

Stony Brook University



OFFICIAL COPY

The official electronic file of this thesis or dissertation is maintained by the University Libraries on behalf of The Graduate School at Stony Brook University.

© All Rights Reserved by Author.

American Masculinity and Home in Antebellum Literature

A Dissertation Presented

by

Derek Scott McGrath

to

The Graduate School

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English Literature

Stony Brook University

May 2014

Copyright by
Derek Scott McGrath
2014

Stony Brook University
The Graduate School

Derek Scott McGrath

We, the dissertation committee for the above candidate for the

Doctor of Philosophy degree, hereby recommend

acceptance of this dissertation.

Dr. Susan Scheckel - Dissertation Advisor
Associate Professor, English Department

Dr. Andrew Newman - Chairperson of Defense
Associate Professor, English Department

Dr. Jeffrey Santa Ana - Committee Member
Assistant Professor, English Department

Dr. Michael Kimmel - Committee Member
Distinguished Professor, Sociology Department, Stony Brook University

This dissertation is accepted by the Graduate School

Charles Taber
Dean of the Graduate School

Abstract of the Dissertation

“American Masculinity and Home in Antebellum Literature”

by

Derek Scott McGrath

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English Literature

Stony Brook University

2014

The conventional argument in literary and gender studies of nineteenth-century United States culture has been that the home was women’s claimed sphere of influence, whereas men were excluded from the home because of their economic, cultural, and societal commitments to the public sphere. Even as Catharine Beecher, Lydia Maria Child, Sarah Josepha Hale, and other adherents to a conservative domestic ideology closely associated the private sphere with women, these same writers identified specific roles and spaces that they expected men to occupy in the home. Hardly only a woman’s domain, the home was a powerful force in motivating constructions of masculine subjectivities before the Civil War and long after. Building on the works of scholars such as Cathy Davidson, Monika Elbert, and Glenn Hendler, “American Masculinity and Home in Antebellum Literature” considers how nineteenth-century writers defined varying forms of domestic masculinity. Beginning with Nathaniel Hawthorne’s definition of the nineteenth-century American romance as a style emerging from the highly domestic space of “the parlor,” this study critically assesses authors who, while not all conventionally associated with household rhetoric, used their literature to offer alternative models of gendered identity by building upon, rather than only dismantling, prevalent domestic ideology. Domestic masculinity served as one topic for various writers—including Edgar Allan Poe, Sojourner Truth, George Copway, and Mark Twain—to define alternative forms of gendered, racial, and national identity that could provide readers with a sense of stable home-space, both in untraditional locations and in the midst of drastic changes to American law, culture, and literary form. This study traces the permeable boundary between the supposedly masculine public and supposedly feminine private spheres, to identify the opportunities and challenges that the home provided to United States writers, men and women, and across the spectrums of race, class, region, and religion.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1. “Home No More”: Poe’s Negotiation of Gender and Domesticity in	
Antebellum Print Culture	21
I. “By a Bostonian”: The Birthplace of Poe and His Early Literary Career	26
II. “My Home No More”: “Tamerlane,” Domestic Masculinity, and Bringing the Orient to Boston	34
III. “Boyish, Feeble, and Altogether Deficient”: Publishing in <i>Godey’s Lady’s Book</i>	46
IV. Detecting the Complementary Poles of Sentiment and Sensation in “The Oblong Box”	54
V. An Expression of Romance: A Southerner’s Last Publications in the Abolitionist Newspaper <i>Flag of Our Union</i>	69
VI. “Troubles Made His Manhood Disappear”: Poe’s Legacy in Gendered Portrayals.....	76
Chapter 2. Neutral Territory: Androgyny, Misogyny, and Hawthorne’s Development of the Domestic Romance	79
I. Hawthorne’s Definition of the Romance	87
II. “These Things Hide the Man”: The “Abode” in Hawthorne’s Literature	101
III. “Before the Public Stark Naked”: Women in Hawthorne’s Homes	106
IV. “The First Time That I Ever Came Home”: Sophia Peabody and Her Husband.....	117
Chapter 3. “To the Fireside of the Paleface”: Domesticity and Native American Identity in the Works of George Copway	124

I. From Ojibwe Homes to White Homes: Copway’s Early Life and Entrance into Publishing	127
II. Kah-Ge-Ga and Boston: Lost and Failed Native American Communities	138
III. Occupy the State House: Domestic Ideology and Politics.....	145
IV. “Domestic Life Among the Indians”: Copway’s Critical Intervention into Publishing	153
V. Dwell in the Heart, Stand Forever	156
Chapter 4. The Question Before the House: Sojourner Truth’s Public Home.....	161
I. Libyan Sibyl: Sharing a Home with Stowe.....	167
II. Sit in at the White House: Freedman’s Village and Meeting Lincoln.....	178
Chapter 5. Why Is Huck Silent? Fatherhood, Slavery, and Domesticity in the Works and Life of Mark Twain.....	186
I. Travel without Charm: Twain’s Itinerant Life.....	190
II. The Floating House.....	192
III. Emotional Huck	195
IV. Childish Men.....	198
V. Sandy’s Silence.....	201
Bibliography	204

Acknowledgements

It is coincidental that I was developing a dissertation about masculinity defined in relation to domesticity at a time in my life where I moved frequently—from one apartment to another, whether as a result of irate landlords, flooded basements, and a compromised budget with rent being too high. Such are the joys of a graduate student's life, as my colleagues and my students have understood because of the complications that everyone has trying to find a place to call home. My friends and advisers have told me that every person's dissertation is a reflection of their personal life; I hope the following study, rather than only emphasizing the negative aspects of such moves, emphasizes what I have gained from numerous moves. I also hope that the housing challenges experienced by many undergraduate and graduate students inspires others to do work to correct these problems in the near future: an education is best gained when students have a stable setting in which to learn and work, and we owe it to our students to make our universities places where they feel safe. In my efforts collaborating with organizations at Stony Brook University, including the Graduate Student Organization, the Graduate Student Employees Union, and the Safe Space Program, there is more work to be done.

Because this dissertation is the culmination of seven years of doctoral studies at Stony Brook University, I have many people to thank at this university and elsewhere for their support. Susan Scheckel, the chair of this dissertation, has been a helpful, compassionate mentor. Susan has made herself available particularly when it comes to discussing how to coordinate research and teaching interests so that each draws upon the other—and has helped guide some of my personal interests in reading the nineteenth century forward into studies of contemporary

literature and culture. Her feedback to the chapters helped to focus the broad attention I have had when it comes to representations of gender and domesticity in numerous time periods, and I appreciate the advice she has offered moving forward with future studies. She and also Peter Manning provided considerable professional assistance—including Peter’s presence at my first presentation to the Modern Language Association in my very first year in the PhD program—for which I will always be grateful.

I also wish to thank other members of my committee. As chair to the defense, Andrew Newman supervised much of the process in revising the following chapters, as well as providing mentorship to my teaching, writing, and research. Michael Kimmel enriched this dissertation with guidance towards contextualizing literary works within their moments of production, with emphasis on the legal, cultural, and societal impact upon and from such literature. Finally, Jeffrey Santa Ana has been a consistent source of support, identifying common threads in my scholastic interests, which allowed my contemporaneous research in an eclectic range of topics—comics, contemporary popular music, anime, superheroes, online fandom, and the works of Joss Whedon—to draw from, or speak to, themes and conceptions of gender explored in nineteenth-century United States literature and culture. In my conversations with Jeffrey, he provided mentorship to identify commonalities across form, genre, and time period that kept me motivated throughout researching and writing this dissertation, which also benefited my teaching and academic conference talks (there is no better feeling for me than getting a row of students at New York University cheering when I make a *Fullmetal Alchemist* reference while lecturing about, of all things, the works of Emerson and Poe.) My research and teaching philosophy owes much to Jeffrey’s encouragement, and I owe so much to all committee members for their guidance in completing this dissertation.

I also am thankful for the guidance I received in the earliest research on this project. Michael Harrawood at Florida Atlantic University's Harriet L. Wilkes Honors College provided direct, clear feedback, from the overall focus of my study to the minute detail of sentence structure. Hilary Edwards at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill offered guidance in some of the earliest research that served as the foundation to this dissertation. Laura Barrett at Armstrong Atlantic State University is one of the reasons I came to Stony Brook University, and I can only hope to make the critical interventions that she has made in her wide range of significant research. Bonita Rhoads at Masaryk University, as well as members of the Poe Society and the Hawthorne Society, offered insights on domesticity and masculinity before the United States Civil War that enriched this dissertation. Elizabeth Abele of the Northeast Modern Language Association provided guidance in studies of masculinity and American culture. I also would like to thank Nan Wolverton, Katherine C. Grier, and other organizers of the 2013 visual and material culture seminar at the Center for Historic American Visual Culture and the American Antiquarian Society. Through hands-on use of antebellum household materials, this session emphasized strategies for using material and visual culture towards understanding the development of domestic ideology throughout United States history. My dissertation benefited from conversations I had with seminar leaders and participants alike. As well, resources at the American Antiquarian Society were of great assistance in particular on the chapters focused on Nathaniel Hawthorne and George Copway.

The English Department at Stony Brook University, as well as the Department of Cultural Analysis and Theory and the Program in Writing and Rhetoric, formed a community of support throughout the process of researching and writing this dissertation. I am grateful to Jesse Curran, Matthew Gilbert, Kat Hankinson, Patrina Jones, Ursula Klein, Kathryn Klein, Lauren

Neefe, Michael Streeter, and Lawrence Zellner for their notes regarding early versions of this project, and to Kristin Boluch, Naomi Edwards, Les Hunter, Christina Lam, and Brandi So for reviewing later drafts of chapters. I also wish to acknowledge fellow graduate students and colleagues (both at Stony Brook University and elsewhere) whose friendships sustained me in writing and revising this dissertation: Angela Carter, James Capp, Giuseppe Costa, Kimberly Cox, Ryan Davidson, Marcelo Disconzi, Nate Doherty, Katherine Foret, Meghan Fox, Jeremiah Garretson, Karen Green, Margaret Hanley, Maggie Helming, Al Herrera-Alcazar, Valerie Hyatt, Mary Ellen Iatropoulos, Margaret Kennedy, Matthew Kremer, Katy Kress, Emily Lauer, Jim McAsey, Keith McCleary, Haseena Milea, Lila Naydan, Joel Simundich, Tucker Stone, David Vibert, and K. Wayne Yang. As well, the insights of my students—too many to name, but especially those students from my upper-division course on the intersection of contemporary popular culture and Edgar Allan Poe—helped to show me how studies in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century United States culture continue to inform our ideas in the twenty-first century. A historical perspective on earlier American society is vital towards approaching many of the challenges we face today, especially when it comes to a better understanding of gender. As well, my mother and father provided moral support in my education: cell phones have been a great way to communicate across large geographical distances. Both of my parents have shown me that gender is in no way monolithic—the work that my mom has performed herself to repair and re-build parts of my childhood home is but one example. And I hope some of the best parts of my dad’s sense of humor appear in this dissertation, especially when it comes to reading the works of Mark Twain. Finally, during my studies at Stony Brook, I was relieved that, should I needed a reprieve from life on Long Island, much of my father’s family was only a short train ride away. I am grateful that they provided another home whenever I needed one.

Introduction

The Scarlet Letter (1850) remains the most well known of Nathaniel Hawthorne's book-length works, continuing to captivate the attention of literary scholars—and to be anathema to high schoolers and undergraduates. Whereas Meredith McGill has traced his earlier critical successes in the tales and sketches he wrote for popular journals, including those catering to women, it was with this book-length romance that Hawthorne spoke to the concerns of his contemporary New England society, while drawing upon a rich and deeply personal history for him related to his Puritan ancestors.¹ *The Scarlet Letter* has attracted considerable scholarship around Hawthorne's complex, seemingly contradictory portrayal of the protagonist Hester Prynne—alternatively coded as a dark, mysterious, and fallen temptress whose embodied and lived protests must be constrained by Boston's Puritans in order to keep order within its society, and as the angelic redeemer of others' sins despite how she is chastised by those same Puritan town administrators.²

The scholarship that most attracts my attention regarding Hester focuses on how her character, and her own story, are associated with Hawthorne and his own story, particularly in the preface to *The Scarlet Letter*, entitled "The Custom-House." From this introduction up to the last pages of Hester's story, Hawthorne indulges in that "device of multiple choice," as F. O. Matthiessen calls it (276-277), a strategy producing a notoriously ambiguous tone that has

¹ See Meredith McGill, *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834-1853* (2003).

² Among the many readings of Hester Prynne as both saint and sinner, especially as associated with her gender, see Frederic I. Carpenter, "Hester the Heretic" (1952); Preston M. Browning, "Hester Prynne as a Secular Saint" (1972); Michael J. Colacurcio, "The Woman's Own Choice" (1985); David L. Arnold, "The Type of Shame" (1992); Neal B. Houston, "Hester Prynne as Eternal Feminine" (1996); Jamie Barlowe, *The Scarlet Mob of Scribblers* (2000); Monika Elbert, "Hester and the New Feminine Vision" (2004); and Yamin Wang, "A Representative of the New Female Image" (2010).

attracted the accolades of scholars for such insightful, captivating written works—and frustrated their efforts to trace some consistent argument across his long literary career.³ At all times in *The Scarlet Letter*, Hawthorne toys with the instability inherent to numerous critical binaries: he dwells in ambiguity. It is “The Custom-House” that establishes the productive work that Hawthorne accomplishes in questioning critically fraught binaries—the past and the present, masculinity and femininity—by staging these questions around domestic spaces and their importance towards defining a more diverse understanding of gender. Beginning with the book’s preface, *The Scarlet Letter* establishes numerous seemingly distinct critical binaries that Hawthorne, in the course of his book, reveals as actually mutually influential upon each other: the Actual and the Imaginary, the public and the private, and masculinity and femininity. These binaries circulate around two separate homes described in his preface: the titular Custom-House of Salem, and his then-current residence at 14 Mall Street in Salem. *The Scarlet Letter*, especially “The Custom-House” preface, serves as my first example in this study. I argue that traditionally feminized household spaces in the nineteenth century fostered a variety of masculine subjectivities that compromise the conventional male-female binary. These multiple competing gender identities, but not necessarily mutually exclusive ones, reveal the multivalent quality of masculinity as it is held in communication with other markers of identities: class, nationality, race, region, religion, and sexuality. Much as Hawthorne depended on the device of multiple choice in his overall body of literature, so too did his work disrupt traditional understandings of gender. In my analysis of the literature and culture of the nineteenth-century United States, the domestic space was a site critical to an understanding of what constituted a legitimized American identity in a time period that, much like our own, worked from a process

³ See also Yvor Winters, “Maule’s Curse” (1937); Charles Feidelson, *Symbolism and American Literature* (1953); Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Office of the Scarlet Letter* (1991: especially pages 21-22); and Magnus Ullén, *The Half-Vanished Structure: Hawthorne’s Allegorical Dialectics* (2004).

of defining who may or may not consider themselves at home in the United States. Often this definition of Americanness centered around gender, and it was more often men who were able to claim that identity as being representative of the ideals of the United States, as I argue not only through removal from but actually participation within the home and larger domestic ideological movements.

