Americans to whom Channing writes are biologically and historically and, to a certain extent, culturally, descended from Europeans, the dis-identification of the American soul from the European soul can only be on the grounds of soil.

The identification of soul and soil that disconnects the American from the European rejects the central tenet for both Channing and Emerson: the universal soul and pure language. Channing’s conception of language as “a means of expression that, if sensitively used, allows the divine to speak through the self” predates Emerson’s language theory.⁵⁵⁷ Like Emerson, Channing believed in “the God within” and that a fundamental harmony, a deeper source from

⁵⁵⁵ Ibid., 131.

⁵⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁵⁷ Andrew Delbanco, *William Ellery Channing: An Essay on the Liberal Spirit in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), 103.

which language flowed.⁵⁵⁸ In accepting a distinct language that cannot translate, Channing accepts not a universal soul, but distinct, national souls. The correspondence of the particular with the universal does not work when the particular is a national particular.

Margaret Fuller in “American Literature” makes the call for a national literature without shunning an imitation of Europe. Though she insists that “[b]ooks which imitate or represent the thoughts and life of Europe do not constitute an American literature,” she is also quick to deny any “sympathy with national vanity.”⁵⁵⁹ “Of those who think and write among us in the methods and of the thoughts of Europe,” she writes, “we are not impatient.”⁵⁶⁰ This reads in keeping with the value of multilingualism Colleen Boggs locates as the point of difference between Margaret Fuller and Emerson. But Fuller and Emerson perhaps still share a resemblance in that Fuller imagines a multilingualism, multinationalism, that concentrates and fuses into the original identity of the nation. Like Emerson, her call for national literature hinges on a differentiation of America from Europe in the face of “excessive influence” of the British parent:

What suits Great Britain, with her insular position and consequent need to concentrate and intensify life, her limited monarchy, and spirit of trade, does not suit a mixed race, continually enriched with new blood from other stocks the most unlike that of our first descent, with ample field and verge enough to range in and leave every impulse free.⁵⁶¹

What differentiates America from Europe in Fuller’s formulation is its constitution as a “mixed race” and this is where Fuller departs from Emerson as well. If for Emerson, American distinction was to be attained by othering its other-self, Fuller’s vision of American distinction is

⁵⁵⁸ Delbanco, 111, 114.

⁵⁵⁹ Margaret Fuller, “American Literature,” in *Papers on Literature and Art*. (1846; Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2007), 122.

⁵⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁶¹ Fuller, 123.

by serving multiple others. She considers that the day of an American original genius “will not rise till the fusion of the races among us is more complete.”⁵⁶² Though, as Boggs contends, Fuller’s model of translation sought to “protect national diversity and literary globalism from homogenizing universality,” the fusion of the races speaks to a kind of universalist project, a unifying totality of diverse fragments akin to Emerson’s own model.⁵⁶³ Yet, if Fuller’s transcendental thought holds up better than Emerson’s does in the light of the nation, it may be because Fuller, preferring the personal to the universal, selects the Other *within* in order to establish national self-realization.

That the nation disrupts Emersonian quotation, however, may be only fitting. If Truth for Emerson is necessarily fragmented, then the modern nation preserves the fragmentation that quotation promises to re-member. Weisbuch notes that Emerson returns to literary engagement with Europe in 1850 with *Representative Men*, a response to Carlyle’s lectures *On Heroes* and his request that Emerson “*shew* us the great soul of a man.”⁵⁶⁴ Emerson can return to Europe because it has by this point lost some of its influence on America. He sees that Europe has peaked and America is on the ascendancy. Still, realization is always met by fragmentation. Emerson not only returns to engage Europe because it is now safe to do so, but, according to Weisbuch, because “it was needed to reinvest America with its utopian promise at a time when the sense that the New World would be the scene for a revolution in the consciousness has been threatened by the horrors of the slave trade and the hundred doubts of commercial development at home.”⁵⁶⁵

⁵⁶² Fuller, 124.

⁵⁶³ Boggs, 97.

⁵⁶⁴ Weisbuch, 209.

⁵⁶⁵ Ibid. 213.

Emerson's engagement with Europe in *Representative Men* is his meditation on an ever fragmented world, a continual decomposition and recomposition. In "Napoleon" the story of the great soul of a man ends with an all consuming egotism. Emerson exposes the poles of democrats and conservatives as simply a matter of temporal continuum. "The democrat is the young conservative. The conservative is an old democrat."⁵⁶⁶ Napoleon, Emerson says, represents the entire continuum, but the counter-revolution "still waits for its organ and representative, in a lover and a man of truly public and universal aims."⁵⁶⁷ After giving "life and limb" for him, France found that "after every victory was another war; after the destruction of armies, new conscriptions"—an endless process of decomposition and recomposition.

Decomposition is the term Nikhil Bilwakesh uses to describe Emerson's late composition style. Bilwakesh argues that what characterizes Emerson's later works is an attempt to "outgo the personality," the diffusion of Emerson's voice into a collection of other voices.⁵⁶⁸ Individual genius is not Emerson's last word, it would seem. In *Parnassus*, as a collection that spans from 1822 to 1870s, Emerson reveals what was most consistently an Emersonian value: quotation, the collecting and selecting of fragments. Bilwakesh sees *Parnassas* in its defiance of Emersonian composition as Emerson's deliberate portrait of aging, hence, the designation of decomposition. But if we forget the canonical notion of Emersonian composition, we can remember Emerson's own commitment to collecting the floating fragments to "re-member up" the body of Truth. What interests me, however, about Bilwakesh's term, decomposition, is the disavowal of any remembering. This disavowal I attribute not as much to a portrait of old age as to a portrait of

⁵⁶⁶ Emerson, "Napoleon," *Nature*, 357.

⁵⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 358.

⁵⁶⁸ Nikhil Bilwakesh, "Emerson's Decomposition: *Parnassus*," *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 67, no. 4 (2013): 526.

modernity, a realization that the nation is always a site a fragmentation, and that the fate of remembering will always be decomposition. When there is no central unity, the story of tradition can only be told in fragments. In what follows, I will look at the larger phenomenon of collecting scraps and fragments, specifically on quotation books, and how the antebellum nation navigated a fragmented print culture.

Editing Cultures: The Quotation Books of Sarah Josepha Hale and John Bartlett

Michel Foucault in “What is An Author” described the author as “a certain functional principle by which, in our culture, one limits, excludes, and chooses; in short, by which one impedes the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of fiction.”⁵⁶⁹ Emerson’s decomposition signified a renunciation of authorship in favor of the role of editor, compiler, collector. In so doing, Emerson joined a popular occupation of the 1850s. With the increased circulation and ubiquity of newspapers, it became more common for readers to own their own copy. Scrapbooking emerges as a widespread phenomenon of the Civil War period, where the newspaper reading public assigned value to “these fragments of knowledge” in the papers that they clipped and compiled to construct their own meaningful record.⁵⁷⁰ Along with personal scrapbooks, there was also a market for other packaged morsels of information, dictionaries, handbooks, traveler’s guides, and quotation books.

In the 1850s there were two quotation books that came out which speak to the deregulation of fragments in the antebellum period and which complement each other in

⁵⁶⁹ Michel Foucault, “What Is An Author?” in *The Book History Reader*, ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery (Abingdon: Routledge 2nd ed., 2006), 290.

⁵⁷⁰ See Ellen Gruber Garvey, *Writing With Scissors: American Scrapbooks from the Civil War to the Harlem Renaissance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 7.

interesting ways. The first was *A Complete Dictionary of Poetical Quotations*, originally by John F. Addington in 1829 in England, but edited and re-compiled in 1850 with modern British and American authors by Sarah Josepha Hale, editor of *Godey's Lady's Book*. The second was *Familiar Quotations*, also adapted from a British collection, Isabella Rushton Preston's *Handbook of Familiar Quotations* and printed by John Bartlett in 1855. Both American books in their appropriation of these British collections of the British canon reveal the compiler's talent of recomposition and decomposition, and the texts they render reveal the absence of a unified narrative in the face of national and literary fragmentation. It is precisely this absence, I argue, that underscores the compiler's authority.

Sarah Hale's American Presence and Erasure

Sarah Josepha Hale was one of the most influential women in the nation, editing the most widely read magazine of the antebellum period.⁵⁷¹ As editor of the Boston's *Ladies Magazine* (from 1828-36) and Philadelphia's *Godey's Lady's Book* (from 1837-1877), she had written numerous editorials, book reviews, published her own poetry and fiction as well as the work of prominent American authors.⁵⁷² She championed the intellectual rights of women, advocating female education. She herself did not have a formal education. She received her literary education from her brother Horatio, who resented that she did not have the same collegiate opportunity he did.⁵⁷³ Married at the age of 18, she continued to receive her literary education through her husband David Hale.

⁵⁷¹ The *Lady's Book* had at the start of the Civil War 150,000 subscribers. Patricia Okker, *Our Sister Editors: Sarah J. Hale and the Tradition of Nineteenth-Century American Women Editors* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), 1.

⁵⁷² Ibid.

⁵⁷³ Okker, 41.

Despite her advocacy of women's equality of the mind, Hale was no suffragette, and responded harshly to the movement. In an editorial in *Godey's* she wrote:

The efforts of that small band of women who assume to represent their sex in claiming the right of suffrage have so persistently ignored the great and radical differences between the sexes that it is especially necessary to recall them. One would think that the mere statement of their doctrines put forward by the agitators would be sufficient to show their unfitness for the dangerous boon they ask.⁵⁷⁴

Though her editorship gave her a public presence, she believed in separate spheres, that the essence of women's moral superiority relied on her separateness from the dirty business of men's politics. This, however, did not mean that Hale did not participate in political action. In fact, as Patricia Okker notes, Hale's legacy has been less in her literary achievements as in her patriotic activity—campaigning for Thanksgiving as a national holiday, supporting the Bunker Hill Monument and the preservation of Mount Vernon as a national monument, as well as her advocacy for the American Colonization Society, repatriating slaves to Liberia.⁵⁷⁵ For Hale, the proper mode of female political action was the exertion of influence on the male decision makers: “Let us, as American ladies, cultivate the virtues, the knowledge, the accomplishments, which will influence, imbue, and inspire the other sex to do the work of the world to the glory of God.”⁵⁷⁶

Hale's position as editor allowed her a mode of influence unavailable to a lot of women, though, as Okker's study of women editors in the American nineteenth century reveals, more

⁵⁷⁴ [Sarah Josepha Hale], “Invention and Intuition,” *Godey's Lady's Book and Magazine*, Jan. 1872, 93.

⁵⁷⁵ On Hale's campaigning for the Bunker Hill monument, see Okker, 70-71; on her advocacy of the ACS, see Okker 80-81; Amy Kaplan, “Manifest Domesticity,” *American Literature* 70 (1998): 581-606; Susan M. Ryan, “Errand into Africa: Colonization and Nation Building in Sarah J. Hale's *Liberia*,” *New England Quarterly* 68 (1995): 558-83. Etsuko Taketani, “Postcolonial Liberia: Sarah Josepha Hale's Africa,” *American Literary History* 14, no. 3 (2002): 479-504.

⁵⁷⁶ “Literary Women of America: Mrs. Sarah Josepha Hale,” *The Ladies' Repository*, Apr. 1855, 196. See also Okker 75-78.

women had availed themselves of the position than we might think.⁵⁷⁷ But the editing of Addington's *Complete Dictionary of American Quotations* was an especially unique opportunity for Hale's political influence, for the feminine power Hale believed in most strongly was women's poetic power:

War, the chace [sic], the wine-cup and physical love are the themes of song in which men first delight and excel; nor is it till feminine genius exerts its power to judge and condemn these, always earthly, and often coarse and licentious, strains that the tone of lyre becomes softer, chaster, more pure and polished and finally, as her influence increases, she joins the choir...⁵⁷⁸

As editor, Hale could exert her power to judge and condemn Addington's text and incorporate American women into the record of the lyric.

From its inception, Hale's recomposition was a decomposition. In her preface, she discusses the history of Addington's book:

About twenty years ago the plan was originated by John Addington, an Englishman, then residing in this city; but he devoted his attention almost exclusively to the British Bards. His labours were valuable, still the work was incomplete; the modern writers of poetry, both English and American, with a few exceptions in favour of the former, were wholly omitted.⁵⁷⁹

Hale deems Addington's work incomplete for its omission of modern poets, but this was precisely Addington's intent. In his own Preface to the 1829 edition, he writes that "former publications of similar title and pretensions to merit, have differed from the present work, in that their compilers have exclusively made their selections from the productions of modern poets

⁵⁷⁷ Okker, 6-37.

⁵⁷⁸ Quoted in Patricia Okker, "Sarah Josepha Hale, Lydia Sigourney, and the Poetic Tradition in Two Nineteenth-Century Women's Magazines," *American Periodicals* 3 (1993): 36.

⁵⁷⁹ Sarah Josepha Hale, Ed., *Dictionary of Poetical Quotations by John Addington* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1850), iii.

(most of which are already to be found in every family library).”⁵⁸⁰ Addington’s purpose is to distinguish his book from its counterparts through an antiquarian purchase. He organizes his text chronologically by various themes to represent the wisdom of the ages.

Hale’s project is a modern one, and she brings the modern world to bear on Addington’s text, continuing with her analysis on the need for revision: “Then these selections were not always in accordance with the present standard of public taste. The old dramatic poets wrote according to their light, which was often reflected through a foul medium, and revealed much that is now considered, and justly, too, as coarse and indelicate.”⁵⁸¹ I would like to focus on two interventions that Hale makes in bringing Addington’s text to a modern recomposition: one gendered and one national. She removes those passages that are indelicate toward women. In the section on women in Addington’s *Dictionary*, he gives a quotation from Chapman’s *May Day*.

He that holds religious and sacred thoughts
Of a woman; he that boasts so reverend
A respect to her, that he will not touch
Her, but with a kiss’d hand and a timorous
Heart; he that adores her like his goddess,
Let him be sure she’ll shun him like her slave.⁵⁸²

She also excises a quotation from Smith’s *Hector of Germany* “Never regard the passions of a woman:/ They’re wily creatures, and have learn’d this wit, / Where they love most,--best to dissemble it.” What must be noted with these removals is that Hale does not excise them simply on the grounds that they are less than favorable toward women. After all, she retains Milton’s line on “this fair defect /Of nature.” Hale’s excisions have to do with the quotations in

⁵⁸⁰ John Addington, *Poetical Quotations: Being A Complete Dictionary of the Most Elegant Moral, Sublime, and Humorous Passages in the British Poets In Four Volumes*. Vol. 1 (Philadelphia: John Grigg, 1829), iv.

⁵⁸¹ Hale, *Dictionary*, iii.

⁵⁸² Addington, 262.

Addington's text that specifically address men. She recomposes Addington's *Dictionary* to acknowledge a female readership and presence.

In her Preface, Hale notes that she retains the chronological order of the original, now with its modern extension, so that "the curious reader may trace the progressive improvements of the *one language*, forming now the bond of union between two great nations, whose children of song are here, for the first time, united." By virtue of chronology, the progressive improvement of "one language" culminates in the crowning achievements of American writers, and frequently, American female writers, herself included. She integrates women in the literary canon, but moreover, sets up a literary evolution in which the British classics build up to the American poet(ess).

The nationalist dimension of Hale's modernization of Addington's text constitutes another of her textual decompositions. Addington's text, published in Philadelphia, highlights in its title page "British Poets." This is not surprising given the antiquarian direction of his project where he boasts presenting 300 British Poets from the last three centuries. In Hale's recomposition, casting chronology as progress, she presents America as the promise of the modern era. Despite her claim of the "bond of union" between America and Britain, her index of authors separates the British Authors from the American—an innovation in books of the kind. The American list starts where the British ends, keeping that sense of an evolutionary continuum she establishes in her Preface.

The American modern, however, undergoes a decomposition itself in Hale's editorial selection. Addington's text contains a section on America that contains a thoroughly modern concern in the middle of this historical project. Addington includes a quotation of Thomas Moore's "To Lord Viscount Forbes" in which America is castigated for the existence of slavery

among its democratic institutions. Thomas Moore was an Irish poet and satirist who had come to America in 1804 to accept a post in Bermuda. Disappointed in what he saw, he returned to England and published *Epistles, Odes, and Other Poems* (1806), which sparked such controversy in the U.S. that he was targeted even by the Anglophiles who had previously admired him.⁵⁸³ Addington's quotations from Moore appear in the America section and in the section on Slavery. One of the quotations, this one from the America section, reads:

Who can with patience, for a moment see,
The medley mass of pride and misery,
Of whips and charters, manacles and rights,
Of slaving blacks and democratic whites?⁵⁸⁴

Hale removes each of the Moore quotations. In the America section, they made two of only four quotations, so Hale supplements the subtractions with a swell of texts, patriotic poems hailing Columbia. From Eliza Cook, "Where Freedom's to be won"; from Percival, "Thou art the shelter of the free,/ The home, the port of liberty"; from Whittier, "My own green Land for ever!"; Oliver Wendell Holmes, "The Continent in ours."⁵⁸⁵ She supplies a quotation from Bryant:

Here the free spirit of mankind, at length,
Throws its last fetters off; and who shall place
A limit to the giant's unchained strength?
Or curb his swiftness in the forward race?⁵⁸⁶

⁵⁸³ For a discussion of Thomas Moore and his America controversy see Herbert G. Eldridge, "Anacreon Moore and America," *PMLA* 83, no. 1 (1968): 54-62.

⁵⁸⁴ Addington, *Dictionary*, Vol. 1, 49.

⁵⁸⁵ Hale, *Dictionary*, 22-23.

⁵⁸⁶ Hale, *Dictionary*, 22.

It would seem that Hale has erased the American present in favor of the American revolutionary past and its future progress. Her collection of fragments will not tell of the thing currently fragmenting the nation. In fact, though she also removes two Moore quotations from the Slavery section of Addington's book, she makes only one addition, from Timothy Dwight, "Ne'er shall the sons of Columbia be slaves, / While the earth bears a plant, or the son rolls her waves."⁵⁸⁷

How do we understand this erasure of the most modern, pressing issue of the American moment? We might see it in keeping with Sarah Hale's renunciation of direct female political involvement. She did not address the Civil War in her *Lady's Book* editorials except to promote a domestic answer to the political question, hoping that a Thanksgiving celebration would bring the nation together.⁵⁸⁸ Alternatively, we might see it in keeping with her involvement in the colonization movement, that proposes as the answer to the slavery problem an erasure of the African slave from America. The final poem added to the America section—Hale's own—points us to the latter:

America! The sound is like a sword
To smite th' oppressor! Like a loving word
To cheer the suffering people, while they pray
That God would hasten on the promised day,
When earth shall be like heaven, and men shall stand
Like brothers round an altar, hand in hand
O! ever thus, America, be strong—
Like cataract's thunder pour the Freeman's song,
Till struggling Europe joins the grand refrain;
And startled Asia bursts the despot's chain;
And Afric's manumitted sons, from thee
To their own Father-land shall bear a song,
--Worth all their toils and tears—of Liberty;

⁵⁸⁷ Hale, *Dictionary*, 485.

⁵⁸⁸ Okker, *Our Sister Editors*, 79.

For these good deeds, America, be strong!⁵⁸⁹

Even in this poem where Hale herself directly addresses the issue of American slavery, she fails to speak a slave presence in America. She cannot speak the slave. She can only imagine the slave in the future as a “manumitted son” who goes “from thee.” The American future serves for Hale as the site of the recomposition of American democracy in the face of its present decomposition.

Though we find the content of Hale’s recomposition unsatisfying, it is the form of her recomposition that entails the real American promise. Hale’s theory of female political participation through influence is rooted in her belief that “[g]reatness is most perfect when it acts with the least display of *self*.”⁵⁹⁰ When she was profiled in *Godey’s Lady’s Book*, she insisted her history not be published while she was its editor, a requirement in keeping with a behind-the-scenes influence.⁵⁹¹ Yet, the America section of *Dictionary* puts Hale in a different light. The progress of the American theme ends with a woman’s voice, with her own emphatic voice, beginning and ending in exclamation marks. She silences the men who only talk to each other, and inserts female voices as equal participants. In a way, her editorship over Addington’s *Dictionary* looks more like the participation of the suffragettes she disputed in her *Lady’s Book* editorials. It constitutes a decomposition and recomposition of her own vision of women’s power.

⁵⁸⁹ Hale, *Dictionary*, 23.

⁵⁹⁰ “Literary Women of America: Mrs. Sarah Josepha Hale,” *The Ladies’ Repository*, Apr. 1855, 196.

⁵⁹¹ LAG, “Sarah Josepha Hale,” *Godey’s Lady’s Book*, Dec. 1850, 326.

Woodward Emery said of Bartlett in his address at the Cambridge Historical Society's 'Reminiscences of John Bartlett', "His tastes and fancies were with books, his business was with books and the making of books, and this brought him in contact with the bookish class."⁵⁹² Indeed, John Bartlett knew his books inside and out, literally. A precocious young reader who "by the age of twelve had read not only most of the juvenile literature of that period" but everything from apparently *Pilgrim's Progress* to "Opie on 'Lying'," Bartlett did not continue his formal education as a college man, but continued another education in books as a worker in a college bookstore.⁵⁹³ He moved to Cambridge in 1836 at the age of 16 and began working in the University Bookstore, first as a bookbinder, and the following year as a clerk. By 1849, Bartlett owned the bookstore.⁵⁹⁴ He also began self-publishing books, his first an American reprinting of Arthur Hugh Clough's *The Bothie of Toper-na-fuosich*; in five years Bartlett would publish over 40 books.⁵⁹⁵ By the 1860s when he entered Little, Brown and Company, he was regarded as an expert on the manufacture of books.⁵⁹⁶

⁵⁹² "Reminiscences of John Bartlett," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Historical Society* I (1906): 83.

⁵⁹³ "I had an early taste for reading, and before the age of twelve had read not only most of the juvenile literature of that period, but also 'Pilgrim's Progress,' 'Josephus,' 'Arabian Nights,' 'Thaddeus of Warsaw,' 'Scottish Chiefs,' 'Cœlebs in Search of a Wife,' 'Cruise of the Midge,' 'Telemachus,' 'Paul and Virginia,' 'Tom Cringle's Log,' Cooper's 'Spy' and 'Last of the Mohicans,' Scott's 'Ivanhoe,' 'Talisman,' and 'Pirate,' 'Gulliver's Travels,' 'Münchhausen, and — Opie on 'Lying'." From John Bartlett's "A Record on Idle Hours" quoted in Joseph Willard's remarks in "Reminiscences of John Bartlett," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Historical Society* I (1906): 69. Most of this quotation also appears in M.H. Morgan, "John Bartlett," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 41.35 (Jul., 1906): 842. Morgan tells us that " 'Opie on Lying' is probably now the least known of them, but I am told that in its day it made even the 'white lie' a perfect terror to children."

⁵⁹⁴ Morgan 842.

⁵⁹⁵ Michael Hancher, "Familiar Quotations," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 14.2 (2003): 16-17. Michael Hancher refers to Bartlett's printing of *Bothie* as "an unauthorized American edition, not to say piracy." In the absence of international copyright, these unauthorized reprintings were common in American publishing.

⁵⁹⁶ "[H]e was also generally recognized as an expert in all matters connected with the actual manufacture of books," Morgan 843.

It would seem, then, that one could trust Bartlett's authority, but, like Sarah Hale, Bartlett's *Familiar Quotation* was a decomposition and recomposition of another text by a British person of the opposite sex. In Michael Hancher's study of the formation of Bartlett's book, he reveals a hidden genealogy behind Bartlett's book, uncovering its original primary source as Isabella Rushton Preston's *Handbook of Familiar Quotations*, published anonymously by John Murray in London. Preston's book formed the basis for a project Bartlett joined with his friend Henry W. Haynes (whom Hancher considers the first edition's principal "author").⁵⁹⁷ The concealment of Bartlett's source, not the case in Sarah Hale's book, places Bartlett in the heart of what Thomas R. Adams and Nicolas Barker, term the "underground."

In their essay, "A New Model for the Study of the Book," discussing reception as an aspect of book history, they note the potential for a book to have "an underground life paraphrased or quoted in other works."⁵⁹⁸ This underground is described in terms like "elusive," a place where ideas and words are "picked up" (potentially suggesting the pickpocket) and appropriated with or without attribution, sometimes outside of authorial intent. There seems to be something almost inherently suspect or illicit about the appropriation of texts. Adams and Barker conclude their description with a notable mention of John Bartlett and his "attempt to bring this secondary use under control."⁵⁹⁹ Bartlett is here cast as a sort of deputy sheriff serving the idea of authorship against this criminal underground of secondary use.

⁵⁹⁷ See Hancher 36-45.

⁵⁹⁸ Thomas R. Adams and Nicolas Barker, "A New Model for the Study of the Book," in *The Book History Reader*, ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery (Abingdon: Routledge 2nd ed., 2006), 59.

⁵⁹⁹ "A much more elusive, and in many ways a more important and less understood, aspect of reception is the way that the ideas, and even the actual wording of those ideas, are picked up and used with or without acknowledgment by later writers for a variety of purposes, some having nothing to do with the original intention of the author and publisher." Adams and Barker, 59-60.

What is ironic is that Bartlett perhaps only seems like deputy sheriff because of what he appropriated from Preston. In his ‘Preface’ to the 1855 first edition of *A Collection of Familiar Quotations*, he lays out the objective that most aligns with the policing of the underground, restoring texts to their authors, bring the underground under the authority of attribution⁶⁰⁰:

The object of this work is to show, to some extent, the obligations our language owes to various authors for numerous phrases and familiar quotations which have become “household words,” and “to restore to the temples of poetry the many beautiful fragments which have been stolen from them, and built into the heavy walls of prose.”

This Collection, originally made without any view of publication, has been considerably enlarged by additions from an English work on a similar plan, and is now sent forth with the hope that it may be found a convenient book of reference.