While Hawthorne's story of Hester Prynne has commanded the attention of readers since the mid-nineteenth century, the earliest sales of *The Scarlet Letter* were driven partially by critical attention given to its preface: many readers were more interested in "The Custom-House" because it documented the controversial political dismissal of Hawthorne from the Salem Custom-House, than those readers were interested to Hawthorne's gothic psychological romance centered around Puritan seventeenth-century Boston.⁴ Whereas Hawthorne has been maligned for his famous indictment against contemporary female authors that he referred to as "damned mob of scribbling women"—at one point writing to his editor James T. Fields how he wished women writers "were forbidden to write, on pain of having their faces deeply scarified with an oyster-shell" (*Centenary Edition* 17: 304; 16: 624)—these women were Hawthorne's own peers: his editors, his publishers, even his relatives and, debatably, friends. His hostility to women who happened to engage the home as a space for literary production should not lead us to overlook Hawthorne's own engagement with such domestic spaces, and the work of men overall in writing their own domestic treatises. Among so many male writers who engaged in the domestic sphere, Hawthorne has stood out due to his alternatively antagonistic and sympathetic portrayals of women, in particular as both men and women occupy shared domestic spaces.⁵

⁴ Both Jane Tompkins's *Sensational Designs* (1985: 78) and Richard Brodhead's *School of Hawthorne* (1986) consider Hawthorne as "America's one widely praised and even institutionalized novelist" (McWilliams 78).

⁵ See Nina Baym, "Thwarted Nature" (1982); and Monika M. Elbert, "No (Wo)man's Land" (1989).

Bronson Alcott, for all his failures at sporadic reform movements—fictionalized in the novel *Little Women* by his daughter, Louisa Mae Alcott—was one of many men who turned to domestic spaces in speaking to larger national reforms. For example, Robert Roberts, famous for his guide for domestics, *The House Servant's Directory: A Monitor for Private Families* (1817), parlayed his accomplishment as the first published African American writer towards work in the abolitionist movement. Likewise, in his book *Walden* (1854), Henry David Thoreau used his solitude in the house he built himself, and the domestic experiences in that space, to meditate on the universal connections between persons to each other and their environments. Thoreau's thoughts and activities during this time in his home are framed as responses to larger national concerns about religion, slavery, and war. He argues in his posthumous text "Walking" (1862) that people, particularly men, would benefit from being "without land or a home," implicitly alluding to that idealized rootless lifestyle as celebrated by his mentor Ralph Waldo Emerson. Whereas Emerson thought that the worries related to home will follow someone even as he engages in that "fool's paradise" of traveling, Thoreau revises his mentor's argument to claim that, "having no particular home," he is "equally at home everywhere" ("Walking" 1993, 1995; "Self-Reliance" 1173).⁶ Herman Melville located domesticity in unconventional spaces and through unconventional familial arrangements, such as Ishmael's close quarters with Queequeg in *Moby-Dick*, thereby simultaneously producing alternative masculinities and alternative domesticities.⁷ Edgar Allan Poe may have written on the madness inspired by close

⁶ See Richard N. Masteller and Jean Carwile Masteller, "Rural Architecture in Andrew Jackson Downing and Henry David Thoreau" (1984); John Dolis, "Thoreau's Walden: Intimate Space and the Economy of Being" (1987); Paul McCarthy, "Houses in Walden" (1987); Etsuko Taketani, "Thoreau's Domestic Economy" (1994); and Maura D'Amore, "Thoreau's Unreal Estate: Playing House at Walden Pond" (2009).

⁷ See Curtis Dahl, "Arrowhead and the 'Razed' Roof" (1983) and "The Architecture of Society and the Architecture of the Soul" (1984); and Wyn Kelley, "'I'm Housewife Here': Herman Melville and Domestic Economy" (1994) and "Pierre's Domestic Ambiguities" (1998).

confinement, yet he also wrote compelling treatises on furniture arrangement, for men's journals at that.⁸

Even Linda K. Kerber's seminal work, "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place" (1988), begins with attention not to the words of women but to Alexis de Tocqueville's problematic assessment of gendered splits between the public and private spheres. In *Democracy in America* (1835), Tocqueville wrote, "In no country has such constant care been taken as in America to trace two clearly distinct lines of action for the two sexes and to make them keep pace one with the other, but in two pathways that are always different" (225 qtd in Kerber 9). Such a generalization initiates for Kerber a critical investigation into the insistence on separate spheres, its benefits and its disadvantages, particularly as affecting women long into contemporary discourse. Tocqueville "had urged that the 'circle of domestic life' be searched for the distinguishing characteristics of American women, and once we looked, the separation of spheres seemed everywhere underfoot, from crocheted pillows reading *Woman's Place Is in the Home* to justifications for the exclusion of women from higher education, to arguments against birth control and abortion" (Kerber 10). Michael Kimmel as well draws upon Tocqueville's remarks to assess three prevalent models of masculinity in the early American republic: the Genteel Patriarch, the Heroic Artisan, and Wealthy Entrepreneur. According to Kimmel, it is the last, whom he calls "[t]he newcomer" in American society, who "derives identity entirely from a man's activities in the public sphere, measured by accumulated wealth and status, by geographic and social mobility" (137). The Wealthy Entrepreneur of the public sphere becomes the idealized model of masculinity in the early American republic forward into contemporary United States culture. This line of argument persisted in the postbellum "sharp rise in industrialization

⁸ See Monika Elbert, "Poe and Hawthorne as Women's Amanuenses" (2004); Eliza Richards, "Poe, Women Poets, and Print Circulation" (2007); and Bonita Rhoads, "Poe's Genre Crossing: From Domesticity to Detection" (2009).

and materialism,” which defined “the measure of the self-made man’s success [...] more and more tied to wealth and social standing” as associated with the public sphere, “and less and less tied to moral virtue” as associated with the private sphere. “This overvaluation of the public sphere inherently devalues the private sphere most often associated with women and communal ties, thus further severing American individualism from more communal values linked to community, caring, and nurturing” (Michael 19).

Whereas following the Civil War the idealized image of self-made masculinity became associated more and more with the public rather than private sphere, inherent to arguments by both Kerber and Kimmel, the American home throughout the nineteenth century is never completely a positive or negative space for women and men, and people of these two genders are never completely confined to only the public or only the private sphere. In her well-known essay, “Manifest Domesticity,” Amy Kaplan considers how it was that domesticity shaped the nation, whereby women, using the home as a symbol and shorthand, “defin[ed] the contours of the nation and its shifting borders with the foreign” (582). Building upon scholarship by Jane Tompkins, Mary Ryan, and others, Kaplan recognizes “the imperialistic drive behind the encyclopedism and determined practicality” of the domestic treatise in the nineteenth century, as “a blueprint for colonizing the world in the name of the ‘family state’ under the leadership of Christian women” (Tompkins, *Sensational Designs* 143-144). According to Gillian Brown, the separate spheres discourse in the nineteenth century also enforced cultural limitations around the roles that women could occupy. This domestic culture, “based on self-denial and collectivity—the ethos of sympathy customarily and disparagingly called sentimentalism”—failed to provide any woman with “an antithetical model of selfhood [...] in service to an individualism most available to (white) men” (6-7). Brown argues that it was men, as well as women, who defined

households as women's spaces in a process to have woman—and, I would add, non-white and non-American individuals—subordinate to predominantly white men. Following the example of Kerber, Kaplan, and Brown, by contextualizing the writings and lives of the authors that I approach in this study, it is apparent that the home was a multivalent symbol that held different emotional ties to nineteenth-century writers and readers depending on their individualized experiences. Men as well as women instigated a system of separate spheres: comparing the domestic texts by a number of men and women authors yields new insights regarding how the home was instrumental in defining both femininity and masculinity, and how these gender identities influenced numerous facets of United States society. Domestic discourse in the nineteenth century included not only that “Cult of True Womanhood,” as Barbara Welter refers to the prevalent ideology that imagined women as working primarily through the private sphere to effect change in the public sphere, but also a range of men and women writers defining a domestic masculinity.

Whereas Hawthorne serves as the touchstone throughout this study in defining domestic masculine subjectivities, it is important to examine the gender cultural movements in the time when he wrote. Known also as the Cult of Domesticity, Welter's term “the Cult of True Womanhood” refers to a set of cultural, political, and social changes in the nineteenth century that demarcated imagined boundaries in the United States between public spaces—gendered masculine—and private spaces—gendered feminine. Because of increased industrialization in the United States, an increasing amount of labor was moved out of households and into factories and offices. In keeping with cultural associations up to that point associating women with the home, with passivity, and with physical weakness, men were conventionally thought as more innately adept for the labor and competition to be encountered in a public sphere increasingly

distinguished from the private sphere of the home. While societal expectations limited many women to that private sphere, they nevertheless continued to use those private spaces for work that was increasingly in the industrialized age associated with the public sphere, including the production of goods. Even as women used the home as a nexus between the public and private spheres, as Gillian Brown has shown, the home was increasingly emphasized as a hub for reinforcing proper morals, coded as white and Protestant Christian, that were conventionally thought to be sacrificed by men for monetary profit when they engaged in work in the competitive public sphere. Evident in the critical history of domestic and gender studies, and in the chapters that follow, men as well were attuned to the importance of home in the civic, moral, and political maturation of Americans.

In *American Masculinity and Home in Antebellum Literature*, I show the permeability of boundaries between separate spheres. Following analysis by scholars of gender and literary studies such as Cathy Davidson, Monika Elbert, and Glenn Hendler, I trace masculine experiences to show how the nineteenth century provides a set of masculine subjectivities defined around the critically productive space of the home. Hardly only a women's domain, the home was instrumental in defining masculinity because, at all times, gender is a spectrum: what influences one set of gendered identities, such as femininity, informs how not only men but women as well embody and perform masculinity in a variety of public and private contexts. The authors I read critically in this study are representative of work accomplished in the nineteenth century to critique, even appropriate, domestic ideology to address the marginalization of many Americans on the basis of their racial, national, and gendered identities, as well as to make innovations in literary form that allowed for such authors to gain audiences in the regional and national publishing markets. Literature serves as but one cultural lens to examine such gender

performances, and how such performances inform the ways in which Americans have defined race and nationality by grounding such identities in an idealized masculine performance that was alternatively lodged in and exiled from the home. In addition to tracing how permeable were the boundaries between the imagined separate spheres, I examine the ways that numerous groups traditionally excluded from ideal formulations of domestic ideology—along the spectrum of not only gender but also race, nationality, class, and religion—also claim some of the ideological meaning and power associated with the home. Whereas Jochen Achilles refers to “male self-definitions in fictions of the early Republic [as] oscillat[ing] between the poles of unity and diversity, the acceptance or rejection of polyvalence, the inclusion or exclusion of otherness” (579), I look forward to the nineteenth century, a time in which this inclusion and exclusion of otherness was structured around alternatively metaphorical and actual inclusion and exclusion from the traditional American home. Through written and oral texts, the authors that I consider in this study deploy the home in unexpected ways to define themselves by seizing upon prevalent domestic ideology and thus to claim social and political agency amidst the instability of nineteenth-century society as perpetuated by industrialization, slavery, federal Indian policies, and alternations in the literary marketplace as it shifted from regional periodicals to nationalized book publishing. In my study, Hawthorne serves as a critical figure in studies of gender, literature, and culture in the nineteenth-century United States, and he serves as the touchstone for my readings in the following chapters of how writers—men and women—destabilize the binaries of the public and the private, and masculinity and femininity. My study thus elucidates complexities both in gender performances before the Civil War as well as in critical scholarship about that time period.

For example, F. O. Matthiessen has served alternatively as the problem with United States literary criticism due to his work to circumscribe the American canon in terms of race and gender, and as the solution to expanding that canon. Scholars have worked diligently to move beyond the set of white, male, largely heterosexual authors that Matthiessen approaches in order to describe a more realistic representation of both American literary production and American culture.⁹ Inherent in Matthiessen's work, however, is also a far more acute representation of gender performances and diverse sexualities than initially apparent. Matthiessen's seminal book *American Renaissance* (1941) describes a complex set of masculine subjectivities, some born from traditional femininities. Matthiessen, for example, refers to Hawthorne's daydreaming as "the tenderness mixed in with his strength, an almost feminine passivity, which many of his friends noted and Alcott expressed in his own way by asking: 'was he some damsel imprisoned in that manly form pleading always for release?'" (230). In his critical reading of Matthiessen's life and scholarship, David Bergman reads Matthiessen's scholarship as referring to both literature and gender as predicated upon a public/private split. "According to Matthiessen, only if writers see the world with a concreteness that transcends the conventional categories that falsify reality can they produce works whose form possesses a coherence that is more than the arbitrary imposition of an empty design" (82). A re-assessment of Matthiessen's study reveals how his focus on a set of all white, male authors—intensely problematic and not at all representative of authors' financial and critical success in the literary marketplace—transcended the conventional critical binaries in terms of defining gender, sexuality, and, by association, literature itself. Matthiessen's boundary crossing is analogous to the work undertaken by Hawthorne to destabilize certain critical binaries, and Hawthorne and Matthiessen each serve as

⁹ See David Leverenz, *Manhood in the American Renaissance* (1990); and David S. Reynolds, *Beneath the American Renaissance* (2011).

a window for re-examining the works of the other and to recognize the productive ambiguity their works offer towards defining a greater number of masculine subjectivities beyond male-female binary to instead recognize a spectrum of gender performances.