Though perhaps imperfect in some respects, it is believed to possess the merit of accuracy, as the quotations have been taken from the original sources.

Should this be favorably received, endeavors will be made to make it more worthy of the approbation of the public in a future edition.⁶⁰¹

The project is here set up as one of recomposition in the face of fragmentation, a particularly criminal fragmentation in need of a regulating authority. In a book on quotations that derives its objective from the question of attribution, however, the presence of unattributed statements in quotation marks needs to be considered.

The quotations are from its source, Isabella Rushton Preston. In her Preface, she recounts how the idea of her book came to be:

This Collection was originally intended for the amusement of a family-circle, without any idea of publication. It was only when the Compiler found how many well-read persons were unable to name the author of even the most familiar passage that it occurred to her to supply, by a work of reference, what appeared to be a desideratum in our literature,

⁶⁰⁰ Because of the extent of collaboration discussed more below, the authority of *Familiar Quotations*’ Preface can only be referred to, appropriately enough, in quotation marks. I still attribute the Preface to Bartlett because he in unofficial and later more official ways put his name on the book.

⁶⁰¹ *A Collection of Familiar Quotations With Complete Indices of Authors and Subjects*. (Cambridge, MA: John Bartlett, 1855), iii.

and to restore to the temples of Poetry the many beautiful fragments which have been stolen from them, and built into the heavy walls of Prose.⁶⁰²

Almost the entirety of Bartlett's Preface, as Hancher notes, is a "reprinting" of Preston's. Even what seemed the very personal confession of Bartlett's private collection of quotations "without any view of publication" is taken from Preston's ("without any idea of publication"). The last lines of Bartlett's preface are an almost exact quotation of the last lines of Preston's completely subsumed into his own language without any quotation marks. Bartlett gives some acknowledgment of Preston's work in his admitting of additions from "an English work on a similar plan" and early reviews of the first edition had no problem identifying what that English work was. The *Christian Examiner* review credits "Mr. Murray, of London, who has done so much in a quiet way for human happiness by publishing his Traveller's Guides, tried last year to help us with 'Handbook of Quotations'; but the work, though well planned, was inadequately executed."⁶⁰³ The question of attribution becomes a question of execution. "Mr. Bartlett," the review continues, "has greatly improved on this humane attempt."⁶⁰⁴

Indeed, it is clear from Rushton's Preface that the attribution concern was hers, not necessarily Bartlett's. As a printer whose first production was a reprinting of a British text, Bartlett was an active participant in the culture of reprinting, the culture that posed the biggest challenge to the idea of authorship, authorial regulation and circumscription, favoring instead a rampant circulation and participation in that underground life of text Adams and Barker describe.

As Bartlett continues to recompose his text, he goes deeper into the underground.

⁶⁰² *Handbook of Familiar Quotations, Chiefly From English Authors*. (London: John Murray, 1853), vii-viii.

⁶⁰³ *Christian Examiner*, July 1855, 144.

⁶⁰⁴ It must, however, be noted that the question of execution is judged on attribution. Bartlett's "improvements" on Preston's works are the inclusion of an author index at the beginning of the text, supplementing the subject index that typically ended quotation handbooks, more copious notes on the appearance of a given quotation in other texts by other authors, and more quotations identified.

The book that would come to be known simply by his name was published anonymously in its independent publishing existence and only took on the “by John Bartlett” in 1864 when it was published by Little, Brown and Company. Bartlett’s reluctance to embrace attribution seems a tacit acknowledgment of the underground genesis of *Familiar Quotations*, and if by the 1860s he could give his name to it (albeit at the request of his publishers), it is because after 10,000 copies he had made the book his own. Looking into the underground genesis of *Familiar Quotations* calls for us to re-evaluate the claims of the original Preface. Its appropriations and implicit participation in the culture of reprinting that had “wrenched from their original connection” the familiar quotations which “have fallen into common use,” seem to contradict with its objective.⁶⁰⁵ It is within the tension between authority/authorship and the reappropriation/reprinting that Bartlett’s *Familiar Quotations* takes its shape.

How did Bartlett’s authority come to be? To answer this question we move from the book’s genesis to its reception. Who was *Familiar Quotations* for, how was it meant to be used, and how was it actually used? In “Bartlett’s *Familiar Quotations*: ‘A Glancing Bird’s Eye View’ by a ‘Morbidity Scholiast,’” Michael David Cohen, analyzing the physical properties of Bartlett’s book makes the claim that the book began its publication career as a work intended for literary elites, and only in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century did it shift its focus to court a mass “middle-brow” audience.⁶⁰⁶ The physical dimensions and the quality of the binding of *Familiar Quotations* would not have fit in with the popular reference works of the time, but where Cohen does say the early edition of *Familiar Quotations* fit in was with *Milledulcia*. The

⁶⁰⁵ From *The North American Review* write-up on the 1855 first edition: “The compiler’s object is to show whence come the scraps of verse and prose, that have been wrenched from their original connection, have fallen into common use, and have often lost all record of their paternity; and, where they have been corrupted, to restore the *ipsissima verba*.” *The North American Review*, July 1855, 280.

⁶⁰⁶ Michael David Cohen, “Bartlett’s *Familiar Quotations*: ‘A Glancing Bird’s Eye View’ by a ‘Morbidity Scholiast,’” *Harvard Library Bulletin* 14.2 (2003): 56.

Milledulcia was a collection of pieces from the English antiquarian journal *Notes and Queries*.

Cohen considers that the resemblance of the binding and design of the book with that of *Familiar Quotations* suggests the two were marketed to the same elite, intellectual audience.⁶⁰⁷ Though Cohen focuses on the class dimensions of this relationship, what I find revealing in this twinship is that Bartlett's book was marketed alongside a text of periodical origin, and sharing the same audience, this audience was the readers of periodicals. It is in periodical circulation where *Familiar Quotations* takes on its own underground life.

The early reviews of Bartlett's book in the periodicals show it to be favorably received, and not just among literary elites. *The Monthly Religious Magazine*, a Unitarian organ for family reading, reviewed *Familiar Quotations* and it is worth quoting in full⁶⁰⁸:

The peculiar value of this work—a duodecimo of about three hundred pages—consists, not so much in presenting to the eye a great number of much-used phrases and maxims, as in referring to their authors quotations that are commonly used with no knowledge of their origin. In this way, the book becomes a curiosity and an entertainment. We doubt whether the best read scholars among us would not find surprises and informations here quite beyond his expectations. Expressions of such daily use that they seem to have created themselves, are assigned to their inventors. How many of our readers can tell who wrote “When Greeks joined Greeks, then was the tug of war;” or “Hypocrisy is a sort of homage that vice pays to virtue;” or “To beard the lion in his den;” or “Richard is himself again”? We understand the book is indebted for something more than its publication to the publisher, a gentleman who knows what he sells in more ways than one.⁶⁰⁹

Far from the scholarly work intended for a small circle of literary elites, the book is here taken as “curiosity and entertainment.” The stress is on the common, the familiar quotations, and it is the value of the book for scholars that is only tentatively addressed (we doubt...would not), the reviewer seeming to feel the need to trump up scholarly interest. The final note of observation

⁶⁰⁷ Cohen 60.

⁶⁰⁸ Frank Mott, *The History of American Magazines 1741-1930*. (Harvard: Harvard UP, 1930), 2: 72.

⁶⁰⁹ *The Monthly Religious Magazine*, “Editor’s Collectanea,” August 1855, 118.

from this review is that Bartlett's name (which appears as publisher in the opening citation of the book) and reputation become attached to the work immediately in the reception. Bartlett's connection to the book is given in the vein of rumor. His authority is circulating at the same time that his book is making the rounds in the periodical reviews, and it is in the periodicals where the authority of *Bartlett's* book is established.

The *Christian Examiner* review to which I have already referred gives a similar nod to the book's project, framed, however, rather differently. The praise remains centered on the book's stated objective, but appropriated (or reappropriated) for a different audience.

For the particular sort of dictionary which Mr. Bartlett has been at the pains of preparing, we are especially grateful. For the question of "quotations" is one of the inevitable miseries of social life. There is no circle, of the least pretensions to "literature," which does not comprise one or more individuals whose felicity consists in hunting their acquaintances into despair, and who will give you no rest till you have "proved your title" to every phrase that you may chance to use. Who has not looked forward to the time when "every gentleman's library" should be furnished with the means of instantaneously abating such nuisances; to the day when a single step from the dinner-table to the book-case would deliver the tormented from the tormentor.⁶¹⁰

In contrast to the common family entertainment described in *The Monthly Religious Magazine*, here the book is presented as a useful tool for the dinner-party nuisances of the literary elite.

Another example of the reappropriation of the book's objective is in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review*, where the book's objective as stated in the Preface is literally reprinted as the review (the words of the Preface marked below in italics):

The object of this work is to show, to some extent, the obligations our language owes to various authors for numerous phrases and familiar quotations which have become "household words," and "to restore to the temples of poetry the many beautiful fragments which have been stolen from them, and built into the heavy walls of prose."
The arrangement of the quotations in this book is admirable, and we confess we were

⁶¹⁰ *Christian Examiner*, July 1855, 144.

somewhat astonished to find the origin of so many words and phrases we hear daily used, in ordinary conversation, by men, too, who have no idea of their origin.⁶¹¹

In this reprinting of the book's objective into the text of the review, the words that were quotations in the Preface's text come to signify as the actual text of the Preface while the text of the Preface becomes the review's text. The objective is then taken into the review's "astonished" assessment of the value of Bartlett's text. What, at this point, is not astonishing is the fact that Bartlett's text is reviewed by a New York industrial magazine. From the very beginning of Bartlett's self-publishing career, he showed himself involved with the culture of reprinting and periodical circulation (see n.13). It is important to recognize that from its first edition *Familiar Quotations*' authorizing quality was reappropriated by all audiences in the periodical circulations of the time. It was the tension of its shared relationship with the underground life of texts in reprinting and circulation and with an attempt at authorial control that allowed it to be reappropriated by a wide range of periodicals circulating. In other words, what I am arguing is that it is not that *Familiar Quotations* was intended as a reference for an elite group of scholars and was appropriated by a wider middle-brow class, nor vice versa. Rather, *Familiar Quotations* was immediately reappropriated by both and it was in reappropriation that its authority was ever more asserted. Basically, as *Familiar Quotations* became more familiar, it became more authoritative.

A copy of *Familiar Quotations*' third edition (1858) in the Columbia Rare Books and Manuscript Library is inscribed to a Mrs. Frank J. Sprague as a "gift of the compiler and publisher John Bartlett" followed on the next page by an inscription in the same hand, "author

⁶¹¹ *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review*, March 1856, 399.

and publisher John Bartlett.”⁶¹² In his response to the Friswell controversy, Bartlett had expressed a lack of interest in publicly putting his name to his book until “at the request of my publishers” it was printed on the 1864 edition, but this inscription reveals that already in 1858, Bartlett could, more privately, put his name on his book—and with the designation of “author.” By today’s standards of authorship, it is already problematic for a compiler of a quotation book to assume the title of author. In Bartlett’s particular case, it is even more problematic after considering the underground genesis of the text, the debts to Preston’s book and the role of Haynes. How is it that Bartlett could inscribe himself an author in 1858 and what kind of authorship is this?

After the success of the first edition, Bartlett made good on the promise for a future edition and begins to make the book his own. The 1856 preface repeats only the same piece reprinted by *The Merchants’ Magazine*, and appends “the present edition has been revised and enlarged by the addition of sixty-three pages.”⁶¹³ In trimming down some of the original appropriations of Haynes’ Preface, Bartlett sheds some of his original obligations. By the third edition, Bartlett’s reappropriation is more consolidated:

The object of this work, as set forth in the original edition, was to show to some extent, the obligations our language owes to various authors for numerous phrases and familiar quotations, which have become “household words.”

That edition, compiled with the assistance of a friend whose efficient aid and judicious suggestions greatly enhanced the value of the work, was afterwards enlarged by the addition of sixty-three pages, and stereotyped.

To the present edition, ninety pages have been added in the form of a supplement, which, together with the newly paged indices, is issued in a separate form.⁶¹⁴

⁶¹² Comparison between the two inscriptions in the edition and Hancher’s reproductions of Bartlett and Haynes’ inscriptions seems to this inexpert eye to show the same hand.

⁶¹³ *A Collection of Familiar Quotations With Complete Indices of Authors and Subjects*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, MA: John Bartlett, 1856), iii.

⁶¹⁴ *A Collection of Familiar Quotations With Complete Indices of Authors and Subjects*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, MA: John Bartlett, 1858), iii.

Bartlett excises the Preston quotation that most lends itself to the “controlling” project of underground usage and instead ends the original objective on “household words,” a phrase that in its underground afterlife suggests not only common use but the culture of reprinting and periodical circulation. Indeed, among the changes to the new edition we find a changed publication format that facilitates reprinting; it’s stereotyped.

By the 4th edition in 1864, the first by Little, Brown and Company, Bartlett has completely rewritten the Preface:

The favor shown to former editions has encouraged the compiler of this collection to go on with the work and make it more worthy.

It is not easy to determine in all cases the degree of familiarity that may belong to phrases and sentences which present themselves for admission, for what is familiar to one class of readers may be quite new to another.

Many maxims of the most famous writers of our language, and numberless curious and happy turns from orators and poets have knocked at the door and it was hard to deny them. But to admit these simply on their own merits, without assurance that the general reader would readily recognize them as old friends, was aside from the purpose of this Collection.

Still it has been thought better to incur the risk of erring on the side of fullness.⁶¹⁵

Here we see more explicitly that the familiarity—the “household words” of the previous editions—is the factor that needs to be determined by an authority, not the origin. Bartlett is further positioning his project not in the authority of authorship but in the authority of circulation, and this is where the underground life of *Familiar Quotations* comes to a head.

If the early reviews were unanimously celebratory, the 1860s reviews were increasingly critical. An 1868 review of the fifth edition in *The Atlantic Monthly* describes Bartlett’s book as

⁶¹⁵ John Bartlett, *Familiar Quotations, Being An Attempt to Trace to Their Source Passages & Phrases in Common Use Chiefly From English Authors*, 4th ed. (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1864), v-vi.

“the book with which it is the easiest thing in the world to find fault.”⁶¹⁶ The review is actually not a bad review, but rather refers to the inevitability of finding fault with such a book. “Every man,” the review continues, “has some passage of some author which, from long repetition and frequent question, he has come to consider a phrase in common use.” The review closes its opening paragraph by suggesting that Bartlett and his collaborators invite contributions from the general public. What the reviewer doesn’t yet realize is that Bartlett, essentially, has. The *Lippincott’s Magazine of Literature, Science, and Education* highlights Bartlett’s oversights and omissions and corrects Bartlett’s original sources.

Mr. Bartlett quotes as the original of the phrase: ‘The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church,’ the following passage from Tertullian: ‘Semen est sanguis Christianorum.’ The real original, however, will be found in a note to that passage in the edition of Tertullian’s works of 1641, where is presented the following quotation from St. Jerome: ‘Est sanguis martyrum seminarum ecclesiarum.’⁶¹⁷

Interestingly enough, this was the same example cited in *The North American Review*’s write-up on the 1855 first edition to commend the book for restoring phrases to their ancient authors. This additional source would be added to the 1876 edition. With the increased circulation and the increased familiarity of Bartlett’s book, his authority is challenged by a public that is shaped by and shaping Bartlett’s text.

It is not only the case that periodical circulation was authorizing Bartlett’s text, but that Bartlett was shaping his reception and constantly circulating his authority. The participation of the public in the periodical circulation would have meant nothing if Bartlett was not actually reading the periodical circulation and responding. In a Dec 5, 1891 issue of *The Critic*, a W.L. writes in with a correction of Bartlett’s attribution of “The Grave of Bonaparte” to Leonard

⁶¹⁶ *Atlantic Monthly*, November 1868, 635.

⁶¹⁷ *Lippincott’s Review*, November 1868, 566.

Heath. W.L. cites another book *Our Family Songs* wherein the poem is attributed to a Henry S. Washburn. In the January 2, 1892 issue, a reply from Bartlett was published:

I have a letter from Mr. Henry S. Washburn, and I give below an extract... "I am not the author of 'The Grave of Bonaparte.' I have said this through the press several times in the last half-dozen years; three times in the *Transcript*, and once each in the *Congregationalist*, and the *Commercial Advertiser*, NY."

This reveals not only the problem of reprinting (where texts are reprinted and circulated away from their original) out of which and into which *Familiar Quotations*' object rose, but it also reveals Bartlett's involvement with that culture of reprinting and circulation, through his own response and reprinting of Washburn's letter and the validation it gets in its citation of five instances of periodical declarations.

Bartlett not only entered into and responded to the discussions circulating around his book, putting into circulation the authority of his book, but he brought circulating discussions around quotation into the authority of his book.⁶¹⁸ Inquiries frequently came into American and British Periodicals for the source of "Though lost to sight, to memory dear," a quotation frequently used on tombstones in the nineteenth century. If there was a most famous unattributed quotation, this had to be it. In 1873, an attribution was published by a correspondent of *Harper's Bazar* and the controversy ensues. The correspondent claimed to have discovered the poem containing the quotation, written by Ruthven Jenkyns and published between 1701 and 1702 in the *Greenwich Magazine for Marines*. This attribution and the

⁶¹⁸ Another instance of this participation in periodical discussions of his book is in the Notes of *The Critic* in 1891: "In reply to our statement that the new edition of 'Bartlett's Familiar Quotations' overlooks Dorman B. Eaton's 'Public Office is a public trust,' Mr. Bartlett directs our attention to page 859 of his 'unvalued book' where the pedigree of the familiar phrase is traced back to Matthew Henry, Edmund Burke, Thomas Jefferson, and John C. Calhoun. Charles Sumner is quoted as having said, so long ago as May 31, 1872, 'The phrase, "Public office is a public trust" has of late become common property.' Later conspicuous users of it are Mr. Eaton (1881), Abram S. Hewitt (1883), and Col. Daniel S. Lamont (1884)." *The Critic: A Weekly Review of Literature and the Arts*, October 24, 1891, 224.

accompanying poem were widely spread in periodicals across the country, numbering one thousand according to *The Literary World*.

Ruthven Jenkyns was a ruse. The poem, in fact, had already been printed in *The Literary World* in August 1871 and in the *English Notes and Queries* in February of the same year. Neither periodical assigned an attribution, each having derived its own reprinting from previous reprinting. *The Literary World*, in response to the correspondent's declaration of discovery and attribution, repudiated his pretensions to discovery, having published the poem themselves two years before, and doubted the attribution: "We were not aware that the marines of the English navy had reached so high a pitch of culture one hundred and seventy-two years ago, that they supported a literary organ." Seeing through the ruse, it was noted that Ruthven Jenkyns and the "Greenwich Magazine for Marines," "were evidently devised by the correspondent of the *Bazar* on the model of 'Captain Jinks of the Horse Marines.'"⁶¹⁹

This controversy reveals two portraits. On the one hand we have the portrait of the culture of reprinting and circulation that is at once creating the familiarity of the quotation and serving as an outlet for the desire for its authorship. And at the same time that this rampant reprinting so disconnects the text from its source that it is impossible to decide the attribution, keeping up with the circulation creates its own kind of authority. A final intervention of Bartlett seals the nail in the coffin,

Mr. Bartlett (of Little, Brown, & Co.), the author of "Familiar Quotations" has taken pains to make a thorough investigation of the case, and having instituted inquiries in Edinburgh and Greenwich has ascertained, beyond a doubt, that there...never was such a periodical as "The Greenwich Magazine for Marines."...the Greenwich canard was invented by some joker, who still remains in obscurity.⁶²⁰

⁶¹⁹ "Notes and Queries," *The Literary World*, September 1873, 58.

⁶²⁰ "Notes and Queries," *The Literary World*, September 1873, 58. The article also mentions Bartlett's pains to investigate a controversy over another famous quotation "Consistency's a jewel," claimed by to have first appeared in *Murtaugh's Collection of Ballads*. Like the *Greenwich Magazine for Mariners*, the book never existed.

The chronicle of Bartlett's "pains to make a thorough investigation of the case" reveal him, first of all, as a man in touch with the circulating controversies around quotation. His authority is in the very fact that he entered into the circulation and that in the culture of reprinting he has wide connections "in Edinburgh and Greenwich."

The joker himself came into the circulating mix. Writing to a San Francisco newspaper, he clarifies that he had written the note of attribution to a friend inquiring after the source of the quotation, thinking it was transparent enough as a fabrication. The note "somehow crept into print," the writer says, and was circulated in American and British newspapers.⁶²¹ The writer who recounts this San Francisco paper admission to *The Literary World* begs that it be reprinted as "your paper has a large circulation in England as well as America...so that the searchers for the *truthful origin* can recommence their labors."⁶²² It is not only the confession of the joker, but its reprinting in a "large circulation" periodical that brings the misattribution to a close, and thus the writer one ups Bartlett for sealing the nail in the coffin.

Bartlett's intervention, however, does not end here. He brings his authority full circle—or fully on circulation—in 1878. *The Literary World* again announces in its "Notes and Queries" Bartlett's find on what may now be the most circulated quotation of the time:

THO' LOST TO SIGHT, TO MEM'RY DEAR

The following song was "composed for, and sung by, Mr. August Braham. The words and music are by George Linley" (a song writer and composer), who was born in 1798, and died in 1865. It is not known when the song was written. It was set to music and published by Cramer, Beale, & Co., London, about 1848. JOHN BARTLETT

⁶²¹ The misattribution made its way to the British *Monthly Packet* and struck the interest of Lewis Carroll himself.

⁶²² *The Literary World*, "Notes and Queries," November 1873, 90.

The note includes a reprinting of the songs' text and we are told that Bartlett's note had been "just published in circular form." It was, therefore, published as a periodical before it made its way into the 1883 edition of *Familiar Quotations*, where he appended a note on the Ruthven Jenkyns controversy. This quotation makes it into Bartlett's book, but the case of its authorship has not been closed. Nothing, in fact, sufficiently closes in the culture of reprinting and circulation. *The Christian Union* in an 1878 response to Bartlett's attribution circular resurrects the Ruthven Jenkyns attribution as a rebuttal, though, as we have seen, the fraud was exposed in *The Literary World* in 1873. But Bartlett himself was aware that inquirers had written into periodicals citing knowledge of the quotation as early as the 1820s, possibly earlier. It is possible that George Linley wrote the song in the 1820s, but it is also possible that he himself is quoting. What we find in Bartlett's entry to the quotation is not an authority on its attribution but an authority on its circulation. In his note he writes that he gives the song in full "as so much inquiry has been made for the source" and in recounting the story of Ruthven Jenkyns, he establishes the importance of this entry and his own authority on its circulating interest and in his knowledge and participation in the underground life of this quotation.

Bartlett's authority has been consistently shaped by the mutual interaction of his text and its underground, its reception in a culture of reprinting and circulation. By the 1890s he had indeed become the authority on circulation. When the Riverside Literature Series published its edition of Oliver Goldsmith's *The Deserted Village, The Traveller, and Other Poems* they included a section of Goldsmith's familiar quotations with the following introduction:

It is doubtful if any English poet, save Gray, has been quoted so abundantly in proportion to the amount he has written, as Goldsmith. Almost every stanza of Gray's "Elegy" is a familiar quotation, and the two poems "Deserted Village" and "The Traveller" surely stand next in familiarity. In order to show this emphatically, permission has been obtained from Mr. John Bartlett, compiler of that most satisfactory work "Familiar Quotations: a Collection of Passages, Phrases, and Proverbs traced to their

sources in Ancient and Modern Literature,” to reprint here the pages of his book covering the poems contained in this number of the “Riverside Literature Series.”⁶²³ We have to read the subsequent reprinting not as Goldsmith’s texts, but as a Bartlett’s. If one can quote Bartlett, this means that he has authored that which is being quoted. But what did Bartlett exactly author? He is not the author of the text itself as that remains Goldsmith’s text. The reprinting of Goldsmith’s poetry as a quotation of Bartlett’s text is an appeal to the latter’s authority on Goldsmith’s circulation. What we are meant to see in the quotation, then, is Goldsmith’s circulation. If Bartlett is the author of what is being quoted and what is being quoted is Goldsmith’s circulation, then Bartlett is the author of Goldsmith’s circulation and the circulation of quotations more generally. This is not to say that he created or is singularly responsible for the circulation of quotations; it is an authorship that has at every stage been of many hands, a participatory authorship, plural, communal—familiar.

Those familiar with the culture of circulating quotations would have been familiar with this type of authorship. And those familiar with Bartlett, like Mrs. Frank J. Sprague, might not have been so surprised to read his inscription as author. In tracing the underground genesis and life of Bartlett’s text we find Bartlett engaged in the culture of reprinting and circulation which he sought to bring to authority not by restraining the underground life of texts in the confines of his own text, but by shaping his text through the forces of reception and rendering it not primarily an authority on attribution, but an authority on circulation. In this way he bestows on himself a title of authorship, maybe lost to us now as authorship became more and more equated

⁶²³ “Familiar Quotations from Goldsmith” in *The Deserted Village, The Traveller, and Other Poems*, by Oliver Goldsmith, The Riverside Literature Series (Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press, 1894), 89.

with singular authority, but available in a culture where, in the words of Emerson's "Quotation and Originality," "by necessity, by proclivity, and by delight, *we all* quote" (emphasis mine).⁶²⁴

While the *Christian Examiner* considered Bartlett's American book superior to its London predecessor, this must have more to do with its own national bias than Bartlett's. Though Bartlett does include American authors, for much of the history of *Familiar Quotations* in Bartlett's lifetime, American authors are significantly fewer. He has no concern like Hale's to present or support an American authorship. But the *Christian Examiner* review ends the review with a cosmopolitan observation:

Over such a book it would be possible to moralize much; and the veriest 'Know-Nothing' may learn something as he turns its pages, if he will but take the trouble to estimate how much of his daily debts of speech he could decently defray without the help of foreign genius and of alien wit.⁶²⁵

The idea that Bartlett's text could have a unifying effect for American readership, is certainly worth moralizing much over, and I would argue that Bartlett decomposition of Preston's book was a decomposition of the concern for authorship, recognizing that recomposition was the task of the reader.