This insistent separation of masculinity and femininity in studies of the nineteenth-century—a “separate spheres” argument—has persisted since Welter’s article “The Cult of True Womanhood” (1966). Whereas gender studies in the 1950s had discounted women’s writings in preference to men’s writings—thanks in large part to a highly conservative national politics that associated femininity in men with weakness, particularly because of hyper-Americanism that associated the political left with not only communism but femininity—critical discourse after Welter’s publication capitalized on this cultural mapping of the separate spheres in order to appreciate the historical significance of domestic spaces as hosting the production, publishing, and marketing of literature. This nineteenth-century understanding of economic and gendered separation affected the literary marketplace in terms of how books and periodicals were marketed. Home journals, for example, aimed to appeal to what women allegedly wanted: how to raise their children, how to tend to their husbands’ moral as well as physical maintenance, how to be fashionable yet humble, and how to organize the house to best suit the health of its residents. Reformers and educators—many of them also writers of fiction—wrote treatises on the salutary benefits of proper domestic care. Catharine Beecher’s *A Treatise on Domestic Economy* (1841) is often recognized as the seminal text. Beecher’s understanding of women’s work in the home was motivated in part by her collaborative work in education, reform, and writing with her sister, Harriet Beecher Stowe. This collaboration not only yielded their co-authored book *American Woman’s Home* (1869), but also influenced Stowe in the writing of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (1852) and hence contributed to the larger sentimentalist tropes found in

contemporary fiction. Even earlier in colonial New England, the first published North American poet, Anne Bradstreet, described herself as producing her literature only after she completed the tasks required of her as mother and wife.¹⁰ Editors such as Sarah Josepha Hale and Lydia Maria Child worked from their houses for important publications such as *Godey's Lady's Book* (1830 to 1878) and Harriet Jacobs's *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl* (1861). Frances Sargent Osgood, Lydia Sigourney, and Frances W. Titus used their households' salons to host rhetoricians, authors, and publishers, often collecting these talks into volumes that they then edited and sold.¹¹ These domestic concerns resonated with numerous authors and the works that they were publishing in this time period, whether novels or domestic treatises—from Lydia Maria Child's *Hobomok* (1824) to her *The American Frugal Housewife* (1829), from Hale's *Northwood* (1827) to Maria Susanna Cummins's *The Lamplighter* (1854). In their literature, these authors claimed a moral necessity to reform the public realm by publishing the lessons of moral instruction that they taught privately in the domestic space. These writers drew heavily upon the actual experiences of their own families and those of their readers, blurring the supposedly firm separation between the private and public spheres that so many scholars have reinforced. Women drew into the household parts of the public sphere—political topics, publishing, literary talks—and in exchange extended moral instruction in public realms through reform activism and literature.

Whereas such critical focus on women's literary production within their homes motivated scholars to re-approach nineteenth-century women's writing to present a more realistic gendered

¹⁰ See Lewis Turco, "The Matriarchy of American Poetry" (1973); Jennifer R. Waller, "'My Hand a Needle Better Fits'" (1974); Paula Kopacz, "'Men Can Do Best, and Women Know It Well'" (1987); Patricia Caldwell, "Why Our First Poet Was a Woman" (1988); and Theresa Freda Nicolay, *Gender Roles, Literary Authority, and Three American Women Writers* (1995).

¹¹ See Lindal Buchanan, *Regendering Delivery* (2005).

canon of United States authors, the prevalence of scholarship grounded in the separate spheres argument transformed this gendered cultural map from a theory into an established fact, often reinforcing conventional gendered definitions that ignored the wider spectrum of multiple femininities that numerous authors—not just women but also men—were occupying. Ann Douglas's *The Feminization of American Culture* (1977) reinforces the separate spheres argument by Welter, while delegitimizing the literary quality of many works by women writers by categorizing such works as lowbrow because of their popularity. Douglas defines nineteenth-century mass culture as feminine and its "popular writers" primarily women, with Harriet Beecher Stowe as the touchstone for her study. According to Douglas, "we dislike, at least theoretically," such women writers because of "their debased religiosity, their sentimental peddling of Christian belief for its nostalgic value." In Douglas's conception, the American literary writers critically appreciated in her time (the 1970s) are men—James Fenimore Cooper, Henry David Thoreau, Herman Melville, Walt Whitman—who "sought to bring their readers into direct confrontation with the moral brutal facts of America's explosive development"; because of their seriousness, these male writers remain culturally resonant across time. Douglas's argument pivots on the distinction between "elite and mass cultures" in the United States, which was inaugurated in the nineteenth century by an appreciation for women like Stowe and a disregard for men like Cooper and his male peers (5-6). Douglas finds the sentimental literature written by women in the nineteenth-century United States to be an inferior aesthetic product born from the limitations that the household placed on those authors; she thus reinforced a masculinizing bourgeois mass culture focused on supporting a capitalist system of consumption. "The domestic novelist" Douglas asserts, "was concerned with the isolation

created by fantasy rather than the solitude imposed by moral commitment,” which created the “illusion of community through shared consumer pleasures available in a mass society” (158).

Douglas’s influence upon 1970s scholarship helped to legitimize the conventional argument that men were circumscribed to the public sphere. Even scholars who were writing in response to Douglas’s limiting argument still subscribed to the separate spheres argument. Jane Tompkins reads sentimental literature as an intrinsically feminist literature; nevertheless, she “accepts Douglas’s gendered premises for understanding nineteenth-century sentimentalism. [Tompkins] does not interrogate the category of sentiment so much as revalue it as a feminine possession” (Gould iii). This insistence that women were associated primarily with the home also influenced contemporary scholars’ treatment of men in relation to the home. Guided especially by Leslie Fiedler’s *Love and Death in the American Novel* (1960), these studies insisted that men occupied their seemingly naturalized sphere of influence in the public realm.¹² The difficulty in gender studies has been to acknowledge the agency that women writers had in developing well written and culturally significant literature, while not limiting them to conventional and often limiting spaces such as the home. This dissertation contributes to studies of masculinity by moving beyond monolithic constructions of both masculinity and femininity as isolated to particular separate spheres.¹³

Yet as Tompkins emphasizes, women, as authors and as characters within their own stories, fashioned domestic spaces into sites that not only influenced contemporary politics but also gave women certain instruments for the production, publishing, and marketing of popular

¹² Also valuable is Joseph Allen Boone’s response in *Tradition Counter Tradition* (1982) to Fiedler’s separation of the gendered spheres, as Boone imagines a number of untraditional homes that authors such as Herman Melville and Mark Twain constructed in unexpected places.

¹³ See Mary Kelley, *Private Woman, Public Stage: Literary Domesticity in Nineteenth-Century America* (1984); and Katharine Adams Carolina, *Owning Up* (2009).

literature that was and still is critically acclaimed. Women have most often been seen as the agents employing the home as a site for innovation and reform in arts and society, including in literature and politics.¹⁴ In response, scholars in the 1980s and 1990s drew upon Tompkins's canonization of notable women writers while seeking to disrupt the archetypal separate spheres argument that had dominated nineteenth-century literary studies for almost two decades. Critics such as Cathy Davidson, Monika Elbert, and Gillian Brown asserted that the distinction between public and private sphere was artificial and located within the space between the public and the private spheres—what can be thought of as analogous to Hawthorne's "neutral territory"—a wider variety of gender performances and embodied masculinities and femininities.¹⁵ This approach to gender studies has expanded to encompass domestic masculinity across a range of time periods, cultures, and societies, and across art forms beyond literary texts to include film, television, comics and graphic novels, and new media.¹⁶ Whereas these scholars have focused on the productions of women, in this study I put work by women in communication with nineteenth-century writings by men in those same domestic spaces. Douglas, in her insistence that women wrote of domestic concerns while men wrote of the seemingly more active, more brutal public sphere, overlooks opportunities to see greater ambiguity—"[t]he very ambiguity" that she says she wants to analyze (6)—inherent in the complexities of associating the public-private binary with the masculine-feminine binary. These two axes are not mutually exclusive: as this study shows, there were women who re-shaped private domestic spaces into a sphere for

¹⁴ See Alison Blunt, "Imperial Geographies of Home: British Domesticity in India, 1886-1925" (1999).

¹⁵ See Gillian Brown, *Domestic Individualism* (1990); Monika Elbert, *Separate Spheres No More* (2000); and Cathy Davidson and Jessamyn Hatcher, *No More Separate Spheres!* (2002).

¹⁶ On nineteenth-century English and transatlantic studies of gendered domesticities, see John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-class Home in Victorian England* (1999). On masculine domesticities after the Civil War and into contemporary culture, see Bill Osgerby, "The Bachelor Pad as Cultural Icon" (2005).

public discourse, and there were men who made claims to the private sphere towards defining more androgynous, less heteronormative alternative masculine subjectivities.

Whereas Glenn Hendler, Mary Chapman, Bruce Burgett, and Milette Shamir have shown how men appropriated of tropes commonly associated with women (sentimentalism chief among them) at their moment of literary production and our literary reception, these studies have not focused specifically on the home as an icon or a symbol for tracing that movement by men between the two spheres.¹⁷ My critical intervention does more than reverse genders from female to male in examining the critical discourses situated around the American home in the nineteenth century. I maintain that the positioning of masculinity around domesticity was often different from the relationship between femininity and domesticity; as gender is always a spectrum in which its constitutive parts are mutually influential upon each other, feminine and masculine subjectivities circulating around the home were always in communication with each other as they defined a variety of engagements with traditional and untraditional domestic spaces, and as a result numerous masculinities and femininities.¹⁸

My first chapter, “Compromised Domestic Discourse and Print Culture in the Works of Edgar Allan Poe,” outlines the ideologically laden and often problematic idea of home, as presented by the emerging literary and popular print cultures of the United States during the mid-to late nineteenth century. Drawing upon Meredith McGill’s studies of antebellum publishing practices, I focus on how contemporary domestic theory was felt as a national yet also highly

¹⁷ See Bruce Burgett, *Sentimental Bodies* (1998); Mary Chapman and Glenn Hendler, *Sentimental Men* (1999); Glenn Hendler, *Public Sentiments* (2001); and Milette Shamir, *Inexpressible Privacy* (2006).

¹⁸ In this study, I consider masculinity and femininity in conversation with each other, while looking to ways in which nineteenth-century American literature and culture presented a range of genders beyond a masculine-feminine binary.

regional impulse that influenced the form and content of Poe's literature.¹⁹ Keenly aware of the literary market's influence on domestic theory, Poe wrote in a style that would attract readers across boundaries of gender, region, class, and political affiliation. Poe situated his stories within the complex debates in his time regarding which roles were available to men and women both in publishing and in households. He even wrote a treatise on furniture arrangement for a magazine tailored to gentlemen readers. His grotesque, gory, and gothic writing style actually complemented rather than clashed with the sentimentalist tone expected in contemporary women's writing. In response to Leland Person and Bonita Rhoads's attention to how Poe's darker works satirize domestic values and the separate spheres paradigm, I argue how it is not necessarily a question whether Poe himself adheres to domestic ideology, so much as it is important to acknowledge that he needed to be an expert in it if he was to publish in some of the leading women's journals of his time, attracting both female adherents to domestic ideology who read *Godey's Lady's Book* and detractors of that ideology who recognized the parody inherent in his works.²⁰ At the same time that he is mocking this sentimental fixation on domestic spaces, in his literature Poe presents a type of masculinity known for its effete scrutiny of aesthetic values, emanating from a legitimate emotional attachment that he and many of his male characters have to the home.

The second chapter, "Nathaniel Hawthorne's Development of the Domestic Romance," considers how the gendering of the household influenced that author's well-known definition of the American romance. As described in "The Custom-House," the romance originates in the familiar milieu of the parlor. When it is time for his writing to emerge from that private space of

¹⁹ See McGill, *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting* (2007).

²⁰ See Joan Dayan, "Poe's Women: A Feminist Poe?" (1991); Leland S. Person, "Poe and Nineteenth-Century Gender Constructions" (2000); and Bonita Rhoads, "Poe's Genre Crossing" (2009).

the house—conventionally ruled by women—to the marketplace—a space whose gendering is contested by the number of both men and women editors—Hawthorne reflects upon an anxiety about gender that suggests even his conventional embrace of the domestic was riddled with contradictions. While Hawthorne’s writing includes statements that are often misogynistic—including his well-known remark against the “damned mob of scribbling women”—Leland Person and Nina Baym have imagined a “feminist Hawthorne” that emerges from stories such as “Mrs. Hutchinson,” *The Scarlet Letter*, *The Blithedale Romance*, and *The Marble Faun* that present nuanced understandings of women and, as I see it, women writers as collaborative participants with him in various writing practices.²¹ Through his definition of the romance as emanating from the traditionally feminized home, Hawthorne found what he describes in “The Custom-House” as a “neutral territory,” a third option not only between the Actual and the Imaginary, and the public and the private, but also between masculinity and femininity.

In the third chapter, “The Question Before the House: Sojourner Truth’s Public Home,” I argue that the nineteenth-century itinerant minister and activist was intimately engaged with domestic ideology in her time. Truth was a manly woman who preferred to travel rather than remain confined in a house, and who faced a daily risk as a freed slave subject at any moment to being captured again. Yet in controlling her public persona to diverse audiences of readers, abolitionists, and women’s rights activists, Truth was careful in how she negotiated her identity in relation to an idealized definition of women’s domesticity. Taking seriously Margaret Washington’s argument that we must closely read Truth’s publications for nuance, I trace how Truth dismantles binaries between not only masculinity and femininity, and blackness and whiteness, but also the public and the private. As Naomi Greyser recognizes, Truth was guided

²¹ See Nina Baym, “Again and Again, the Scribbling Women” (1999); and Leland S. Person, “Hawthorne’s Early Tales” (2005).

by her publishers to be a suitable figure within prevalent domestic ideology. Nevertheless, Truth capitalized on popular interest in salon talks to re-structure many homes into sites for activism and publishing²² Truth even served as Abraham Lincoln's official representative to the African American community Freedman's Village, requiring a one-year residence in that village with the goal of training women on household management. Her work to occupy authorship, masculinity, and American citizenship provides new insights regarding the opportunities and challenges for African Americans to feel at home, particularly when conventional scholarship imagines the "Cult of True Womanhood" that implicitly excluded non-white, non-middle class women from embodying "true womanhood."

As I argue in the fourth chapter, "'To the Fireside of the Paleface': George Copway's Native American Homes," the Ojibwe writer responds to prevalent antebellum re-definitions of American native identity by addressing the nexus of race and home-feeling in the United States. An author whose literary reputation is plagued by accusations of plagiarism and stereotyping, Copway nevertheless defines home through an association with the United States that is predicated on a public performance of race: in his negotiations of what his audiences expect of a Native American writer, Copway's literary and public performances reinforce and undermine those audiences' expectations. At the time when Copway was writing and speaking, entry into North American culture—now defined as white culture—required Native Americans to sever ties to their home, based on federal policies in which the expansion of United States borders depended upon taking away from Native Americans both their land and their cultural identity. In response to this attempted whitewashing of the United States, Copway re-purposed material from women's and home journals in his publications and his speeches to describe how Native

²² See Naomi Greyser, "Affective Geographies" (2007); and Margaret Washington, *Sojourner Truth's America* (2009).

Americans feel the loss of home, forcing his white readers to sympathize based on their own interest in prevalent domestic ideology.

The concluding chapter, “Why Is Huck Silent? Mark Twain’s Portrayals of Fatherhood and Domesticity,” turns to Mark Twain for a postbellum satirical and realist approach to antebellum men’s regard for their homes, in particular that romance literature that Hawthorne had earlier defined from his relationship to his home. Critical scholarship on Twain has responded to Leslie Fiedler’s popular reading of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* as a positive portrayal of men freeing themselves from the stultifying influence of women-dominated households. Yet Twain’s satire clings to that which he mocks. In order to write an effective criticism of conventions in the romance, he must familiarize himself with those conventions and use them well. Despite portraying his characters’ sentimentalist tendencies as hackneyed, he never mocks Huck for the authentic emotional pain that he feels, especially for Jim. In reading Twain’s fictional and nonfictional writing regarding what it means to feel at home, my conclusion shows how Twain’s childhood memories about his father’s slave-holding practices, and the children that he orphaned, influences the romantic tone pervading Twain’s realist text. *Huckleberry Finn* is not only a satire of domestic sentimentalism but also the best example of Twain’s postbellum romance that, analogous to Hawthorne’s definition that begins this dissertation, illustrates how varied has been the relationship between masculinity and domesticity in the nineteenth-century United States.

Chapter 1

“Home No More”:

Poe’s Negotiation of Gender and Domesticity in Antebellum Print Culture

When thinking about “homes” in relation to the works of Edgar Allan Poe, the first thought for many readers concerns those haunted abodes that dominate his literature. Within the walls of those houses are often the haunting remains of women—their corpses found stuffed behind the walls and up the chimneys in the domestic settings to “The Fall of the House of Usher” (1839), “The Murders in the Rue Morgue” (1841), and “The Black Cat” (1843). In the most private rooms of men’s houses, women such as Lenore and Ligeia are resurrected. The voices of lost female loves can be heard echoing through the hallways and rooms of “The Raven” (1845) and “Tamerlane” (1827). In “The Philosophy of Composition” (1846), Poe traces the thought process that led him to determine the most suitable meter, sounds, length, and topic to produce what he thought was the ideal poem. In reading critically his own poem of the anonymous author pining for his²³ lost Lenore, Poe declares “the death then of a beautiful woman is unquestionably the most poetical topic in the world” (*Selected Writings* 680). Poe’s statement has been subject to intense analysis, especially in gender studies regarding the potential misogyny inherent in Poe’s idealization of the death of women: upon their demise, they may no longer speak, and it is left to a writer such as Poe to eulogize them as idealized

²³ Interestingly, scholars increasingly examine Poe’s first-person poems and tales, including not only “The Raven” but also “The Tell-Tale Heart” (1843), to identify whether the author ever at any point technically genders those narrators—and how a re-interpretation or even re-presentation of Poe’s tales as told from the perspective of women can inform studies of gender representations. See Mary J. Couzelis, “What Can ‘The Tell-Tale Heart’ Tell About Gender?” (2012).

beautiful objects—an idealized that is compromised as misogynist by the gory nature by which Poe dispatches such female characters to brutal deaths in his tales.²⁴

This idealization of dying women, often within domestic spaces, takes on new resonance when read in the context of those periodicals re-publishing, even premiering, some of Poe's goriest, seemingly most misogynist works: among the many periodicals to which Poe submitted his works and which re-printed his works (with or without his permission), we can include women's and home journals such as *Godey's Lady's Book*, *Graham's Lady and Gentleman's Magazine*, and *The Opal*. Many of the most supportive critics of his love poetry and dark fiction were women, including Sarah Josepha Hale, Lydia Sigourney, and Frances Sargent Osgood. Whereas some of those same publishers and women would describe him as potentially unmanly—"feminine" or "boyish" were words that these women often used to describe him—his continually developing masculinity was predicated upon a sensitive engagement with women writers as collaborators, and a shared interest with them in the domestic ideology of the time. The women who read, reviewed, and praised his writing were, like Poe, interested in gothic portrayals of violence and murder against both men and women as they happened in traditionally feminine spaces such as household. The already large body count in Poe's body of literature includes men buried in these houses: the elderly victim with the nasty eye from "The Tell-Tale Heart" (1843) who is placed under the floorboards; the unlucky Fortunato walled up in Montresor's crypt in "The Cask of Amontillado" (1846); and Roderick Usher buried with his sister under the rubble of their collapses abode in "The Fall of the House of Usher" (1839).

²⁴ The potential sarcasm inherent to "The Philosophy of Composition" also warrants consideration: because Poe is so methodical regarding the limited number of appropriate topics, forms, lengths, sounds, and meters appropriate for quality poems, should authors adhere to his philosophy of composition, then every poem would be exactly like "The Raven." Based on how Poe's works can be read as the absolute embodiment of a particular genre, such as Gothicism, yet also so specifically accurate as to be an over-the-top satire, such as when "A Predicament" is read in the context of its larger satirical text "How to Write a Blackwood Article" (1838), it is possible to extend the satirical reading of "The Philosophy of Composition" as a mockery of elegies such as "The Raven."

Hence Poe imagines that within the most pleasant domestic space haunts the violence that men and women perform upon each other. Poe takes literally the transcendentalist rhetoric of becoming one with one's own setting: the titular character of "The Facts in the Case of M. Valdemar" (1845) has his mesmerized corpse melt into "a nearly liquid mass of loathsome—of detestable putrescence" sitting atop his bed (*Selected Writings* 414). In Poe's overall body of literature, Valdemar is but one of those male figures who garners readers' sympathy for his pathetic demise—effectively made into an object to be mourned, much like those beautiful women that Poe incessantly claims, explicitly in his criticism or implicitly in his tales and poems. The potential objectification of women as defined in "The Philosophy of Composition" therefore becomes a concern for men as well, even for Poe's own personal integrity. Joan Dayan argues that by removing identity from the female objects of adoration, Poe likewise removes that identity from men in those poems. This productive reading of his literature emphasizes how femininity and masculinity are bound to each other: what affects women will affect men as well.²⁵ Scholars have recognized these potentially feminist implications of Poe's literature, because his tales offer insights regarding patriarchal violence against women, and because his critical reviews published in popular journals highly recommended writers, both men and women.²⁶ Whereas there is misogyny inherent in Poe's attempt to freeze a woman—and dead woman at that—as aesthetic objects to be admired for their beauty and poetical effect, his portrayal of women, when considered alongside his portrayals of men and his collaborative

²⁵ See also Catherine Carter, " 'Not a Woman'" (2003); Eve Célia Morisi, "The Female Figure of Poe's Poetry" (2005); Joseph Church, " 'To Make Venus Vanish': Misogyny as Motive in Poe's 'Murders in the Rue Morgue'" (2006); and Daniel Hoffman, "Ligeia—Not Me! Three Women Writers Respond to Poe" (2012).

²⁶ See Paula Kot, "Feminist 'Re-Visioning' of Tales of Women" (1996); and Monika Elbert, "Poe and Hawthorne as Women's Amanuenses" (2004).

artistic endeavors with women, can open up new readings of how Poe portrays masculinity by appealing to tropes, ideologies, and settings traditionally associated with women.

It was the traditionally feminine space of the antebellum United States household that captivated Poe and his critics, because these writers considered that space to have particular importance to men as well as women. Poe himself wrote a treatise on interior design, “The Philosophy of Furniture,” a piece of criticism that would guide the descriptions of domestic spaces in his gothic tales such as “The Tell-Tale Heart,” “Ligeia” (1838), and “The Fall of the House of Usher,” and which was directed not to only women but to men as well, apparent in the essay’s publication in *Burton’s Gentleman’s Magazine*. According to his contemporary James Russell Lowell, Poe stands out because he is one of the few artists willing to confront “the vague and the unreal as sources of effect.” Writing for *Graham’s Lady’s and Gentleman’s Magazine*—which was itself the successor of *Burton’s Gentleman’s Magazine*, formed out of a merger with another periodical—Lowell argues that authors “have not used dread and horror alone, but only in combination with other qualities, as means of subjugating the fancies of their readers.” In other words, Lowell thinks good writers depend not only on suspense but also on the quotidian details of their readers’ lives: “The loftiest muse has ever a household and fireside charm about her.” According to Lowell, Poe lacked access to such a muse, because his “secret lies mainly in the skill with which he has employed the strange fascination of mystery and terror,” not in his ability to thread such unsettling gothic tropes into household writing (Lowell, “Edgar A. Poe” cvii). At best, then, for Lowell, Poe has a fireside charm more often apparent in his tales of haunted houses than in the kind of domestic literature written in his time by Hale, Lydia Maria Child, and others.

This popular fascination with Poe's use of suspense may overshadow his frequent portrayal of the kind of domestic spaces Lowell overlooks. It was Poe's engagement with domestic ideology that allowed him to draw upon more supposedly feminine literary forms—sentimentalism among them—in order to direct his alternatively gruesome and amorous literature to both men and women. Many of Poe's thoughts on domesticity were published in women's journals—at a time when those same women's journals were also publishing, even premiering, some of his most violent tales of mystery, torture, and murder. Because Poe understood how to use the emerging print culture of his time to disseminate his varied literature to diverse audiences across the nation, he was able to reach readers across economic, gender, and regional lines, appealing to their shared interests in both proper household arrangement and paradoxically sensationalized gothic fiction. Meredith McGill argues that the “conditions of publication [were] felt at the level of literary form” (3). She determines that this decentralized print culture allowed writers to develop innovative approaches in form and content to appeal, if not to a national audience, then paradoxically to both regional and transnational audiences. Eliza Richards builds upon similar claims in reading Poe's texts within the context of the poems, tales, and criticism that those women writers produced in his time. According to Richards, “seemingly opposed poetic modes are inseparable aspects of a process of cultural transmission”: in other words, “the poetics of creation are inseparable from the poetics of reception,” which reflects how “men's and women's literary traditions are overlapping and interdependent, though not identical,” producing a “gendering of poetic practices [that] is far more fluid and complex than traditionally considered” (*Gender and the Poetics of Reception* 1). Reading forward McGill and Richards's insights regarding publishing and readers' reception, I argue that domestic theory served as one outlet that influenced the form and content of Poe's works, and allowed him to

address his writings to varied audiences throughout the United States and abroad as part of his larger project to present himself as the literary voice for both America and Europe. At a time when publishing in the United States was going through significant changes in terms of ownership, reprinting, and distribution both domestic and foreign, Poe was at the forefront in terms of his ability to publish in so many different kinds of periodicals throughout the nation, then benefit through a culture of reprinting that would take his works overseas. The diversity of his audiences, in terms of region, politics, interests, and gender, is apparent just by the titles of those American periodicals: *The Southern Literary Messenger*, *The Broadway Journal*, *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine*, *Graham's Lady's and Gentleman's Magazine*, *Godey's Lady's Book*, *The American Whig Review*, *The United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, and the abolitionist newspaper *The Flag of Our Union*. These periodicals published not only Poe's tales and poems across numerous forms and genres but also his critical essays on a variety of cultural topics, including tales, art and literary criticism, women's fashion, landscape architecture, and domestic interior design. Given how extensive Poe's styles and publishing venues were, he is a strong example to begin an exploration of masculinity and domesticity in the nineteenth century.

"By a Bostonian": The Birthplace of Poe and His Early Literary Career

Poe understands what it means to feel at home—in a nation, in a town, in a house—as he defines his conception of his own masculinity and his understanding of what it means to be an author in relation to his birthplace of Boston, Massachusetts. Although Poe was a well traveled author, writing in New York, Virginia, and elsewhere, critical discourse often identifies him as a predominantly southern author.²⁷ This critical narrative grapples with his literary work rooted in

²⁷ Sterling F. Delano in particular positions Poe as a southern antagonist against his northern literary counterparts, especially in New England (*The Harbinger* 78). See also Robert D. Jacobs, "Rhetoric in Southern Writing" (1958);

the publishing markets of New England and New York, especially early in his career. Richmond, London, and Baltimore are just a few of the places where he lived and wrote—and that does not include the numerous spots he occupied in what is now the greater New York metropolitan area, including Greenwich Village and the Bronx. Poe is read as a man with so many homes that he might as well have no home at all. Yet Boston remains a city that is closely associated with significant moments in his literary career, including its beginning and end. An important center of national and regional publishing in the nineteenth century, Boston was the home to numerous periodicals catering to diverse gendered and political interests. Poe’s publications in many of these Boston periodicals, in particular its home journals and women’s journals such as *Godey’s Lady’s Book*, emphasize how he was able to appeal to diverse audiences.²⁸

Furthermore, Poe’s first and last publications were printed in Boston, and much as his literary life began in that city, so too did his literal life. While his literary executor Rufus Griswold attempted to elide Poe’s history with Boston, incorrectly listing Baltimore, Maryland, as his birthplace, scholars and the city itself have undertaken significant steps to reclaim Poe as the city’s premier author. Kenneth Silverman has been one of the major scholars to identify Poe’s close association with Boston, noting that it was Poe’s birthplace and the place his mother said she “found her *best*, and *most sympathetic* friends” (qtd in Silverman, *Edgar A. Poe: A Biography* 38; emphasis in original). In 2012, the City of Boston and its Poe Foundation took steps to secure their own civic appropriation of the author’s legacy. The Foundation designated a

Jay B. Hubbell, “Poe and the Southern Literary Tradition” (1960); Thomas Hubert, “The Southern Element in Poe’s Fiction” (1974); Joan Dayan, “Amorous Bondage” (1994); David Leverenz, “Poe and Gentry Virginia” (1997); J. Gerald Kennedy, *Poe and Race* (2001); David Faflik, “South of the ‘Border,’ or Poe’s Pym” (2004); and Eve Dunbar, “The Terror of Poe” (2007).

²⁸ Whereas *Godey’s Lady’s Book* was published by Louis A. Godey in Philadelphia, it was primarily edited in Boston by one of that city’s most prolific writers and philanthropists, Sarah Josepha Hale.

section of Boston near his birthplace as “Poe Square,” commissioning a statue of its hometown hero from New York artist Stefanie Rocknak. With her submitted design, Rocknak emphasizes that Poe is a figure in transit between home and somewhere else: “Just off the train, the figure would be walking south toward his place of birth, where his mother and father once lived.” The statue shows the artist clutching a suitcase, as papers—and a raven almost as large as him—escape its confines. Concludes Rocknak, “Poe with a trunk full of ideas - and worldwide success - is finally coming home” (qtd in Kaiser). Rocknak’s statue demonstrates a challenge for many of us in literary scholarship: whether it is more apt to let this male writer continue on his wayward path, or whether we can make stronger, more significant arguments by fixing him in one location, one home.