Give It Up, Sub-Subs!: A Final Word on Decomposition and Recomposition

In Melville's *Moby-Dick*, the task of the reader is to take on the whale. With Ishmael, we dissect it, categorize it, and classify it, we squeeze and jerk, but the Leviathan eludes us. In this case study—more properly, a reading—I attempt to situate the novel within the context of antebellum recomposition and decomposition, in an effort to cut it down to size. The Usher and

⁶²⁴ Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Quotation and Originality" in *Letters and Social Aims*. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Co, 1904), 178. It occurred to me that Bartlett's *Familiar Quotations* might have influenced the genesis of this essay, but the copy in Emerson's library was the 5th, of 1868, almost 10 years after he delivered this lecture. Walter Roy Harding, *Emerson's Library*. (Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 1967), 22.

⁶²⁵ Ibid. 145.

the Sub-Sub librarian, the first two characters to whom we are introduced in *Moby-Dick*, are pitiable figures. They appear as vestiges of a tradition that has ceased to interest. The texts that they render—the Etymology and the Extracts, respectively—are indecipherable. What is their purpose? What do they mean? The pale Usher is reminded of his mortality as he dusts his volumes and reminds us of the mortality of archive. The Sub-Sub, too, is connected to the realm of the dead; as a “burrower and grub-worm,” he belongs to the underground.

The first thing we learn about the Usher from the subheading of Etymology is that he is dead, of consumption, so that when the narrator says, “The pale Usher—threadbare in coat, heart, body and brain; I see him now,” what we are seeing is the Usher’s ghost. The narrator also gives us a picture of the Sub-Sub in the afterlife, taking the place of the archangels in the seven-storied heavens and striking together “unsplinterable glasses!” These figures that remind us of mortality and death, of decomposition, simultaneously figure afterlife, or recomposition.

The largeness of the whale and the whale of a book should not obscure the fact that *Moby-Dick* is a story of fragments. The Sub-Sub who “pick[s] up whatever random allusions to whales he could anyways find in any book whatsoever, sacred or profane” is a representative of a culture that was indeed alive and well in the nineteenth century and particularly during the antebellum period.⁶²⁶ *Moby-Dick*’s Extracts resemble the quotations that were compiled into dictionaries, handbooks, and quotation books. Like Hale’s recomposition of Addington’s book, the Sub-Sub’s extracts proceed in chronological order, from a classical history, to a British history, to an American history.

Frank Shuffleton in his analysis of Melville’s Extracts argues for their relevance by a two-pronged effect. They, “on the one hand, point to the historical and imaginative background

⁶²⁶ Herman Melville, *Moby Dick* (New York: Library of America, 1991), 12.

of Ishmael's developing consciousness" and on the other, they "tease us into thought, provoking us into an attentive, reactive, and questioning reading of Ishmael's narrative."⁶²⁷ Shuffleton pulls out a cohesive narrative from Extracts, wherein the quotations foreshadow and prefigure the course of the narrative. The first five Extracts, the biblical ones, he proposes, "begin to limn all that will happen both in the career of mankind and in the career of Ahab."⁶²⁸ The next extracts show a historical fear of the whale for its size and strength. By the English Civil War, Shuffleton says, "men can perceive that the whale may be relevant to their inner lives, to their aspirations and imaginings, for 'by art is created that great Leviathan, called Commonwealth or State—(in Latin, Civitas), which is but artifial man.'"⁶²⁹ Here Shuffleton cites the point that Melville's Extracts themselves serve to make his novel into a universal parable.

Here, I think it is important to remember the narrator, who, before he introduces himself to us as Ishmael, introduces himself as the commentator of the Sub-Sub.⁶³⁰ This raises the question whether the Extracts exist for the novel or the novel exists for the extract, and I am arguing that it is both. If the Extracts attempt to coordinate for the novel a universal parable, then the novel serves to comment on this endeavor.

When the novel and the extracts intersect, they seem to intersect on the point of doubt. Take Extract 30, for example, from *A Voyage to Greenland* by Harris Coll, voyaging on the ship Jonas-in-the-Whale. He says, "Some say the whale can't open his mouth, but that is a fable."⁶³¹

⁶²⁷ Frank Shuffleton, "Going Through the Long Vaticans: Melville's 'Extracts' in *Moby-Dick* Author(s)." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 25, no. 1 (1983): 528.

⁶²⁸ Shuffleton, 530.

⁶²⁹ Ibid.

⁶³⁰ Melville, *Moby-Dick*, 12. "poor devil of a Sub-Sub, whose commentator I am."

⁶³¹ Melville, 16.

He continues to give outrageous reports on the whale, without assessing their veracity or not: “I was told of a whale taken near Hitland, that had above a barrel of herrings in his belly...One of our harpooners told me that he caught once a whale in Spitzberger that was white all over.” We continue to collect reports, what is said about the whale. When in the novel Ishmael cites the Jonas-in-the-Whale expedition, it occurs at a turn from Hindoo and biblical portraits of the whale, another turn from fable to more reports. “But quitting all these unprofessional attempts, let us glance at those pictures of leviathan purporting to be sober, scientific delineations, by those who know.”⁶³² The emphasis is on “purporting” as Ishmael continues to critique the plates from the books of “those who know.” Neither religious fables nor scientific expertise can capture the portrait of the whale.

The tension between fact and fiction, history and fable, spiritual and scientific truth raises concerns over the accessibility of Truth. Melville returns to that Emersonian and Benjaminian question with another story of collecting fragments of language. At the end of Chapter 82, he tells the a “Hindoo” story of decomposition and recomposition:

When Brahma, or the God of Gods, saith the Shaster, resolved to recreate the world after one of its periodical dissolutions, he gave birth to Vishnoo, to preside over the work; but the Vedas, or mystical books, whose perusal would seem to have been indispensable to Vishnoo before beginning creation, and which therefore must have contained something in the shape of practical hints to young architects, these Vedas were lying at the bottom of the waters; so Vishnoo became incarnate in a whale, and sounding down in him to the uttermost depths, rescued the sacred volumes.⁶³³

Melville, too, imagines a pure language, a body of Truth, lost and scattered in the deep that must be rescued, and these fragments of language, of Truth, have to do with the decomposition and recomposition of the world. His ironic comment on the Vedas as “practical hints for young

⁶³² Melville, 304.

⁶³³ Melville, 412.

architects,” speaks to the relationship of scientific and religious truth, merely versions of the central question of knowledge.

How seriously can we take this story as representative of Melville’s attitude toward the collecting of fragments. Is it really so vital or really so irrelevant? We can only take the story seriously or not if we are sure of some kind of Truth, spiritual or factual, but Ishmael’s exact purpose as commentator is to keep us in doubt. The result, however, is that the collecting of fragments does become vital if only because that’s all there is. “As yet, however,” Ishmael says in “Cetology,” “the sperm whale scientific or poetic, lives not complete in any literature.” Melville’s innovation on Emersonian Truth is the evacuation of an original unity in a chronic modern doubt. If we take the story of the Pequod as an allegory for Union, its splintered end as floating fragments is a dark portent of national decomposition. But the lack of an original myth of Union represents a certain kind of freedom, as decomposition becomes “a periodical dissolution.” Rachel weeps not for her children. She simply gets about the work of recomposition.

EPILOGUE

“The Art of Quotation seems rather to be falling into neglect. It is a thousand pities,” writes a contributor to the February 13, 1886 issue of *The Saturday Review*.⁶³⁴ Indeed, by the end of the nineteenth century, some of the standard forms of quotation were on the wane. The realist and naturalist novel did not have much use for epigraphs. In terms of foreign quotations, it seems that by the end of the nineteenth century, American literature had developed enough of its own material to lose touch with foreign traditions. Or, as the writer in the *Saturday Review* thought, “Perhaps...men write too much nowadays to have much leisure for reading, and so, like Wordsworth, have none to quote from but themselves.”⁶³⁵

But if the art of quotation would be what it was in the modernist literature of the twentieth century, we can guess that at the end of the nineteenth-century, quotation could not have gone too far away. If, as I have argued, quotation is a literary form particularly adapted to national development, we can expect to find quotation in the hands of those who seek to test the nation, ask it to stretch, grow, or change. After the Civil War, we might find quotation mediating the questions of reconstruction, the place of the freed slave in the nation. And indeed, we do.

We find Charles Chesnutt in “The Wife of His Youth” (1899). In this short story, Mr. Ryder is a member of The Blue Veins, a kind of social club organized after the War “to establish and maintain correct social standards among a people whose social condition presented almost unlimited room for improvement.” The membership of the Blue Veins, we are told, are exclusively light-skinned African-Americans—the name Blue Veins itself deriving from the comment that membership was only for those whose skin was white enough to show blue veins

⁶³⁴ “The Art of Quotation,” *The Saturday Review*, February 13, 1886, 227.

⁶³⁵ Ibid.

underneath. While those outside the club find it to represent the same kind of prejudice as the slavery days South, those within the club regard it as “a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, to guide their people through the social wilderness.” The reference is to Exodus, the pillar of cloud by day and fire by night that lead the Israelites through the wilderness after their escape from Egypt suggests that the Blue Veins are involved in the work of figuring out life after freedom.

Mr. Ryder, the de facto Dean of the Blue Veins, is a self-made man within the organization with a passion for quotations: “He could repeat whole pages of the great English poets.” We find him preparing for a ball at which he was going to propose to the lovely widow Mrs. Dixon. Mrs. Dixon is lighter and better educated than Ryder, and she constitutes part of his “upward process of absorption.” This relates to Mr. Ryder’s theory for the mixed blood:

[W]e people of mixed blood are ground between the upper and the nether millstone. Our fate lies between absorption by the white race and extinction in the black. The one doesn’t want us yet, but may take us in time. The other would welcome us, but it would be for us a backward step. ‘With malice towards none, with charity for all,’ we must do the best we can for ourselves and those who are to follow us. Self-preservation is the first law of nature.

Ryder’s quotation within his theory is from the conclusion of Lincoln’s Second Inaugural address in which he discusses the work of restoring the Union, North and South, “to bind up the nation’s wounds.” Again quotation points us to the work of life after Civil War and emancipation. In Ryder’s theory we can maybe see some resemblance to quotation itself. Quotation is a figure of mixed blood, caught between the process of absorption and extinction.

Ryder’s strategy for upward absorption with Mrs. Dixon is quotation. Before the ball, he reads Tennyson, “fortifying himself with apt quotations” for his response to the toast to “The Ladies.” He first essays “A Dream of Fair Women” but the word “pale” obstructs its sufficient

reflection of his beloved and her “ruddy complexion.” Just as he is about to settle on a description of Queen Guinevere, he receives a visit from Liza Jane, a woman seeking her lost husband from before the Civil War, a free man who was a hired worker for her master and who fled when she warned him her master was trying to sell him. Ryder tells Liza Jane’s story in his response to the toast and continues to imagine her lost husband, and what he should do should he find her searching for him. *What should he do*, is Ryder’s question for the audience. If Ryder’s personal theory—and the Blue Vein Society by extension—was about forward progress in the social wilderness, upward absorption, then Liza Jane represents that backward step, the emotional bonds of slavery days. We can imagine, then, that for him and for this audience, this was not an easy question.

To answer it, he imagines himself as the advisor to Liza Jane’s husband and gives him Polonius’s advice from *Hamlet*.

‘This above all: to thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.’

Quotation was Ryder’s tool for upward absorption, but it also facilitates his “backward step.” When the audience agrees that the husband should acknowledge Liza Jane, Ryder brings her into the assembly and introduces her as “the wife of my youth.” This final allusion to Proverbs 5:18, “rejoice in the wife of your youth,” transforms the attitude toward “the backward step,” suggesting that integration is only achieved by integrity, coming to terms with both pulls of the mixed blood.

This is the lesson we also know to be true with quotation. Herman Meyer notes that the inconspicuous quotation, the hidden quotation, when not recognized, as a case where quotation has achieved complete assimilation, loses its special character. “[D]espite the initial camouflage,

they demand to be recognized as quotation,” he writes. Quotation, Meyer writes, operates in sovereign freedom. In the new context, its possibilities for signification expand and it becomes an element of play. Again, we might find correspondence here between quotation and Ryder and his Blue Veins. In the new context of freedom, they can adopt forms and figure themselves, style themselves. “[B]ut,” Meyer tells us, “it is a paradoxical truth that the quotation, as an element of play, nevertheless arrives ultimately at aesthetic responsibility,” in other words, some connection to the source or attribution. Ryder arrives ultimately at ethical responsibility, but we can doubt whether this is always necessarily the case with quotations. Another time.

We find quotation, too, in W.E.B. DuBois in *Songs of Black Folk* (1901) making an epigraphic tradition of the Western canon culminating in the black spirituals. His vision of integration is a literary canonical one:

I sit with Shakespeare and he winces not. Across the color line, I move arm in arm with Balzac and Dumas, where smiling men and welcoming women glide in gilded halls. From out the caves of evening that swing between the strong-limbed earth and the tracery of the stars, I summon Aristotle and Aurelius and what soul I will, and they come all graciously with no scorn and no condescension. So, wed with Truth, I dwell above the Veil.

The ability to summon any writer with “no scorn and no condescension” reminds us that, though quotation’s special character is not in complete assimilation, but in a balance of assimilation and dissimilation, assimilation is frequently the harder to achieve.

Shakespeare, indeed, doesn’t wince when summoned. In the story “Of Alexander Crummell,” DuBois places the words of Hamlet’s soliloquy in the breast of his protagonist.

But this I know: in yonder Vale of the Humble stand to-day a million swarthy men, who willingly would

“...bear the whips and scorns of time,
The oppressor’s wrong, the proud man’s contumely,

The pangs of despised love, the law's delay,
The insolence of office, and the spurns
That patient merit of the unworthy takes"

The words no longer signify the vicissitudes of life but the "meaner thing," slavery. Quotations can sustain multiple populations.

In Frederick Douglass's "The Composite Nation" (1869), he discusses the situation of Chinese immigration in relation to slavery. A quotation from Cowper's "Task" on slavery, "Lands intersected by a narrow frith, abhor each other. Mountains interposed, make enemies of nations." This, for Douglass, as much explains the ill feeling toward the Chinese as Cowper used it to explain the prejudice against the slave. The relationship makes Frederick Douglass as eloquent and passionate a defender of Chinese immigration and naturalization as of African-American emancipation and equal rights.

We expect to find quotation mediating the questions of immigration in the latter part of the century and at the beginning of the twentieth with the Immigration Law of 1903 and we do find it in the intertextual relation between Jack London's journalism on a Hawaiian leprosy colony and his short stories on leprosy, turning over questions of segregation (immunological) and integration, assimilation and miscegenation. In "The Lepers of Molokai," London seems to be engaged in a full PR campaign on behalf of segregating lepers in the leprosy colony. He recounts a horserace between a Chinese, a Hawaii, and a Portuguese boy, all lepers, on the Fourth of July. That image of this cosmopolitan collective having a good time on the birthday of America could not be more poster-worthy. He proceeds to further glamorize the leprosy colony, telling a story of an Africa-American who stole into the leprosy colony, passing for a leper, and ultimately marrying a leper as grounds to remain in the colony. This story he puts into the voice of Jack Kersdale in his short story "Good-by, Jack," a character who like Jack London, the

journalist, endorses the leper colony until he recognizes a lover on her way to the colony and the possibility that he, too, may be on his way to Molokai. The segregation question London complicates in his Molokai journalism and fiction is part of a larger question on the status of Hawaii, its population and racial mixing, its relation to the United States and the potential for Asia-Pacific alliance, as well as Jack London's status from *malahini* ('newcomer') to *kamaaina* ('native of the soil').

Quotations are perhaps a fitting national literature for a composite nation. Fractious and fragmentary, always, and always ambivalent, they speak to a national self always in development, always provisional, negotiating its past with its present and future, able to modulate the emphases on the narrative, to stretch and bend, and when necessary, to decompose and recompose anew.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "A Coterie," *The Boston Lyceum*, Aug. 15, 1827, 56-66.
- Adams, Hannah. *A Summary History of New-England: From the First Settlement at Plymouth to the Acceptance of the Federal Constitution, Comprehending a General Sketch of the American War* (1799). Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2011.
- Adams, Hannah and Stephen Higginson, *A Narrative Concerning the Controversy Between the Rev. Jedidiah Morse, D.D., and the Author*. Boston: John Eliot, 1814.
- Adams, Thomas R. and Nicolas Barker, "A New Model for the Study of the Book," in *The Book History Reader*, ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery. Abingdon: Routledge 2nd ed., 2006.
- Addington, John. *Poetical Quotations: Being A Complete Dictionary of the Most Elegant Moral, Sublime, and Humorous Passages in the British Poets In Four Volumes*. Vol. 1-4. Philadelphia: John Grigg, 1829.
- "American Gallantry for the Port Folio," *The Port-Folio*, Nov. 1812, 481-4.
<http://proquest.umi.com>.
- "American Literature: Number Two," *The Knickerbocker*, May 1835, 378-84.
- Austin, John L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Axelrad, Allan. "'The Lumley Autograph' and the Great Literary Lion: Authenticity and Commodification in Nineteenth-Century Autograph Collecting," in *Susan Fenimore Cooper: New Essays on Rural Hours and Other Works*, ed. Rochelle Johnson and Daniel Patterson (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2001), 22-38.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas, 2004.
- Barish, Jonas A. "The Prose Style of John Lyly," *ELH* 23, no. 1(1956): 14-35.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2871781>
- Barone, Dennis. "Before the Revolution: Formal Rhetoric in the Federal Era," *Pennsylvania History* 54, no. 4 (1987): 244-262. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27773203>
- Barthes, Roland. *The Pleasure of the Text*, New York: Hill and Wang, 1975.
- "From Work to Text" in *Image-Music-Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977, rpt. 1978), 155-164.

- , *S/Z: An Essay*. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Hill and Wang, 1974.
- [Bartlett, John]. *A Collection of Familiar Quotations With Complete Indices of Authors and Subjects*. Cambridge, MA: John Bartlett, 1855.
- , *A Collection of Familiar Quotations With Complete Indices of Authors and Subjects*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: John Bartlett, 1856.
- , *A Collection of Familiar Quotations With Complete Indices of Authors and Subjects*, 3rd ed. Cambridge, MA: John Bartlett, 1858.
- , *Familiar Quotations, Being An Attempt to Trace to Their Source Passages & Phrases in Common Use Chiefly From English Authors*, 4th ed. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1864.
- Bartlett, T.H. "Memorials to Captain Nathan Hale," *The American Architect and Building News* 14 Apr. 1888, 173.
- Bawarshi, Anis. "The Genre Function," *College English* 62, no. 3 (2000): 335-360.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/378935> .
- Baym, Nina. "Putting Women in their Place: *The Last of the Mohicans* and Other Indian Stories" in *Feminism and American Literary History: Essays* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 19-35.
- Bell, Richard. "In *Werter's* Thrall: Suicide and the Power of Sentimental Reading in Early National America," *Early American Literature* 46, no. 1 (2011), 93-120.
- Benjamin, Walter "The Task of the Translator," in *Illuminations* (New York: Schocken Books, 1968), 69-82.
- Bennett, Tony. "The Exhibitionary Complex," *New Formations* 4 (1988): 73-102.
- Berlant, Lauren. *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Bilwakesh, Nikhil. "Emerson's Decomposition: *Parnassus*," *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 67, no. 4 (2013): 520-545.
- Bishop, James E. "A Feeling Farmer: Masculinity, Nationalism, and Nature in Crèvecoeur's *Letters*," *Early American Literature* 43, no. 2 (2008): 361-377.
- [Bishop, W.H.], "Typical Journeys and Country Life in Mexico," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, Mar. 1882, 537-553.

- Blecki, Catherine La Courreye and Karin A. Wulf, *Milcah Martha Moore's Book: A Commonplace Book from Revolutionary America*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997.
- Boggs, Colleen Glenney. *Transnationalism and American Literature: Literary Translation 1773-1892*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- [Brackenridge, Hugh Henry]. "Preface," *The United States Magazine; a Repository of History, Politics and Literature*, Jan. 1779, 3, <http://proquest.umi.com>.
- Bradford, Ernle. *The Sultan's Admiral: The Life of Barbarossa*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968.
- Brooks, Peter. *Reading For the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Brophy, Joseph M. *Popular Culture and the Public Sphere in the Rhineland, 1800-1850*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Brown, William Hill. *The Power of Sympathy*. New York: Penguin, 1996.
- Browne, Sir Thomas. *Religio Medici, Its Sequel Christian Morals, With Resemblant Passages from Cowper's Task and a Verbal Index*, Ed. John Peace. Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard, 1844.
- Bryant, William Cullen. Editorial. *The Evening Post*, June, 17, 1836, 2.
- . "Lectures On Poetry," in *Prose Writings of William Cullen Bryant*, ed. Parke Godwin, vol. 1, *Essays, Tales, and Orations*. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1884.
- . *Letters of William Cullen Bryant*, vol. 2, 1836-1849, ed. William Cullen Bryant II and Thomas G. Voss. New York: Fordham University Press, 1977.
- . *The Letters of William Cullen Bryant*, Vol. 6, 1872-1878, Ed. William Cullen Bryant II & Thomas C. Voss. New York: Fordham University Press, 1992.
- . "Mexico and Maximilian" in *Prose Writings of William Cullen Bryant*, ed. Parke Godwin, vol. 2, *Travels, Addresses, and Comments* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1884.
- . *Poems: Collected and Arranged by the Author in Two Volumes*, vol. 1. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1862.
- . "The Proposed Annexation of Texas, August 4, 1837," in *Power for Sanity, Selected Editorials of William Cullen Bryant, 1829-1861*, ed. William Cullen Bryant II (New York: Fordham UP, 1994)

- . "Removal of the Indians." Editorial. *The Evening Post*, Jan. 7, 1830, 2.
- . "A Story of Cuba," in *Prose Writings*, vol. 1, 267-296.
- . "Texas-July 25, 1844," in *Power for Sanity*, 231.
- , "Translators of Homer" in *Prose Writings of William Cullen Bryant*, vol. 2.
- . "The Year 1847- December 31, 1847" in *Power for Sanity*, 255-56.
- Brickhouse, Anna. *Transamerican Literary Relations and the Nineteenth-Century Public Sphere*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Brock, Darryl E. "José Agustín Quintero: Cuban Patriot in Confederate Diplomatic Service," in *Cubans in the Confederacy: José Agustín Quintero, Ambrosio José Gonzales, and Loreta Janeta Velazquez*, ed. Philip Thomas Tucker (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 2002), 9-142.
- Bugg, John. "The Other Interesting Narrative: Olaudah Equiano's Public Book Tour," *PMLA* 121 (2006): 1424-1442.
- Buinicki, Martin T. *Negotiating Copyright: Authorship and the Discourse of Literary Property Rights in Nineteenth Century America*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Bulwer-Lytton, Edward. *Pelham; Or, the Adventures of a Gentleman*, Ed. Jerome J. McGann. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1972.
- Carretta, Vincent. *Equiano, The African: Biography of a Self-Made Man*. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.
- Castle, Terry. *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986.
- Channing, William Ellery. *A Letter on the Annexation of Texas to the United States*. London: John Green, 1837.
- . "Remarks on National Literature," In *The Works of William Ellery Channing*, Ed. William Henry Channing. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1894.
- Chapin, Clara Cutler. "Bryant and Some of His Latin American Friends," *Bulletin of the Pan-American Union* 78, no. 11 (1944): 609-12.
- Child, David Lee. "Texas," *The Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine*, Jan. 1836, 193-205.

- Cogswell, J.G. "Autographs and Autograph Collections," *Spirit of the Fair*, April 19, 1864, 150-151.
- Cohen, Michael David. "Bartlett's *Familiar Quotations*: 'A Glancing Bird's Eye View' by a 'Morbidity Scholiast'," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 14.2 (2003): 56.
- C[ooke], P[hilip] P[endleton]. "Old Books and New Authors," *The Southern and Western Literary Messenger and Review*, Apr. 1846, 199-203. <http://proquest.umi.com>
- Cooper, James Fenimore. *Notions of the Americans; Picked Up by a Travelling Bachelor*, vol. 1 (1828). New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, rpt. 1963.
- , *The Letters and Journals of James Fenimore Cooper*, vol. 4, ed. James Franklin Beard. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1964.
- , *The Pioneers* (1823). New York: Penguin, 1988.
- , *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826). New York: Penguin, 1986.
- Copeland, Edward. *The Silver Fork Novel: Fashionable Fiction in the Age of Reform*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Corse, Taylor. *Dryden's Aeneid: The English Virgil*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1991.
- Cragg, William. "Bulwer's *Godolphin*: The Metamorphosis of the Fashionable Novel," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 26, no. 4 (1986), 675-690.
- Dacome, Lucia. "Noting the Mind: Commonplace Books and the Pursuit of the Self in Eighteenth-Century Britain," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64, no. 4 (2004): 603-25. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3654271>
- Davidson, Cathy N. *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in North America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- "Olaudah Equiano, Written by Himself," *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 40, no. 1/2, (Fall 2006-Spring 2007): 18-51. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40267683>
- Davidson, Donald. "Quotation," *Theory and Decision* 11, no. 1 (1979): 27-40.
- [Death of Bolivar], *The Evening Post*, Feb. 14, 1831, 2.
- Delbanco, Andrew. *William Ellery Channing: An Essay on the Liberal Spirit in America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

- Demarest, William. Catalogue, Harper & Brothers Records, MS 0555, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Signature Event Context." Trans. Samuel Weber and Jeffrey Mehlman. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988, 1-23.
- Dillon, George L. "My Words of An Other," *College English* 50, no.1 (1988): 63-73.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/377601>
- Dimock, Wai Chee. *Through Other Continents: American Literature Across Deep Time*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- D'Israeli, Benjamin. *Vivian Grey*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1878.
- D'Israeli, Isaac. *Curiosities of Literature, and the Literary Character Illustrated*. Philadelphia: Thomas, Cowperthwait, & Co., 1841.
- Edwards, George Thornton. *The Youthful Haunts of Longfellow* (1907). Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, rpt. 2005.
- Elbert, Monika M. "Striking a Historical Pose: Antebellum Tableaux Vivants, 'Godey's' Illustrations, and Margaret Fuller's Heroines," *The New England Quarterly* 75, no. 2 (2002): 235-275.
- Eldridge, Herbert G. "Anacreon Moore and America," *PMLA* 83, no. 1 (1968): 54-62.
- Ellis, Keith. "Translating José María Heredia's 'Niágara' into English," *Translation Review* 77/78 (2009): 7-19.
- Elson, Ruth Miller. *Guardians of Tradition: American School Books of the Nineteenth Century*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *Nature and Selected Essays*, Ed. Larzer Ziff. New York: Penguin, 1982.
- , *Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson, With Annotations*, Vol. 3; 1833-1835, Ed. Edward Waldo Emerson and Waldo Emerson Forbes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1910.
- , *Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Vol. 5, 1835-1838, Ed. William H. Gilman. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- , *Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Vol. 7, 1838-1842, Ed. A. W. Plumstead & Harrison Hayford. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- , "Quotation and Originality," *The North American Review*, Apr. 1868, 543-558.