Much as scholars struggle to place Poe, so did the author himself: he certainly was not at peace with Boston, often resisting it. Born in Boston in 1809, Poe’s relationship with this city was contentious to say the least. He referred to the city as “Frogpondia,” likening its most acclaimed writers to torpid amphibians, focused on interiority yet lacking engagement with the world at large. He engaged in caustic debates with the city and New England’s leading poets and publishers. The bitterness of Poe’s remarks against Frogpondian authors for their ornamental writing and moralistic posturing inspired particularly sharp criticism against his own writing and its lack of morals. Whereas Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, for example, thought that a moral “was essential to poetry,” Poe thought the two should be kept separate (Ljungquist, “The Poet as Critic” 13). Ralph Waldo Emerson mocked Poe as an inferior poet, only a “jingle man” (qtd in Howells, *Literary Friends and Acquaintance* 63). Walt Whitman argued that Poe’s writing was “almost without the first sign of moral principle, or of the concrete or its heroisms, or the simpler affections of the heart” (*Prose Works* 231). These assessments should not overlook that Poe

actually did engage in such morals, albeit in his earlier poetry from the 1820s, evident especially in “Tamerlane,” set in New England and focused on the danger of ambition as it infects young men such as Poe himself. In fact, in the 1840s, Poe had written to Longfellow about the “fervent admiration [that Longfellow’s] genius has inspired in me,” and referred to him as “unquestionably the best poet in America” (qtd in Meyers, *Edgar Allan Poe* 171). Around that same time, however, Poe was defining himself in opposition against those New England authors, the byproduct being that he was positioning himself, intentionally or not, as an outstanding national figure, in both the North and the South. Poe had written critical assessments of fellow writers, with both praise and rebuke, but his remarks about Longfellow in the 1840s began to take a decidedly caustic tone. Poe presented his remarks against Longfellow to a national audience: much as his earlier poetry published in Boston had been criticized for its derivativeness, Poe now referred to Longfellow as “a determined imitator and a dexterous adapter of the ideas of other people,” drawing so heavily upon especially European poets’ forms that his work lacked originality (qtd in Meyers, *Edgar Allan Poe* 171). For his part, Longfellow avoided writing any public response to Poe’s published accusations of plagiarism, leaving it to his supporters to defend the originality of his works—and to accuse Poe of being the actual plagiarist, again promulgating arguments that his work lacked originality (Wagenknecht, *Henry Wadsworth Longfellow* 144). Poe then responded even more furiously in the press against not just Longfellow but anyone who would defend this author’s apparently derivative works. These competing allegations of plagiarism leveled against Poe and Longfellow catapulted Poe into national literary attention, albeit more for the viciousness of his criticism than for the quality of this criticism or that of his tales and poems.

Poe's frustration with Boston-area writers was particularly acute in 1845, a year that encapsulates his conflicted regard for his birthplace, and his often contradictory work to present himself as both a southerner and a northerner, hence a writer whose works were placed in a range of periodicals throughout the still growing nation. That year, Poe had much to celebrate: he began writing for the *Broadway Journal*, and he published what is likely his most famous poem, "The Raven." That same year, the publisher Wiley and Putnam, persuaded by the popularity of "The Raven," printed *Tales*, Poe's first volume in five years. Despite the publication of *Tales* and the re-printing of "The Raven" in more than 20 periodicals in its first year of release, the lack of copyright protection in the nineteenth century denied Poe much financial gain in publishing. Poe attempted to parlay the critical success of "The Raven" and his newly invigorated publishing success to secure payment for public readings. One opportunity took him back to the city of his birth: on October 16, 1845, Poe presented an evening talk at the Boston Lyceum, for which he would be paid \$50. Advertisements from the Lyceum marketed the talk as featuring a new original work by Poe (Walker, *Edgar Allan Poe* 37).

The 1845 Boston Lyceum talk was a failure. Poe arrived to his own reading drunk, the *Boston Daily Star* claiming he spoke while in a "gentlemanly condition of liquor obfuscation"; Poe admitted he was "drunk" in a subsequent editorial response to this report (qtd in Berry, *All That Makes a Man* 42). At the beginning of his Lyceum talk, Poe initiated a vituperative tirade against the kind of didactic poetry emerging out of New England, alluding to the works by Longfellow and others (Ljungquist, "The Poet as Critic" 14). While he indulged his audience by reciting "The Raven," he still had no original poem to present as had been advertised. He had earlier propositioned fellow poet Frances Sargent Osgood to have her write a poem for him to read as his own, one that, as he put it, was "equal to my reputation" (Richards, *Gender and the*

Poetics of Reception 1).²⁹ With no new poem written, Poe instead presented a poem titled “The Messenger Star of Tycho Brahe”—but which was really his previously published epic poem “Al Aaraaf” (1829), a work that by 1845 had fallen into obscurity (Walker, *Edgar Allan Poe* 37). Critics were not kind to Poe’s talk. Cornelia W. Walter, editor of the *Boston Evening Transcript*, called Poe’s presentation a “failure” that inspired audience members to walk out of the Lyceum “rapidly” (Walter 2). The best review was a tepid one from *Boston Courier* on October 18, 1845, which referred to Poe’s talk as “an elegant and classic production,” yet again emphasizing that the audience thinned quickly over the course of his talk (“Mr. Poe’s Poem” 2).

Responding in his periodical *Broadway Journal* to these criticisms against the Lyceum talk, Poe attempted to pass off his reading of “Al Aaraaf” as a wholly original poem that spoke to the city of Boston as what he called a complicated “hoax” against the New England literati, and a bit of self-deprecation against his earlier literature. He claimed that this early poem of his, written when he was less mature in developing compelling form and contents, was nearly incomprehensible and so feigning intellectual depth that of course the posturing transcendentalists in his audience would lap up such drivel. He added that Boston readers were so interested in such uninspired works by its native poets—Longfellow implied to be one of them—that it was not fair for the Lyceum to specifically request an “original” poem when no one in that town would know what originality actually is (qtd in Ljungquist, “Poe’s ‘Al Aaraaf’ 199).

The coincidence that his Lyceum reading of “Al Aaraaf,” a tale inspired largely from orientalist rhetoric, would be referred to in the popular press as the “Boston poem” has striking similarities to another coincidence, as related to Poe’s first published poem, one that also was

²⁹ Eliza Richards has read productively into Poe’s appeal to Osgood to write a poem that he could claim as his own. This instance especially speaks to how well Poe and his female colleagues were able to impersonate each other’s voices, assuming alternatively feminine and masculine voices, hence disrupting conventional gendered separations (Richards, “Gender and the Poetics of Reception” 1).

orientalist in nature and was first released in Boston. In revising “Al Aaraaf” from a tale of the orient into one that would speak to the transcendentalists of Boston, Poe drew upon eastern settings and in the process actually spoke to his concerns about American masculinity in the United States. This work required Poe to negotiate the positions of the West and the East, and also the North and the South, in order to produce a sense of masculinity that would be universal and hence at home any place in the United States and even the world at large. This work was applicable to Poe’s effort to portray himself alternatively as an authentic southerner and as a native son of Boston. His talk at the Lyceum was the later attempt to re-style himself as part of the Boston intellectual community; when he failed to garner critical acclaim, he returned to his chastisement of New England writers such as Longfellow.

Sidney Moss refers to the Boston Lyceum “hoax” as the beginning of “Poe’s downfall as a critic” (190), yet it is oddly appropriate that Poe’s downfall would take place in the same city in which his literary career began, especially as centering around his publication that drew heavily upon arabesque tropes. “Al Aaraaf” is one critical instance in his varied career in Boston. Long before the 1845 reading of “Al Aaraaf” at the Lyceum, Poe released another poem in 1827 that turned issues of the East into issues of being a man in Boston. There was one orientalist figure who served Poe as trying to position himself between the South in which he grew up, and Boston to where he escaped following his falling out with his father and his work to enter the literary marketplace. And it is the figure of one fourteenth-century conqueror who serves as Poe’s avatar: his pseudonym as a writer, and his conception of masculinity at home. Boston was the site of Poe’s first publication, the volume *Tamerlane and Other Poems* (1827), and the book’s titular poem “Tamerlane” documents the history of an ambitious man, the fourteenth-century Turkish conqueror Timur the Lame, struggling between his competing desires

for fame, for love, and for a home.³⁰ Considering that Poe admits to portraying the legendary conqueror as sounding less like a Turkish man of the 1400s and more like a Boston man of the 1800, that Poe would use “Tamerlane” as a pseudonym for some of his earliest poems, and that the character’s personality and desires in his poem resemble how readers have imagined Poe’s personality and desires, this first of Poe’s publication, often overlooked in preference to his later works, can provide an alternative trajectory for reading how Poe portrays domesticity and masculinity in his later literature.

Poe’s departure for Boston in many ways resembles his own efforts to escape, if not from a moss-covered cottage like Timur’s, then at least from a location not exactly welcoming to him. After his falling out with his foster father John Allan, Poe left Richmond, Virginia, for Boston in March 1827, carrying with him a manuscript of his poems, which in subsequent years he claimed to have penned as early as age 10 or 14. Now excluded from the Allan family’s financial support, Poe worked numerous jobs in merchandise sales and publishing in order to finance his June 1827 publication of *Tamerlane and Other Poems*. Stephen W. Berry argues that the protagonist of *Tamerlane*, in his quest to conquer that all he sees, would have spoken for Poe and other southern young men who settled other lands under the pretense of spreading civilization and Western culture into foreign places. With Poe’s struggles to finance his own publication of *Tamerlane*, this reading of Poe as a southerner is compelling, yet overlooks the influence that the New England setting had upon this author as he revised what would be his first published work. Jeffrey Meyers reads the preface of *Tamerlane* as “beg[inning] the confessional mode of many of his later poems and stories, and employ[ing] his characteristic method of simultaneous concealment and revelation” (34). Applying Meyers’s idea more closely to the poem

³⁰ For clarity in this study, “Tamerlane” will refer to either Poe’s poem or collected volume, and “Timur” to the protagonist of both works.

“Tamerlane,” in defining Timur as being as much a Bostonian as he was, even as Poe conceals his own identity by name yet uses the plot of the poem to speak of his own life and his own concerns, I argue that Poe uses an orientalist imagining of Timur to speak obliquely about his own ideas regarding youth, ambition, and most importantly gender and domestic discourse, as I present in the next section.

“My Home No More”: “Tamerlane,” Domestic Masculinity, and Bringing the Orient to Boston

In 1822, when Poe was about 13 years old, a production of Matthew Gregory Lewis’s play *Timour the Tartar: A Grand Romantic Melodrama* was staged in his home at the time, Richmond, Virginia. The play focused on the titular historical figure, the fourteenth-century Turkic conqueror Timur the Lame. Timur was the subject of much orientalist rhetoric from a range of authors including Christopher Marlowe, Lewis, and eventually Poe himself, all of whom alternatively celebrated Timur as a sensitive poetic soul, and feared him as a brutal dictator. Based on the time and location of the 1822 Richmond staging of *Timour*, Poe may have been in the audience, or at least would have heard about the performance. From that point forward, as Poe attempted to define himself as a legitimately southern writer, the historical figure Timur, conceptualized by Poe in largely orientalist terms, would serve as the author’s avatar for meditating on his own identity. Poe took on Timur’s name for his own publications: two of his 1833 poems for the *Baltimore Saturday Visitor*, “Fanny” and “To —-,” were published under the pseudonym “Tamerlane.” The challenges that Timur faces in his story have parallels in Poe’s life and publishing, especially with regard to his sense of himself as a man who failed to adhere to strict gendered conceptions of masculinity, and as an imagined foreigner never quite at home wherever he ventured. Like this bellicose yet sentimental man desiring a home, Poe saw himself

as misunderstood by his peers, isolating himself even as he was yearning for some sense of being at home. Timur, as his other persona, often led Poe to question just where he belonged, hence drawing him back to Boston.

In footnotes to “Tamerlane,” Poe admits that he re-imagines this fourteenth-century Turkic conqueror as speaking without historical accuracy: “I must beg the reader’s pardon for making Tamerlane a Tartar of the fourteenth century, speak in the same language as a Boston gentleman of the nineteenth; but of the Tartar mythology we have little information” (*Selected Writings* 10 n3). Poe’s excuse overlooks the contemporary scholarship available in his time that in fact did provide significant information about fourteenth-century Turkish culture, regardless of its accuracy or its availability to a young, financially troubled Boston poet such as himself. In a subsequent footnote, Poe also identifies the cultural inconsistency when he structures “Tamerlane” as a deathbed confession given by Timur, who is ostensibly Muslim, to a Christian friar. Poe offers some justification based on unnamed historical sources:

How shall I account for giving him a ‘friar,’ as a death-bed confessor—I cannot exactly determine. He wanted some one to listen to his tale—and why not a friar? It does not pass the bounds of possibility—quite sufficient for my purpose—and I have at least good authority on my side for such innovations. (*Selected Writings* 9 n2)

Whether in the content of the poem proper or its footnotes, Poe makes little effort to justify the anachronisms, geographical errors, and cultural imperialism. While Poe humbles himself as a young author whose cultural appropriation will be inaccurate and perhaps discordant with the overall message of his poem, his exaggeration was not unique at the time of publication: other nineteenth-century American writers had capitalized upon an orientalist image of Timur as largely a vicious warlord, overlooking the deeper complexity of this person. Some writers in this time period were more aware of the flawed rhetoric surrounding Timur. As one article for *The*

Portfolio (1816) began, “Tamerlane was unquestionably a mighty conqueror; twenty-seven crowns were the splendid rewards of thirty-five victorious campaigns; Bajazet and the Ottoman empire sunk beneath his arms. From the Volga to the Persian gulf, and from the Ganges to Damascus, the nations owned his sway.” While emphasizing Timur’s conquests and masculinized posturing, the article primarily excoriates historians for fixating on Timur’s “almost boundless range of conquest” to “stigmatize [him] as the scourge and the destroyer of mankind” in order to ignore how “his soul was magnanimous, his victories ennobled by humanity, and the character of the conqueror was exalted and adorned by the graces and accomplishments of the hero.” Both artists and historians in Poe’s time imagined Timur as a crass, bloody tyrant, beginning life as “a peasant and a rebel,” always an outsider, even monstrous, “deformed in body, a fierce barbarian, resembling Alexander in nothing but the scene and destructiveness of his victories” (1839). Artists such as Poe attempted to recognize Timur as the learned scholar that he was, and emphasized his capacity for aesthetic appreciation and sentimental nostalgia for a simpler, rustic life. During a time of rapid national expansion, Timur could represent for these writers an attractive example for United States domination across the continent: he was a conqueror, yet he pined for the love, family, and domestic life he sacrificed in order to amass his empire. Timur was imagined as a person who embodied the possessive aspirations of many Americans. Still, he was an example orientalized in order to be held at a distance thereby offering an alternative perspective on continental conquest, and the dangers of such ambition. As a Middle Eastern figure, Timur was unfamiliar enough to antebellum readers who imagined a predominantly white United States populace, hence this historical figure could be a vessel for those less appealing traits that Americans did not want to embody: he could be the doppelganger against which righteous American distinguished their civilizing of western

lands compared to Timur's mere brutal conquest what *The Portfolio* referred to as his "vanquishing the powers of Christendom" ("Observations on the Tragedy" 138-139).

In light of such contentious, often competing portrayals of Timur, this historical figure enabled Poe to explore many of the themes of ambition and isolation that would dominate his later literature. Much of this ignorance allows Poe to revise Timur's life into one that better speaks to the author's own personal concerns. Boston was the place that Poe used initially to identify himself as the author of some of his earliest published work: he signed *Tamerlane and Other Poems* only with the subtitle, *By a Bostonian*—hence assuming that same manner of speech that he gave to his avatar Timur. "Tamerlane" therefore anticipates how Poe will approach these similar concerns about domesticity and gender in his later works: Timur, a character so closely associated with Poe's time in Boston, serves as a fictional embodiment that elucidates the author's struggles to negotiate his understanding of masculinity and home during a time that for Poe involved numerous removes to multiple cities, for the chance at professional success and out of personal complications with family.

Although not hiding from the public this volume of some of the first poems he ever wrote—at least initially, as he published *Tamerlane* anonymously—Poe later segregated "Tamerlane" and his other earlier poems to the sections marked "juvenile" in subsequent collections of his works, an organizing structure used by later editors. Inspired in part by Poe's own regard for "Tamerlane" as one of those juvenile poems, as well as his prefatory remarks and footnotes, the poem is generally viewed as an imperfect work by a very young author. The 1827 *Tamerlane* publication was released when Poe was only 18 years old—a year younger than the collection's publisher, Calvin Thomas. This volume would be the only book Thomas ever published, his printing shop closing the year of publication (Meyers 33; Reid 30; Poe, *Tamerlane*

and Other Poems 12.). *Tamerlane* as a collection is not completely a critical failure, however. The volume included early versions of what would become some of Poe's most famous works: "Dreams," "Spirits of the Death" (originally published as "Visit of the Dead"), and "Evening Star." *Tamerlane* also included one of the last poems published in his lifetime, "A Dream Within a Dream," published with the original title, despite his critics' chastisement for his mimicry, "Imitation." But the title poem "Tamerlane" has been difficult for scholars to approach, given how uncharacteristic it seems in form and content compared to Poe's later works. A lengthy account of the life of fourteenth-century Turkic conqueror Timur the Lame, the poem went through numerous revisions, ranging in length between 200 to 400 lines, much longer than most of Poe's other poems and standing in stark contrast to his admonishment in "The Philosophy of Composition" that the best literary works are those that can be read in one sitting. So lengthy was the 1827 version that it took up most of the forty pages that comprised *Tamerlane and Other Poems*. Yet in subsequent edits to the poem, Poe reduced the length to about 200 lines, with some revisions to its content, including the removal of all footnotes that, while providing context in which to understand the life of this ancient conqueror, also jokingly revealed the author's self-awareness of the plot's absurdity.³¹

Not only in its length but also in its overall form and content, "Tamerlane" differs sharply in from Poe's later works because it is so reliant on the tropes of authors who had more acclaim and popularity than this young poet did.³² Whereas his subsequent fiction, criticism, and poetry tend to focus on domesticity for either intense cultural analysis of interior design, or setting

³¹ Unless indicated otherwise, all line citations to "Tamerlane" come from the 1845 publication of *The Raven and Other Poems*. Citations from the preface of the 1827 book *Tamerlane* come from its 1884 reprint.

³² Even Poe's most popular works are imitative, however, alluding heavily to works by women writers especially. "The Raven," for example, borrows its rhythm and stanza form from Elizabeth Barrett's "Lady Geraldine's Courtship" (1844)—and Poe acknowledged as much when he dedicated *The Raven and Other Poems* (1845) to her.

scenes appropriate for his frightening tales, “Tamerlane” sounds less like a creation of the erudite and horrific Poe, and more like an eighteenth-century romantic portrayal of a lovelorn Byronic hero; in fact, it concludes with an allusion borrowed from Byron’s *Don Juan*. Even the name of Timur’s lover in the poem, the fictional Ada, is an allusion to Byron’s daughter, Ada Lovelace. Especially in his portrayal of Timur as drawn from Byron’s *The Giaour*, Poe’s imitation of romantic writers included borrowing heavily from their fascination with the arabesque and orientalism. Poe’s use of both is well documented,³³ especially as he appropriated one of those key words in developing his 1840 *Tales of the Grotesque and Arabesque*. Poe’s portrayal of Timur’s Asia adhered to a larger cultural fascination following the 1708 English translation of *One Thousand and One Nights*—a story that Poe continued in his “The Thousand-and-Second Tale of Scheherazade,” in which the titular female narrator is executed when her additional story fails to impress her married monarch.³⁴ In writing “Tamerlane” Poe also borrowed heavily from works in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that used an idealized Asian setting to meditate upon philosophical concerns: Montesquieu’s *Persian Letters*, Voltaire’s *Zadig*, Samuel Johnson’s *Rasselas*, Samuel Beckford’s *Vathek*, and Thomas Moore’s *Lalla Rookh*. Poe also may have drawn upon Christopher Marlowe’s play *Tamburlaine* in order to define Timur as a rhetorical figure to suit the message of his work. There are significant differences, however. Marlowe remodeled the Muslim Timur into a figure of anti-Islamic rhetoric who ends the play stepping upon the Quran. In contrast, Poe, like other romantic orientalists, tends to portray Timur as seemingly more American than foreign: as Poe himself says in the footnotes to his

³³ See also Athar Murtuza, “An Arabian Source for Poe’s ‘The Pit and the Pendulum’” (1972); Paul Lyons, “Opening Accounts in the South Seas” (1996); Jacob Rama Berman, “Domestic Terror and Poe’s Arabesque Interior” (2005); Travis Montgomery, “Poe’s Oriental Gothic” (2010); Jim Egan, *Oriental Shadows* (2011); and Dennis R. Perry, “A Poe within a Poe: *Inception*’s Arabesque Play with ‘Ligeia’” (2012).

³⁴ That this story of a woman’s murder premiered in *Godey’s Lady’s Book* testifies to the cross-gendered interest that tales of the orient held for nineteenth-century readers, as I will analyze in subsequent sections.

poem, Timur hardly sounds like he is Turkish, his manner of speaking making him sound like he would be as much at home in Boston (Meyers 34). Ultimately Poe's imitateness, while beneficial to many of his latter satires—especially his imitations of the abstruse form and content of many transcendentalist authors—did not bring much critical attention in his time, and very little since. *The United States Review and Literary Gazette*, *The North American Review*, and Samuel Kettel's 1829 *Specimens of American Poetry* all mentioned the book, but only gave it brief mention in their catalogs of recent releases. Calling the collection a volume also is being more than kind: forty pages in length, it was printed more like a pamphlet than a book, and only fifty copies were released (Meyers 33-34; Quinn 128).

It is through this imitateness, however, including the misplaced imitateness of Timur sounding more New England than Turkish, that Poe speaks to personal concerns about his place in Boston, his place in the nation, and his place as a man. In "Tamerlane," Poe holds competing masculine subjectivities simultaneously, offering a complex portrayal of the historical Tartan conqueror that, while drawing upon racist orientalist and arabesque characterizations, reflects the gender and racial complexities inherent to numerous masculinities in Poe's time. Especially in the poem's closing lines—borrowed heavily in content and even wording from Byron—Timur serves as a figure to whom Poe can ascribe the complexities of domestic masculinity. Much as Timur repressed many of his private concerns in order to advance publicly as a ruler, so too did Poe and many writers, men and women, have to find a balance between the affairs of their homes with their desires for fame in the public sphere.

Poe characterizes Timur in part as a swaggering figure of affectless masculinity. The Turkic conqueror thus becomes an orientalist substitute for a United States beginning to foresee running out of a frontier to settle. In his opening lines, Timur, now on his deathbed and giving

his confession to an attending priest, distinguishes himself from this priest, whom he judges as too sentimental, by emphasizing how regal, how militant, how divine, and overall how much more manly he is than this man of the cloth. He thinks of the priest not as a man of God but as a “power / Of Earth” who merely feigns that he can “shrive me of the sin / Unearthly pride hath revell’d in”: in the eyes of Timur, the priest postures as if he has authority, whereas the conqueror has the actual throne, crown, lands, and subjects to prove what true power is. Even as Timur apologizes to the priest for questioning his authority—“I would not call thee fool, old man, / But such is not a gift of thine”—his remarks are filled with left-handed compliments and, even as he is dying, he mocks the age of his attending friar (lines 3-5, 11-12).

Timur’s mockery gives way to an oblique call for sympathy, however.

My passions, from that hapless hour,
Usurp’d a tyranny which men
Have deem’d, since I have reach’d to power,
My innate nature—be it so. (lines 65-68)

Timur defines his success in conquest as born from his own ambition, gendered in this text as not necessarily only masculine but also feminine. This “innate nature” that his subjects impute to him, Timur implies, refers to his sensitivity, a quality that had been associated with the historical figure by Poe’s predecessors. Here Poe emphasizes that sensitive, aesthetic quality that the popular imagination conferred upon Timur in the nineteenth century. At this moment in the poem, his ambition should be at its strongest, but Timur shuns such gentleness and lets his “passions” have “tyranny” upon him, to re-make him into the warrior-monarch he was destined to be. But Timur cannot keep up the affectless demeanor and, as with many of Poe’s stories, the change in this man’s persona is blamed upon a woman. “But, father,” interrupts the dying monarch,

there liv’d one who, then,

Then—in my boyhood—when their fire
Burn'd with a still intenser glow
(For passion must, with youth, expire)
E'en *then* who knew this iron heart
In woman's weakness had a part. (lines 69-74)

Referring to a woman, his lover Ada, as having had her “part” in his transformation, Timur recognizes his masculine posturing as defined along a spectrum with femininity. In describing his “intenser” emotions, especially his “passion,” as associated with “woman’s weakness,” Poe subscribes to limiting characterizations of women regarding their diverse potential emotional orientations, as potential for all persons regardless of gender—from seeming affectlessness to intense emotionality. Poe’s clichéd portrayal suits the sentimental tone of Timur’s deathbed confession, again limiting women as the weaker sex and as the beloved object that is too weak to survive this world.

But that is not all that Timur argues. He claims that it was a “woman’s weakness” that was part of his “iron heart”—was part of his own emotionality. He is hinting at a feminine potential in himself. As with other popular portrayals in antebellum literature by Margaret Fuller and, as I show in the next chapter, Nathaniel Hawthorne, androgyny held a unique place in Poe’s literature. Whereas many of his works punish men for seeming weakness, out of their gender panic because they find themselves inadequate compared to the women in their lives whose deaths these men expedite—the alcoholic, impoverished narrator of “The Black Cat” who murders his wife; the weak product of incestuous aristocracy, Roderick Usher, who buries his sister Madeline alive in “The Fall of the House of Usher”; and the opium addicted narrator of “Ligeia” who sacrifices Lady Rowena to resurrect his titular lover yet ends his story confronting the haunting image of that same lover whose intelligence and accomplishments eclipsed his own—it is Tamerlane who, as Poe’s earliest published protagonist, can provide an alternative

trajectory for reading those men who benefit from their embrace of femininity, however temporary or problematic that embrace may be. These more androgynous men—among them, C. Auguste Dupin, Roderick Usher, the silenced man of “Loss of Breath,” and Ligeia’s lover—assume both masculine qualities and feminine qualities, finding themselves, or feeling themselves, to be positioned in ways similar to the women that they themselves subjugate. Poe’s lines complicate how to read Timur, both for his erudite and scholastic appreciation of the arts, and his violent conquest of so much of Asia: he is both a cultured figure who thinks himself too feminized because he is guided by his emotions, and too masculinized by his ambition for power. Timur begins the poem, chastising his own “yearning heart,” as the attending priest listens:

O yearning heart! I did inherit
Thy withering portion with the fame,
The searing glory which hath shone
Amid the Jewels of my throne,
Halo of Hell! and with a pain
Not Hell shall make me fear again—
O craving heart, for the lost flowers
And sunshine of my summer hours!
The undying voice of that dead time,
With its interminable chime,
Rings, in the spirit of a spell,
Upon thy emptiness—a knell. (lines 15-26)

Initially, Timur assumes the tone of regret against his heart—his emotions—as if they are the fault for his assumed downfall. As he proceeds, however, his downfall is not the loss of his empire, as he dies still the lord of those lands he has conquered. Rather, his actual downfall is his sacrifice of those happier moments from his past, the “sunshine of my summer hours,” for a “throne” and its associated unending “Hell” of a heart forever empty. It is not so simple for Timur to act as if his heart compromised his accomplishments—far from it, as it is his sentimentality that motivates his conquest. The traditionally feminized sentimentality in which Timur indulges motivates his masculine conquest.

Furthermore, it is not just that to be emotional is to be womanly, in Timur's opinion: it is that ambition, that hyper-masculine posturing that allowed his successful conquest, has in itself potential femininity. Anticipating the gender-neutral and trans-gender potentiality of Margaret Fuller and his contemporary and near-contemporary peers, Poe's first published poem establishes an alternative origin for tracing his later portrayals of men and women, especially that beloved lost lover. Whereas Ada's death is never portrayed in the poem—only hinted, upon Timur's return to their previously shared home, not desolate—Timur's deathbed confession implicitly ends with his demise: when the poem stops, Timur stops speaking, likely then stops living. By using "Tamerlane" as the origin of Poe's literary career, gender studies can re-approach his long career in collaboration and publishing with women writers to see not only the inherent misogyny and objectification of women in his works, but also the potentially productive work in which his gender portrayals question just how firm are the assumed differences between masculinity and femininity, especially regarding emotionality, affectlessness, and as I will show regarding the poem's concluding lines, the domestic space.

Poe struggles to adapt the duality of this historical figure into a representation of masculinity suitable for an antebellum United States audience. Timur tries to pass off this outburst of love as just a momentary interruption that leaves his mind too addled to know how to proceed:

I have no words—alas!—to tell
The loveliness of loving well! (lines 75-76)

The awkward repetition in Poe's verse is played up as merely the dying monarch's own struggles to express himself clearly. At this point Timur can mock himself for his immaturity: his dreams of conquest, "Of human battle," being so foolish when he was speaking of them with "my voice, / My own voice, silly child!" rather than the voice of the adult he is today (lines 50-51). Poe

eulogizes this lost idealism of youth as a transition to Timur's concluding meditation on the need to find a home. "[B]oyhood is a summer sun," Timur tells the priest, "Whose waning is the dreariest one—For all we live to know is known / And all we seek to keep hath flown" (lines 207-210). After pages of the dying Timur praising himself for how great a conqueror he is, the last lines focus on his regret for sacrificing what could have been a long romance with his beloved Ada, in their shared cottage, now decrepit with age and as empty as his heart. Borrowing lines from Byron's *Don Juan*, Timur narrates: "I reach'd my home—my home no more— / For all had flown who made it so" (lines 213-214). Despite how different Poe's first published poem is from his later, better-known works, "Tamerlane" inaugurates his lifelong interest in issues of masculinity with regard to what it means for men to feel at home. Timur waits until the end of his deathbed confession, after defining himself to his attending priest as such an erudite and strong warrior, to play the part of a recalcitrant man finally ready to admit his flaws and mistakes. After so many lines of self-aggrandizement, the sentimental ending contrasts sharply with Timur's tone throughout most of the poem. Poe explains this stark difference by suggesting, within the poem, that the cause for this sentimental ending is the prevailing influence of women long after their departure from domestic spaces. As Timur remembers leaving the cottage, he continues,

I pass'd from out its mossy door,
And, tho' my tread was soft and low,
A voice came from the threshold stone
Of one whom I had earlier known— (lines 215-218)

The dash gives no hint regarding to whom the voice belongs. Ada seems to be the answer, yet it is not clear whether the actual woman continues to occupy this cottage, or the voice was merely in Timur's imagination. Yet his inclination to hear something within the walls of this house

implies a lingering female presence that continues to haunt him, and his ambitions for conquest.