- [Emerson, Ralph W.], "Europe and European Books," *The Dial*, Apr. 1843, 511-520.
- Englekirk, John. "Notes on Longfellow in Spanish America," *Hispania* 25.3 (1942): 295-308.
- , "El Epistolario Pombo-Longfellow," *Thesaurus* 10 (1954): 1-58.
- Equiano, Olaudah. *The Interesting Narrative and Other Writings*. New York: Penguin, 1995.
- Eßmann, Helga "Literary 'Universality': Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and American National Literature" in *The Internationality of National Literatures in Either America: Transfer and Transformation*, ed. Armin Paul Frank and Helga Eßmann (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 1999), 85-106.
- Faherty, Duncan. *Remodeling the Nation: The Architecture of American Identity, 1776-1858*. Lebanon, NH: University of New Hampshire Press, 2007.
- Fatherly, Sarah E. " 'The Sweet Recourse of Reason': Elite Women's Education in Colonial Philadelphia," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Bibliography* 128, no. 3 (2004), 229-256.
- Fiedler, Leslie A. *Love and Death in the American Novel*. New York: Criterion Books, 1960.
- Foster, Hannah Webster. *The Coquette*. New York: Penguin, 1996.
- Foucault, Michel. "What Is An Author?" in *The Book History Reader*, ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery. Abingdon: Routledge 2nd ed., 2006.
- Franklin, Benjamin. *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin* (1867). Mineola, NY: Dover Press, rpt. 1996.
- Fried, Debra. "Valves of Attention: Quotation and Context in the Age of Emerson." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1983; Ann Arbor, Mich.: ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Fuller, Margaret. "American Literature," in *Papers on Literature and Art*. (1846). Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2007, 122-159.
- Galloway, Andrew. "William Cullen Bryant's American Antiquities: Medievalism, Miscegenation, and Race in *The Prairies*" *American Literary History* 22.4 (2010): 724-751.
- Garber, Marjorie. *Quotation Marks* (New York: Routledge, 2003),
- Gardner, Jared. *Master Plots: Race and the Founding of An American Literature, 1787-1845*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

- Garvey, Ellen Gruber. *Writing With Scissors: American Scrapbooks from the Civil War to the Harlem Renaissance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the second degree*, trans. Channa Newman & Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Gerson, Stéphane. *Pride of Place: Local Memories and Political Culture in Nineteenth-Century France*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003.
- Giles, Paul. *Transatlantic Insurrections: British Culture and the Formation of American Literature, 1730-1860*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Gillingham, Lauren. "The Novel of Fashion Redressed: Bulwer-Lytton's *Pelham* in a 19th-Century Context," *Victorian Review* 32, no. 1 (2006), 63-85.
- Glenn, Samuel F. "A Brief Chapter On Quotations," *Lady's Book*, Aug. 1837, 63-4
- Godwin, Parke. *A Biography of William Cullen Bryant with Extracts from his Private Correspondence*, vol. 1 & 2. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1883.
- Goldsmith, Oliver. "Retaliation" in *The Deserted Village, The Traveller, and Other Poems*, The Riverside Literature Series (Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press, 1894), 72-76.
- Good, Carl. "A Chronicle of Poetic Non-Encounter in the Americas," *The New Centennial Review* 3.1 (2003): 225-255.
- Grant, John N. "Dido Melissa," *Phoenix* 23, no. 4 (1969): 380-391.
- Griswold, Rufus W. *The Poets and Poetry of America: with a Historical Introduction*. Philadelphia: Carey & Hart, 1842.
- Gutzmann, Daniel and Erik Stei, "How Quotation Marks What People Do With Words," *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, no. 10 (2011), 2650-2663.
- Hale, Sarah Josepha, Ed. *Dictionary of Poetical Quotations by John Addington*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1850. [Hale, Sarah Josepha], "Invention and Intuition," *Godey's Lady's Book and Magazine*, Jan. 1872, 93.
- Hancher, Michael. "Familiar Quotations," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 14, no. 2 (2003): 13-53.
- Harding, Walter Roy. *Emerson's Library*. Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 1967.
- Havens, Earle. *Commonplace Books: A History of Manuscripts and Printed Books from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Hazlitt, William. "The Dandy School," *The Examiner*, November 18, 1827, 721-723.

-----, "On Fashion," *The Edinburgh Magazine and Literary Miscellany*, September 1818, 203-06.

Hempstead, Stephen. "Anecdotes of the Revolution: The Capture and Execution of Nathan Hale, in 1776," *The Port-Folio*, Dec. 1826, 502-4.

Henríquez Ureña, Max. *Panorama histórico de la literatura cubana*. Habana: Editorial Arte y Literatura, 1978.

Heredia, José María. *Poesias Completas : Estudio Preliminar*, ed. Raimundo Lazo. Toluca, Méx: Editorial Porrúa, S.A., 1985.

-----, José María Heredia, "Paralelo Entre Washington y Bonaparte: de *Viajes* de Chateaubriand," in *Miscelanea: Periodico Critico y Literario*. Tlalpam: Imprenta del Gobierno, 1829, 8-12.

-----, "Cartas de José María Heredia," *Revista de Cuba*, Tomo IV (1878), 617-620.

Hiller, Alice. "'An Avenue to Some Degree of Profit and Reputation': The *Sketch Book* as Washington Irving's entrée and undoing," *Journal of American Studies* 31, no. 2 (1997): 275-293. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27556265>

Holmes, Oliver Wendell. *Ralph Waldo Emerson, John Lothrop Motley: Two Memoirs*. Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1892.

Hook, Theodore. "The Elements of Conversation; Or Talking Made Easy," *The Albion*, Feb. 27, 1836, 65-67.

Howell, William Hunting. "Spirits of Emulation: Readers, Samplers, and the Republican Girl, 1787-1810," *American Literature* 81, no. 3 (September 2009): 497-526.

-----, "A More Perfect Copy: David Rittenhouse and the Reproduction of Republican Virtue," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, 64, no. 4 (October 2007): 757-90.

Hughes, Winifred. "Silver Fork Writers and Readers: Social Contexts of a Best Seller," *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 25, no. 3 (1992): 328-347. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1345892>

-----, "Elegies for the Regency: Catherine Gore's Dandy Novels," *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 50, no. 2 (1995), 189-209.

Hunter, James L. "Poetical Similarities," *The Southern Literary Messenger*, Apr. 1844, 233-240. <http://proquest.umi.com>.

[Hurlbert, William Henry], "The Poetry of Spanish America," *North American Review* Jan.

1849, 129-160.

-----, *Gan-Eden: Or, Pictures of Cuba*. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., 1854.

“Interesting Sketch,” *Weekly Register*, 25 Apr. 1812, 129-130. <http://proquest.umi.com>.

Irving, Washington. *The Sketch-Book of Geoffrey Crayon*. Ed. Haskell Springer. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1978.

-----, “International Copy-Right Law,” *The Knickerbocker* Jan. 1840, 78-79.

Irwin, Robert Mckee. “The American Renaissance and the Mexican *Renacimiento*: The Long Critical Disconnect in the Americas,” *The New Centennial Review* 8.1 (2008): 235-251.

Isom-Verhaaren, Christine. *Allies with the Infidel: The Ottoman and French Alliance in the Sixteenth Century*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2011.

Jaksic, Ivan. *The Hispanic World and American Intellectual Life, 1820-1880*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.

Jefferson, Thomas. *The Autobiography of Thomas Jefferson* (1821). Mineola, NY: Dover, 2005.

Judson, Andrew T. *An Address Delivered at South Coventry, Connecticut, At the Request of the Hale Monument Association, November 25, 1836*. Norwich: Aurora Press, 1837.

Kadir, Djelal, “America and Its Studies,” *PMLA* 118, no. 1 (2003): 9-24.

Kaplan, Amy. “Manifest Domesticity.” *American Literature* 70 (1998): 581-606

Keane, Patrick. *Emerson, Romanticism, and Intuitive Reason: The Transatlantic “Light of All Our Day.”* Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005.

Kelly, William P. *Plotting America’s Past: James Fenimore Cooper and the Leatherstocking Tales*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.

Kendra, April. “Gendering the Silver Fork: Catherine Gore and the society novel,” *Women’s Writing* 11, no. 1 (2004), 25-38.

Kennedy, W. Sloane. *Henry W. Longfellow: Biography Anecdote, Letters, Criticism*. New York: Haskell House, 1882, rpt. 1973.

Koppenhaver, Allen J. “The Dark View of Things: The Isolated Figure in the American Landscapes of Cole and Bryant,” in *Views of American Landscapes*, ed. Mick Gidley and Robert Lawson-Peebles (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 183-198.

Lauer, Josh. “Tracers of the Real: Autographomania and the Cult of the Signers in Nineteenth-

- Century America," *Text and Performance Quarterly* 27, no. 2 (2007), 143-163.
- Lease, Benjamin. *Anglo-American Encounters: England and the Rise of American Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- "Literary Imitations and Similiarities, &c.," *Sharpe's London Magazine*, Mar. 1848, 37-40 ; *The Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature*, Jul. 1848, p. 397-401.
- "Literary Imitations," *Putnam's Monthly Magazine of American Literature, Science, and Art*, Aug. 1856, 113-20.
- "Literary Women of America: Mrs. Sarah Josepha Hale," *The Ladies' Repository*, Apr. 1855, 194-6.
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Kenneth P. Winkler. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1996.
- Lockridge, Kenneth. *On the Sources of Patriarchal Rage*. New York: New York University Press, 1992.
- Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth. *Hyperion*. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1861.
- , *Kavanagh*. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields, 1849.
- , *The Letters of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*, vol. 2, 1837-1843, ed. Andrew Hillen. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1966.
- , *The Letters of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*, vol. 3, 1844-1856, ed. Andrew Hillen. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1972.
- , "The Literary Spirit of Our Country," *United States Literary Gazette* April. 1825, 24-28.
- , *The Waif*. Cambridge, MA: John Owen, 1845.
- , Trans. *The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri: The Inferno*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1886.
- Loughran, Trish. *The Republic in Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. Nation Building, 1770-1870*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Ljungquist, Kent and Buford Jones, "The Identity of 'Outis': A further chapter in the Poe-Longfellow War," *American Literature* 60.3 (1988): 402-415.
- Lyly, John. *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit and Euphues and His England*, Ed. Leah Scragg. New York: Manchester University Press, 2003.

- McCullough, David. "John Adams and the Good Life of the Mind," *Records of the Academy (American Academy of Arts and Sciences)* No. 2002 (2002): 10-16.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3786002>
- McGill, Meredith L. *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834-1853*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- . "Common Places: Poetry, Illocality, and Temporal Dislocation in Thoreau's *A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers*," *American Literary History*, 19, no. 2 (2007): 357-374.
- McLamore, Richard V. "The Dutchman in the Attic: Claiming an Inheritance in *The Sketch Book of Geoffrey Crayon*," *American Literature* 72, no. 1 (2000): 31-57.
- McMullen, Haynes and Larry J. Bar, "The Treatment of Libraries in Periodicals Published in the United States before 1876," *The Journal of Library History* 21, no. 4 (1986): 641-672.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25541736>
- Macey, Samuel L. *The Dynamics of Progress: Time, Method, Measure*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010.
- Martineau, Harriet. *Society in America*, vol. 1. London: Saunders & Otley, 1837.
- . *Autobiography*, ed. Linda H. Peterson. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2007.
- Matthiessen, F.O. *American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman*. London: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- Mellor, Anne K. "What's Different about 'Regency' Women Writers?" *Keats-Shelley Journal* 55 (2006), 42-47.
- Melville, Herman. *Moby Dick*. New York: Library of America, 1991.
- Memoria, "The Martyrs: A Tale of the American Revolution," *Atkinson's Cabinet*. Feb. 1837, 73-79.
- Meyer, Herman. *The Poetics of Quotation in the European Novel*. Trans. Theodore and Yetta Ziolkowski. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1968.
- Miller, J. Hillis. "The Critic as Host," *Critical Inquiry* 3, no. 3 (1977), 439-447.
- Miller, Perry. *The Raven and the Whale: The War of Words and Wits in the Era of Poe and Melville* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1956).