Continuing from the dash, Timur lectures the priest:

O, I defy thee, Hell, to show
On beds of fire that burn below,
An humbler heart—a deeper wo (lines 219-221)

At this point Timur seems to be engaged only in performance to the priest, a showing of regret for the sake of last rites. But the difference in tone at this moment also directs attention to the emerging duality at the time when Poe is writing, as domestic ideology is increasingly addressed by women writers, as Poe struggles to find a way to define a space for men when, as Timur says, all those women have left the domestic space. As a whole “Tamerlane” shows the development of his title character, across antithesis and up to synthesis: he begins as a boyish and even womanly child, eventually shunning such supposed weaknesses to be the powerful conqueror he is upon his deathbed, but concludes with an account that seeks to blend his lovelorn innocence with his impassioned sense of victory. By making Ada into the figure for which he conquers, does he thereby conquer her? If that is an idea that Poe pursues, he consistently undermines every such claim as he has his male protagonist fail to attain that goal. This point is finalized when he returns to find “home no more.” He can claim an image of Ada, yet that image itself is tenuous and, as evident in the poem, constantly shifting—but he definitely cannot claim Ada as a person.

“Boyish, Feeble, and Altogether Deficient”: Publishing in *Godey’s Lady’s Book*

When Poe next released an edition of “Tamerlane,” it was two years later in 1829 in *Al Aaraaf, Tamerlane, and Minor Poems*. By this point, Poe was not considering himself as only a Bostonian: unlike the volume *Tamerlane*, *Al Aaraaf* had no pseudonym but identified its author

as “Edgar A. Poe.” By his 1843, *Al Aaraaf* included as its subtitle “By a Virginian.” The Bostonian was now a southerner, as Poe was actively positioning himself as not only a regional but also a national author. As well, the only explanation Poe gave in *Al Aaraaf* concerning why he published “Tamerlane” anonymously was a vague reference to “circumstances of a private nature” (qtd in I. Walker 18). Based on the kind of critical reaction that Poe received in one of the first reviews of this and other poems, his hesitance may have been warranted. While this early review contained some praise for the young author, its naming of him as “boyish” and “feeble” would follow him into his later career, influencing how he would present gender and domesticity in his later literature.

In January 1845, in its first year of publication, *Broadway Journal* included the following piece regarding its literary competitor, *Godey’s Lady’s Book*: “No less than ten ladies and six gentlemen, besides the editors, have helped to fill the forty-six pages of this magazine. [...] But the great marvel is that so many writers should have been able to produce so small an amount of readable matter.” Although he would not join *Broadway Journal* as editor until a month after this opinion column was published, the passage reflects the complicated relationship that Edgar Allan Poe had with *Godey’s Lady’s Book*. It was in *Godey’s* that Poe published some of his most notable works, even his critical essays, including “Literati in New York City” and a re-printing of his well-known view of Nathaniel Hawthorne’s *Twice-Told Tales*. In fact, Poe’s short story “The Assignation” first appeared as “The Visionary” in the January 1834 issue of *Godey’s* publication, then known by the long-winded title *Monthly Magazine of Belles-Lettres and the Arts, the Lady’s Book*. Published anonymously, “The Visionary” was Poe’s first story to be made available to a wide periodical marketplace. This story, which concludes with a man and a woman ending their tumultuous love affair by assisting each other in suicide, seems hardly the

subject matter for a women's journal that was supposed to cater to genteel highbrow readers. Poe's choice to publish such a work in *Godey's Lady's Book*, and the decisions by its owner Louis Godey and his eventual editor Sarah Josepha Hale to continue to publish such works, illustrates the complexities of gender-specific print culture before the Civil War.

The works Poe published for *Godey's Lady's Book* are various in form and content. In addition to "The Assigination," the magazine published his other tales, including "A Tale of the Ragged Mountains," "The Oblong Box," "The Thousand-and-Second Tale of Scheherazade," "The Cask of Amontillado," "Mellonta Tauta," and, of all titles for a women's journal, "Thou Art the Man!" In addition, *Godey's Lady's Book* published his criticism, including well known pieces such as "Marginalia" and "The Literati of New York City" and reviews of notable authors. In these reviews, Poe brought attention—positive and negative—to well known authors such as William Cullen Bryant, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and William Gilmore Simms, and was also instrumental in attracting readers' attention to many women authors such as Elizabeth Oakes Smith, Mary Hewitt, and Frances Sargent Osgood, some of whom also would be published in *Godey's Lady's Book*. He may also have written additional essays on proper decorum as directed to the magazine's women readers and the men in their lives. Thomas Mabbott, for example, attributes to him "A Few Words on Etiquette" from the August 1846 issue of *Godey's* (206). With such a variety of available genres in which he could write, and with the number of topics on which it could publish, Poe and *Godey's Lady's Book* were able to form a mutually beneficial relationship that allowed the former to develop his unique philosophy of literature and larger literary treatment of gendered domestic spaces, and allowed the latter to capitalize upon a growing marketplace of female readers fascinated not only with the latest in French fashions and

proper domestic upkeep, but also guidance in aesthetic appreciation and production—and of course sensationalized tales of murder.

Founded by Louis Godey in the 1830s, the Philadelphia *Lady's Book* struggled to attract women readers, until he bought out and merged with Sarah Josepha Hale's Boston journal *Ladies' Magazine and Literary Gazette*, a journal referred to as “the oldest periodical of the kind in the United States” (Oberholtzer 229). The merger resulted in large part because Godey wanted to hire Hale based on her greater success at appealing to a variety of women readers from a number of economic backgrounds and with varied interests. He also admired her success in reaching beyond conventionally feminine topics such as household management and childcare to include intensive literary appreciation and analysis. The merger was a success for both Godey and Hale, making the resulting *Godey's Lady's Book* one of the bestselling magazines in the nineteenth century, eventually having a subscription of 150,000 in 1860, as much as its competitor *Harper's*, a statistic all the more impressive when most magazines at that time folded after less than a year (Ratner 66).

Poe, writing in *Graham's Magazine* in December 1841, was quick to point out, “Mr. GODEY is only known to the literary world as editor and publisher of ‘The Lady's Book,’ but his celebrity in this regard entitles him to a place in this collection. [...] The man who invariably writes so well as Mr. G. invariably does, gives evidence of a fine taste, combined with an indefatigability which will ensure his permanent success in the world's affairs” (“A Chapter on Autobiography [Part II]” 274). Poe had so much confidence in *Godey's Lady's Book* that he even chastised Godey for choosing to publish one of his letters in *The Times* instead. “All the error about it was yours,” wrote Poe to Godey. “You should have done as I requested — published it in the ‘Book.’ [...] I have never written an article upon which I more confidently

depend for literary reputation than that Reply.” Perhaps as a joke, Poe threatened to sue Godey over the seeming insult (Letter to Louis A. Godey, 16 July 1846).

As for the book’s editor, Hale brought to Godey’s lackluster journal a sensibility that tapped into an interest in family togetherness among white nineteenth-century Christian American women—and many of the men in their lives, Poe included. Although as indicated by its title the journal was intended for women, *Godey’s Lady’s Book* had the potential to attract a readership across gender lines, making it one of the most popular magazines, especially impressive at a time when the periodical market was suffering from low sales overall. In addition, Hale brought to the *Lady’s Book* what Godey could not: strong aesthetic taste—or at least an eye for what would appeal to readers’ tastes—a strength reflected in the title of her periodical, before the Godey merger, as *Lady’s Book and Literary Gazette*. Rather than publish primarily European authors, Hale’s journal included what *Broadway Journal* called that supposed lack of “readable matter,” but in fact was actually offering a place for lesser known American authors to attract audiences. By directing the journal to women, Hale could tap into an underserved readership, while also drawing upon many of the women writers she knew in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, who were organizing literary salons in their households that attracted male writers, Poe being an ever popular presence at many of those parlors.

Hale’s mission statement for *Godey’s Lady’s Book* emphasized that the magazine would be a financial success by showing men how helpful the periodical would be, as Lorman Ratner argues, by “enabl[ing] its readers to become better wives” (65). In the articles that she included in *Godey’s Lady’s Book*, Hale reflected the prevalent antebellum domestic sensibility that defined women’s roles as properly exercised within their sphere of influence, the private sphere of the home, in order to guide husbands and children to become exemplary participants in the

public sphere. In one issue that Hale edited, women were advised to focus their energies within the household, where “Her power is in her beauty” (Hale, “Why Women Were Made Lovely” 92)—a sentiment that aligns with Poe’s own obsession with women’s beauty, referring to it as the most poetical topic in “The Philosophy of Composition.”

By publishing in *Godey’s Lady’s Book*, Poe learned to adapt his customary tales of mystery and murder to women readers, forcing him to mature as a writer in order to appeal to Hale’s mission statement, which claimed that all published articles work towards the improvement of men and women in a proper Christian culture. This strategy would culminate in the last tale of ratiocination that Poe would publish—and, when compared to his first such tale, reveals how his publishing in *Godey’s Lady’s Book* re-defined the very conventions of detective stories that Poe actually inaugurated. While regarded as one of the first contributors to the detective genre, even in his lifetime Poe successfully re-defined what that genre was capable of accomplishing, as he undermined its tropes and gendered conventions.

As Hale defined the principles guiding her editing of *Godey’s*, her goal was to give a space for developing a uniquely United States literary voice—while drawing upon European influences. She had kept that goal in mind long before the merger with Godey’s own periodical, and this interest would bring to Poe some of the first serious critical consideration of his work—for good and bad. In its January 1830 issue, Hale’s *Ladies’ Magazine and Literary Gazette* was actually one of the first periodicals to review any of Poe’s literature: his 1829 *Al Aaraaf, Tamerlane and Minor Poems*. Unlike the first volume, *Tamerlane and Other Poems*, this second volume identified Poe by name. The reviewer, however, is not named in the *Ladies’ Magazine*. Scholars debate the reviewer’s identity. Based on the tone of the writing and the number of similarly anonymous reviews she printed in her own journal, some scholars identify Hale as the

author. Other scholars identify Hale's employee John Neal, a close friend of Poe and one of his supportive albeit tough critics, as the author of the piece. In the 1829 edition of *Al Aaraaf*, Poe dedicated "Tamerlane" to Neal.³⁵

Regardless of the author's identity, the review itself identifies Poe's strengths but largely in terms of his imitative potential rather than his innate abilities as a productive artist. In the course of the review, the author reduces the young Poe to merely a child. This is all surprising since, based on the domestic content of the title poem "Tamerlane," it is expected that the reviewers for *Godey's Lady's Book* would find much to like in the volume, especially as this man realizes at the end of his deathbed confessional how much he lost when he abandoned his beloved woman and home. After all, without a woman's presence in the household, Timur's bravado at the poem's end collapses. His tone at the end is markedly different from his first lines, where he asks the attending priest whether he deigns to confer "[k]ind solace in a dying hour!" (line 1). Once Timur acknowledges "woman's weakness had a part" in his youthful ambitions for empire, however, he assumes greater humility: he lapses into nostalgic pining for his previous time with her, "together— / Roaming the forest, and the wild," she standing as his "Heaven" on earth (lines 74, 96-97, 101). Without Ada, he can see that "boyhood is a summer sun / Whose waning is the dreariest one" (lines 207-208), which culminates with this emperor remembering his return to the home he once shared with his beloved.

I reach'd my home—my home no more—
 For all had flown who made it so.
I pass'd from out its mossy door,
 And, tho' my tread was soft and low,
A voice came from the threshold stone
Of one whom I had earlier known—(lines 213-218)

³⁵ Patricia Okker considers Hale the author (236 n14), whereas Burton Ralph Pollin identifies Neal as the author (11).

Imagining himself no longer as king but as “a cottager” (line 130), he yearns for that domestic space, yet finds without Ada present—the one who “had flown who made it” his “home”—all that remains is a feeling of discomfort, almost like that uncanny that underlies so much of Poe’s later literature, in which the feeling of home is present yet unfamiliar, embodied (or rather disembodied) in this poem as that bodiless “voice,” whether only of his imagination, of his memories, or like the ghosts and corpses of his later tales emerging from walls of the house itself. Poe’s conclusion presents a man revealing his “humble[] heart” and “deep[] wo[e]” to the attending priest and by extension to readers (line 220), because he failed to maintain the kind of domestic space that Hale celebrated in *Godey’s Lady’s Book*: Timur sacrifices Ada for his empire, whereas he could have kept her present to check his ambition.

But this poetic, household sentimentality did not go over with that anonymous reviewer at *Godey’s Lady’s Book*. In addition to criticizing Poe’s writing in terms of its quality, the reviewer attaches questions regarding the author’s age and even masculinity, finding him to be too much a boy, and too weak a man: “It is very difficult to speak of these poems as they deserve. A part are exceedingly boyish, feeble, and altogether deficient in the common characteristics of poetry; but then we have parts too of considerable length, which remind us of no less a poet than Shelly [sic]. The author, who appears to be very young, is evidently a fine genius, but he wants judgment, experience, tact” (“Literary Notices” 47). It is not as if Poe does not invite himself to be referred to as boyish—he announced as much in *Tamerlane and Other Poems*, and his avatar Timur himself claims his ambition was birthed from his boyish days and his desire for Ada’s love. The criticism he receives may explain why scholars are so keen to see Poe as reacting violently to women: after a lady’s journal refers to him as “boyish,” his later fiction portraying premeditated, accidental, or simply brutal murder of Lady Rowena, Madeline

Usher, and the wife to “The Black Cat” could be read as acts of violent aggression against the kind of women who could not appreciate his genius. Yet that argument falls apart when remembering the close association Poe had with many women writers. As Eliza Richards has documented, despite his personal difficulties engaging many women writers personally and romantically, Poe was a serious collaborator who worked alongside women writers in developing his and their literary voices. His reviews of many women writers contained some of the most positive criticism he had to offer, especially compared to his incendiary attacks against Longfellow. Finally, despite this criticism from either Neal or Hale, Poe would continue to work with both in his publications for *Godey’s* and in both editors’ other publications. It was his engagement with *Godey’s Lady’s Book* that allowed Poe to innovate numerous genres—including that genre he himself fostered, the tale of ratiocination, or the detective story.