- Miller, Quentin. "'A Tyrannically Democratic Force': The Symbolic and Cultural Function of Clothing in Catherine Maria Sedgwick's Hope Leslie," *Legacy* 19, no. 2 (2002): 121-136. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25679424>
- Moers, Ellen. *The Dandy: Brummell to Beerbohm*. New York: Viking Press, 1960.
- Monaghan, E. Jennifer. *Learning to Read and Write in Colonial America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005.
- [Moore, Milcah Martha]. *Miscellanies, Moral and Instructive, in Prose and Verse; Collected from Various Authors for the Use of Schools and the Improvement of Young Persons of Both Sexes*. (Reprint, London: J. Philips, 1787).
- Morgan, M.H. "John Bartlett." *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 41.35 (Jul., 1906): 842-844.
- Morison, Samuel Eliot. *John Paul Jones: A Sailor's Biography*. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., rpt. 1999.
- Morse, Jedidiah. *An Appeal To The Public: On The Controversy Respecting The Revolution In Harvard College, And The Events Which Have Followed It; Occasioned By The Use Which Has Been Made Of Certain Complaints and Accusations of Miss Hannah Adams Against the Author*. Charlestown, 1814.
- Mott, Frank. *The History of American Magazines 1741-1930*. Harvard: Harvard UP, 1930.
- Moyne, Ernest J. "The Origin and Development of Longfellow's Song of Hiawatha," *Journal of Inter-American Studies* 8.1 (1966):156-182. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/165220>
- Munby, A.N.L. *The Cult of the Autograph Letter in England*. London: Athlone Press, 1962.
- Muñoz M., Laura. "Dos Cónsules Mexicanos en La Habana: Su Visión Geopolítica y la Defensa del Interés Nacional," *Historia Mexicana* 49, no. 2 (1999): 253-277.
- Newbury, Michael. *Figuring Authorship in Antebellum America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- Nicolay, Claire. "Delightful Coxcombs to Industrious Men: Fashionable Politics in 'Cecil and Pendennis'," *Victorian Literature and Culture* 30, no. 1 (2002), 289-304.
- Northrop, Mary S. "A Young Hero," *St. Nicholas; An Illustrated Magazine for Young Folks*, Jul. 1894, p. 794-800.
- "The Novels of Miss Sedgwick," *American Monthly Magazine*, Jan. 1836, 15-25.

- Oakley, J.W. "The Reform of Honor in Bulwer's Pelham," *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 47, no. 1 (1992), 49-71.
- O'Kell, Robert. "The Autobiographical Nature of D'Israeli's Early Fiction," *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 31, no. 3 (1976), 253-284.
- Okker, Patricia. *Our Sister Editors: Sarah J. Hale and the Tradition of Nineteenth-Century American Women Editors*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995.
- , "Sarah Josepha Hale, Lydia Sigourney, and the Poetic Tradition in Two Nineteenth-Century Women's Magazines," *American Periodicals* 3 (1993): 32-42.
- "On Keeping, Or Costume in Character," *The New Monthly Magazine and Literary Journal*, Jan. 1824, 162-67.
- "On Mottos and Quotations from the Ancients," *The Monthly Magazine and American Review*, Dec. 1800, 404-07.
- Ord, Melanie. *Travel and Experience in Early Modern English Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Orjuelas, Héctor. "Revaloración de una Vieja Polémica Literaria: William Cullen Bryant y la Oda 'Niágara' de José María Heredia," *THESAURUS* 19.2 (1964): 248-273.
- Ostrowski, Carl. "'I stand upon their ashes in thy beam': The Indian Question and William Cullen Bryant's Literary Removals" *ATQ* 9, no. 4 (December 1995): 299-312.
- Parks, Edd Winfield. *Ante-bellum Southern Literary Critics*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1962.
- Pérez-Carrasco, Jenny. "La poesía intervencionista de José María Heredia," *Meta: journal des traducteurs* 50.4 (2005). <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/019927ar>
- Plett, Heinrich. "Intertextualities," in *Intertextuality*, Ed. Heinrich Plett (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 3-29.
- Poe, Edgar Allan. *Essays and Reviews*, Ed. G.R. Thompson. New York: Literary Classics of the United States, 1984.
- Pollin, Burton R. "Bulwer-Lytton and 'The Tell-Tale Heart.'" *American Notes and Queries* (September 1965): 7-8.
- , "Bulwer's Rienzi as Multiple Source for Poe." *Poe Studies* 29.2 (December 1996): 66-68.
- "Polygon Papers, Number Twelve: Quoters and Quotations, Plagiarists and Plagiarisms," *The Knickerbocker*, Jan. 1845, 32-42.

- P[reston], I[sabella] R[ushton]. *Handbook of Familiar Quotations, Chiefly From English Authors*. London: John Murray, 1853.
- Purcell, Sarah J. *Sealed with Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.
- Quine, W.V.O. *Mathematical Logic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Quintero, José Agustín. Trans. "El Dia de Lluvia." by H.W. Longfellow. *Revista de la Habana*, Tomo Cuatro, (1855), 212.
- Railton, Stephen. *Fenimore Cooper: A Study of His Life and Imagination* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978)
- Recanati, François. "Open quotation". *Mind* 110, no. 439 (2001): 637-687.
- "Remarks on the Magazine of August, 1779," *The United States Magazine; a Repository of History, Politics and Literature*, Sep. 1779, 403-405, <http://proquest.umi.com>.
- "Reminiscences of John Bartlett," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Historical Society* I (1906).
- [Review of Hannah Adams's *A Narrative Concerning the Controversy* and Jedidiah Morse's *Appeal to the Public*], *The Rhode Island Literary Repository*, Vol. I. Providence: Robinson and Howland, 1815; 569-588
- Review of *Cecil Hyde, a novel in two volumes*. *The Commercial Advertiser*, October 17, 1834, 2-3.
- Review of *Notes on Colombia, taken in the Years 1822-3*, *The United States Review and Literary Gazette*, March 1827, 418-32.
- Review of *Poems*, by William Cullen Bryant. *The Foreign Quarterly Review*. Aug. 1832, 136-137.
- Review of *Vivian Grey*. *The Album and Ladies' Weekly Gazette*. May 9, 1827, p. 6-7.
- Rice, Grantland S. *The Transformation of Authorship in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Rockland, Michael A. "Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and Domingo Faustino Sarmiento," *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 12.2 (1970): 275-277.
- Rojas, Rafael. "La Política Mexicana Ante la Guerra de Independencia de Cuba (1895-1898), *Historia Mexicana* 45, no. 4 (1996): 783-805.
- Rosa, Matthew Whiting. *The Silver Fork School: Novels of Fashion Preceding Vanity Fair*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

- Robbins, Bruce. "Introduction Part I: Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism." In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, Ed. Bruce Robbins and Pheng Cheah. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998, 1-19.
- Rowe, John Carlos. *Post-Nationalist American Studies*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Rowson, Susanna. *Charlotte Temple* (1794). New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Rush, Benjamin. "Thoughts upon Female Education, According to the Present State of Society, Manners, and Government in the United States of America." In *Classics in the Education of Girls and Women*, ed. Shirley Nelson Kersey. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1981: 169-179.
- Ryan, Susan M. "Errand into Africa: Colonization and Nation Building in Sarah J. Hale's *Liberia*." *New England Quarterly* 68 (1995): 558-83.
- Said, Edward. *Beginnings: Intention and Method*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.
- Satelmajer, Ingrid. "Unbinding 'The Book': Bryant's 'The Fountain' in the Democratic Review," *American Periodicals* 13.(2003): 31-49. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20771155>
- Schmidt, Gary D. *A Passionate Usefulness: The Life and Literary Labors of Hannah Adams*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004.
- Sedgwick, Catherine Maria. *Hope Leslie* (1827) New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006.
- Seville, Catherine. *The Internationalisation of Copyright Law: Books, Buccaneers and the Black Flag in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Seymour, George Dudley. *Documentary Life of Nathan Hale*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger, 2009.
- Shaffer, Arthur H. *The Politics of History: Writing the History of the American Revolution, 1783-1815*. Chicago: Precedent Publishing, 1975.
- Shaffer, Jason. *Performing Patriotism: National Identity in the Colonial and Revolutionary American Theater*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Shuffleton, Frank. "Going Through the Long Vaticans: Melville's 'Extracts' in Moby-Dick Author(s)." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 25, no. 1 (1983): 528-540.
- Silva Gruesz, Kristen. *Ambassadors of Culture: The Transamerican Origins of Latino Writing*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

- Slauter, Eric. *The State as a Work of Art: The Cultural Origins of the Constitution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Sloan, Karen S. "The Nineteenth-Century Church Music Controversy: A Possible Referent for Cooper's 'Manifestly Impossible' Singing-Master in *The Last of the Mohicans*," *ANQ* 19, no. 1 (2006), 33-42.
- Slotten, Martha C. "Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson: a Poet in 'The Athens of North America'," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Bibliography* 108, no. 3 (1984), 259-288.
- S.M.S., "Literary Imitations, No. II," *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book*, Sep. 1847, 121-124.
- Stabile, Susan M. *Memory's Daughters: The Material Culture of Remembrance in Eighteenth-Century America*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- , "Salons and Power in the Era of Revolution: From Literary Coteries to Epistolary Enlightenment." In *Benjamin Franklin and Women*, ed. Larry Tise (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 129-148.
- [Stephens, Anne]. "His Country's Victim," *The Portland Magazine*, Dec. 1834, 65-74; or "An Incident of the American Revolution," *Spirit of the Times*, 12 Mar. 1842, 15-21.
- Sternberg, Meir. "Proteus in Quotation Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse," *Poetics Today* 3, no. 2 (1982): 107-156. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1772069>
- Tamarkin, Elisa. *Anglophilia: Deference, Devotion, and Antebellum America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Tawil, Ezra. *The Making of Racial Sentiment: Slavery and the Birth of the Frontier Romance*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Tennenhouse, Leonard. *The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and the British Diaspora, 1750-1850*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- "Thoughts on Quotations from Authors. A Fragment," *The United States Magazine; a Repository of History, Politics and Literature*, Aug. 1779, 352-53, <http://proquest.umi.com>.
- Tomc, Sandra. "'Clothing upon sticks': James Fenimore Cooper and the Flat Frontier," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 51, no. 2 (2009): 142-178.
- . "Restyling an Old World: Nathaniel Parker Willis and Metropolitan Fashion in the Antebellum United States," *Representations* 85, no 1 (2004): 98-124. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/rep.2004.85.1.98>
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility*. London: Routledge, 1995.

- Wald, Priscilla. *Constituting Americans*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.
- Warner, Michael. *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Weber, Eugene. "Of Stereotypes and of the French," *Journal of Contemporary History* 25, no. 2 (May - Jun., 1990), 169-203.
- Weinstein, Bernard. "Bryant, Annexation, and the Mexican War," *ESQ* 63 (1971): 19-24.
- Williams, Stanley T. *The Spanish Background of American Literature*, vol. 1, 2,. New Haven: Yale UP, 1955.
- Willis, Lloyd. *Environmental Evasion : The Literary, Critical, and Cultural Politics of Nature's Nation*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2011.
- Willis, Nathaniel Parker. *Lecture on Fashion, Delivered Before the New York Lyceum, June, 1844*. New York: Mirror Library, 1844.
- Wilson, Cheryl. *Fashioning the Silver Fork Novel*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2012.
- Vázquez, Andrés Clemente. *Entre Brumas: Reminiscencias Americanas y Europeas*. Havana: Tipografía del Avisador Comercial, 1899.
- V[illaverde, Cirilo]. review of *Gan-Eden*, by William Henry Hurlbert, *Revista de la Habana* Tomo. IV (1855): 5-8.
- Virgil's Aeneid*. Trans. John Dryden. New York: Penguin, 1997.
- "Washington Irving," *The National Advocate*, October 28, 1826, 1.
- Weisbuch, Robert. "Post-Colonial Emerson and the Erasure of Europe," In *The Cambridge Companion to Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Ed. Joel Porte & Sandra Morris. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 192-217
- Westover, Paul. "How America 'Inherited' Literary Tourism." In *Literary Tourism and the Nineteenth-Century*, Ed. Nicola J. Watson. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009: 184-195.
- Young, Edward. *Conjectures on Original Composition*, ed. Edith J. Morley. Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1918.
- Zuckert, Michael P. *Launching Liberalism: On Lockean Political Philosophy*. Lawrence: University of Kansas, 2002.