Detecting the Complementary Poles of Sentiment and Sensation in “The Oblong Box”

Published nearly concurrently in the Philadelphia *Dollar Newspaper* on August 28, 1844, and in *Godey’s Lady’s Book* in September 1844, “The Oblong Box” draws upon Poe’s earliest work in the gender-bending aspects of the detective genre as illustrated in his first such tale of ratiocination, “The Murders in the Rue Morgue” (1841). Yet whereas “The Murders in the Rue Morgue” has been read as a misogynistic attack against women’s presence in the home,³⁶ “The Oblong Box” stands as an example of how Poe changes his portrayal of women, from deceased objects of desire to be eulogized, to more realistically portrayed, albeit still macguffins within the detective genre, whose loss is mourned by way not of an emotionally wrought narrator but a secondary character. Poe’s development of this genre from 1841 to 1844 depends on how he

³⁶ See Joseph Church, “‘To Make Venus Vanish’: Misogyny as Motive in Poe’s ‘Murders in the Rue Morgue’” (2006).

structures “The Oblong Box” with tropes culled from both sentimental literature and sensational literature. The combination of the sentimental with the sensational, as studied by Jonathan Elmer and Slavoj Žižek, destabilizes the detective tale as a genre. I determine that this unstable genre emerges due to Poe’s work in preparing the short story for more than one periodical: the women’s journal *Godey’s Lady’s Book* and the popular Philadelphia newspaper *Dollar Paper*. By re-printing “The Oblong Box” in *Godey’s Lady’s Book* shortly after it appeared in the *Dollar Newspaper*, Poe had to navigate through the politics of both periodicals’ editors, to create a story with the sensationalism to appeal to the former’s lowbrow readers of newspapers, and the sentimentalism and affirmation of love for the latter’s mission statement of Christian family togetherness.

The inclusion of “The Oblong Box” in the Philadelphia *Dollar Newspaper* as a journalistic publication heightens the implication that “The Oblong Box” may have been read by some of its readers as a work of nonfiction. This reading is encouraged by how often Poe’s fictional works, by their obsessive attention to detail, anonymous first-person narrators, allusions to real-world persons and places, and overall intense parodist quality, were mistaken for non-fiction, such as “The Premature Burial” also for the Philadelphia *Dollar Newspaper* (1844), and “The Facts in the Case of M. Valdemar” for the *American Review* (407). Poe benefited from such misconceptions, frequently publishing hoaxes in the New York newspaper *The Sun*, such as what came to be known as “The Great Moon Hoax” (1835) and “The Balloon Hoax” (1844), and another hoax in the *Southern Literary Messenger*, “The Unparalleled Adventure of One Hans Pfaall” (1835). Despite the sensationalized, even mystic properties featured in these tales, like “The Oblong Box” their first-person limited omniscient narrator’s detailed attention to cause and effect managed to convince enough readers of their factuality, leading to extended debates in the

pages of those same newspapers and in competing periodicals in the United States and England over just how much fiction there was to these tales, heightening their sensationalism.³⁷

On the other hand, *Godey's Lady's Book*, by its inclusion of "The Oblong Box," complicates the journal's ostensible mission statement to improve the lives of women. In addition to its first goal of educating women on how to be better participants in the prevalent domestic ideology of their time, *Godey's Lady's Book* had a simultaneous goal of presenting portrayals of men to show how cross-gender relationships between men and women benefited men. Hardly a tale only for sensationalism, "The Oblong Box" becomes a hauntingly sentimental tale that shows Poe's adept ability to market himself simultaneously to diverse audiences.³⁸ Scholars have traced the simultaneous deployment of sensationalism and sentimentalism in works written by Poe's peers. Motivated by the assumed expectations of his women readers, Poe placed his texts in periodicals marketed towards women, and he also drew upon tropes and topics that were thought to appeal to such women readers. Because both sensationalized and sentimentalized texts appeared in these women's journals, Poe was able to develop literature that could occupy both genres: he skillfully used the tropes of sensationalized literature, yet set them within household settings, which allowed him to develop complex portrayals of men and women.

"The Oblong Box" follows an unnamed narrator sailing from South Carolina to New York, when he happens to run into his friend, Cornelius Wyatt, recently married and traveling

³⁷ See Lynda Walsh, *Sins Against Science* (2006).

³⁸ Jane Tompkins holds sensationalism and "sentimental power" in tension with each other, each force benefiting from the other, particularly in Stowe's combination of Gothicism with her morality lessons against slavery and for the sanctity of the family. As Michael T. Gilmore traces in Stowe's works, sentiment often coincides with masochism on the part of characters and readers ("*Uncle Tom's Cabin* and the American Renaissance" 75). See also Jonathan Elmer, "Terminate or Liquidate?" (1995); Catharine E. O'Connell, "The Magic of the Real Presence of Distress" (1994); and Marianne Noble, *The Masochistic Pleasures of Sentimental Literature* (2000: 126-146).

with his wife and sisters. The narrator cannot help but notice how Wyatt obsesses over the proper care of one piece of his luggage, the titular oblong box, even keeping it locked in his bedroom, while sending away the woman he claims to be his wife to have her sleep in a separate room. Up to this point, the story resembles the kinds of tales so often mistaken by Poe's contemporary readers as nonfiction texts based on their appearance in newspapers and their procedural structure. The narrator's attention to detail is so obsessive that his interpersonal contact with other persons is rather crass. Regarding Wyatt's wife, for example, the narrator cannot "help regarding Mrs. Wyatt as a decidedly plain-looking woman" (*The Works of the Late Edgar Allan Poe* II: 358). Ostensibly, this detail serves the detective story: noticing how her "exquisite" clothing clashes with her physical appearance and low-class demeanor, this detail foreshadows the revelation that in fact she is not really Wyatt's wife. Apt for Poe's literature, Wyatt's wife is dead, kept in that oblong box that serves as the mystery to this detective story. The tale then concludes with both the box and Wyatt lost at sea, sinking along with their cargo ship while the narrator is lucky enough to survive the ordeal. As his last tale of ratiocination, then, the story closely resembles so many of Poe's other tales that it risks coming off as a cliché closing to his work in this genre, borrowing tropes from his other tales of the high seas such as "Ms. Found in a Bottle" (1833), "A Descent into the Maelström" (1841), and his only novel-length fictional work *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym* (1838).

The status of "The Oblong Box" as his last tale of ratiocination provides an avenue by which to trace the author's development of that detective genre, especially as pertains to the complex and controversial portrayals of women in that genre and his overall oeuvre. Whereas Wyatt's wife is dead throughout the tale, her presence in that titular oblong box is because of Wyatt's love for her; as was expected of many mourning spouses, he seeks to give his wife a

proper burial in her own home. Despite the tale's climax, with the grisly detail of a man drowning as he plummets into the ocean with his wife's corpse, that scene makes Poe's "The Oblong Box" simultaneously a sentimental tale, its emotionality enhanced by how Poe uses his last detective story to undermine some of the violence against women that inaugurated his work in the ratiocination genre. "The Oblong Box" allowed Poe to meditate upon his frequent topic of the death of a beautiful woman, while locating that discussion in larger concerns about men's mourning for their lost wives.

Poe satisfies these goals of improving both women and men, while adhering to his penchant for suspense and the idealization of women's corpses, because his narrative, presented through the point-of-view of a gossipy, ostensibly single man obsessed with the mourning husband, reveals the dangers in which men find themselves should they isolate themselves in order to treat others as mere objects of scrutiny—a trait celebrated through the iconic C. Auguste Dupin in Poe's trilogy of tales of ratiocination, which includes "The Murders in the Rue Morgue," "The Mystery of Marie Rogêt" (1842), and "The Purloined Letter" (1844)—rather than engaging with these persons on a more intimate, sympathetic level. That the death of Cornelius Wyatt continues to haunt the narrator after the cargo ship *Independence* sinks—and the name of that ship—reveals an oddly allegorical lesson inherent to Poe's story, despite that author's repeatedly professed hostility towards such tales of instruction.

In his study of Poe's appeal to both literary discourses, Jonathan Elmer refers to "the sentimental and the sensational [as] complementary modes, dependent on each other for their own proper functioning" (94). For Elmer, the combination of sentimentalism and sensationalism reinforces patriarchal roles ascribed to women. "[A] symbolic identification with the moral discourse defining the death of the female hero (as just, as tragic but necessary, as beautiful, and

so forth), [sentimentalism and sensationalism] depend on the reader's ability to transcend the particularities—those 'appendages' of character—that concretize and crystallize imaginary identification" (Elmer 100). In other words, the genres may lack nuanced characterization, which hinders how readers may sympathize with characters, or at least find such characters realistic: recognizing the tropes as supporting societal structures may overwhelm appreciation of the art itself and those characters themselves. Readers must look beyond the artificiality of the tale's structure in order to attain any sympathetic relationship to those characters. Slavoj Žižek also argues that "we could say that in imaginary identification we imitate the other at the level of resemblance—we identify ourselves with the image of other inasmuch as we 'like him,' while in symbolic identification we identify ourselves with the other precisely at a point at which he is inimitable, at the point which eludes resemblance" (Žižek 109). Poe's use of both sentimentalism and sensationalism as genres provoke reactions from readers to cross certain identity boundaries—gender chief among them—in order to sympathize with characters in these rather broad genres of sentimentalism and sensationalism, including the potentially hackneyed tropes of the detective genre. Reading Elmer and Žižek forward, I argue that Poe revises his tropes from the earlier Dupin tales in order to call his readers into finding cross-gender sympathy for both men and women. Whereas Elmer compares Poe's works to those of more conventionally sentimental writers such as Harriet Beecher Stowe, I direct Elmer's argument forward to consider how the sentimental and the sensational work simultaneously to produce, as with the disembodied voice in "Tamerlane," another uncanny effect in his last published tale of ratiocination. Whereas his first tale of ratiocination, "The Murders in the Rue Morgue," is fixated around the substitution of domestic women with domestic men through the murder of the former, by the time he writes "The Oblong Box" and effectively executes both male and female

characters, Poe presents a more sentimentalized version of the detective story. Furthermore, in adding sentimentalism to his otherwise sensationalistic tale, Poe can present both domestic spaces and heterosexual and homosocial domestic relationships in defamiliarized settings: before Herman Melville would do likewise with *Moby-Dick*, Poe in “The Oblong Box” re-maps a cargo ship as a site for the concerns of contemporary male-female relationships.

“The Oblong Box” therefore stands in sharp contrast to Poe’s first tale of ratiocination. Whereas “The Murders in the Rue Morgue” (1841) presents female characters as deceased persons and hence as primarily objects for forensic study, and whereas that tale focuses on men taking over traditionally feminine spaces such as the household from those dead women, “The Oblong Box” is structured as a tale of mourning by the nameless narrator for his deceased friend and that man’s wife. This love story in “The Oblong Box” draws upon sentimental tropes that frequently clash, productively, with the otherwise methodical investigation that the story’s narrator pursues. In contrast, “The Murders in the Rue Morgue,” as Poe’s first tale of ratiocination, assumes a structure that is conventional by this point in literary history. In “The Murders in the Rue Morgue,” Poe introduces C. Auguste Dupin, a brilliant, learned man who would become the lead character to two of the author’s other tales of ratiocination, “The Mystery of Marie Rogêt” (1842) and “The Purloined Letter” (1844). Descended from an aristocratic family now fallen into financial ruin, Dupin intercedes in police work out of boredom. Alongside the anonymous narrator of this trio of stories, who serves as the Watson to his Sherlock, Dupin draws upon his close attention to human habit, culture, and psychology, with a bit of German transcendental philosophical musings, to identify the underlying truth that the pragmatic, superficial Parisian police force cannot locate. In the course of his first tale, “The Murders in the Rue Morgue,” Dupin investigates the murder of two women. The crime scene is

their apartment, locked from inside. The murderer nearly decapitates one woman, and then strangles the second before stuffing her corpse up the chimney. Through Dupin's examination of recent newspaper accounts, hair samples of the murderer left at the crime scene, the animalistic noises of that murderer heard by neighbors, and the potential height and weight of the murderer based on the size of the bruising and cuts this murderer left on the deceased women, Dupin determines that the murderer was actually not human but an orangutan who had escaped from a captain's ship that was docked in Paris.

“The Murders in the Rue Morgue” premiered in April 1841 in *Graham's Lady's and Gentlemen's Magazine*. The gendering of this periodical, and Poe's long history with this periodical throughout its many permutations as a contributor and later editor, clarifies the complex gendering of the tale. The periodical was founded in December 1840, when George Rex Graham merged two periodicals he had recently purchased: *Burton's Gentlemen's Magazine* and *Atkinson's Casket*. Poe had published in both periodicals—works for *Burton's* including “The Man That Was Used Up,” “The Fall of the House of Usher,” “William Wilson,” and “Morella” (all published in 1839), works for *Atkinson's* including “To Science” (1830), “Irene” (1831), and “To Helen” (1831), and works simultaneously such as “The Man of the Crowd” (1840). Perhaps because of this long-term relationship with both periodicals, Poe was hired in January 1841 by Graham to serve as editor of the new periodical. Whereas *Burton's* advertised itself by name as a periodical intended for men, the addition of “Lady's” to the new *Graham's* marketed the magazine as appealing to both men and women. As I will discuss later regarding *Godey's Lady's Book*, the titling does not hamper Poe's content—he is still as gory, gothic, and droll regardless whether the source periodical is marketed to men, women, or both. Actually, when taking all of the works that Poe published in these three periodicals—*Burton's*,

Atkinson's, and *Graham's*—what emerges is a pattern of stories that reveal how gender neutral the kind of gothic literature Poe was publishing, and as concerns this specific part of my argument, how Poe would come to use the detective genre to problematize the masculine-feminine binary by setting his tales in traditionally feminine spaces, by focusing on traditionally feminine topics, and by deploying traditionally feminine tropes and plots.

For example, Bonita Rhoads argues that “The Murders in the Rue Morgue” combines “the oscillating positions of the private ‘feminine’ domestic sphere and the public ‘masculine’ realm” by portraying stay-at-home men who displace homebound women upon their demise (17). From the beginning of his first detective tale, Poe apes the conventions of the domestic novel, “recounting the harsh circumstances of an orphan left to face the cruel world and his subsequent rescue by way of domestic protection and intimacy” (Rhoads 17-18). In his tales of Dupin, this protagonist is placed into traditionally feminine positions. Budgeting his meager monetary holdings, Dupin is predominantly housebound. His investigation into the death of two women allows him to be the sole occupant of their apartment—the crime scene that he investigates. Years before Susan Glaspell in her play *Trifles* (1916), but around the time as when Jane Austen’s posthumously published parodist mystery novel *Northanger Abbey* was released (1817), Poe would locate the similarities between detectives who happened to be men and women who tended to be associated with domesticity. As Rhoads argues, “Dupin’s vision presents an unofficial gaze, trained from the sidelines, that cuts incisively through the mirage of politicized and commercialized representations flooding the nineteenth-century’s public domain” (18). Yet through Poe’s filter as a male author, presenting an idealized masculinity to his audience, he adjusts the domestic novel in form and content. “[I]n the domestic plot, the

restoration of home life is the end point, whereas in Poe's aberrant reconstruction the homecoming of the orphan is merely the point of departure" (18).

Upon positioning "The Oblong Box" within the trajectory of Poe's writing in the detective genre, as beginning with "The Murders in the Rue Morgue," this last of his tales of ratiocination also can be read as an examination of what happens when a gossipy man, confined to one domestic space—or, as suits a cargo ship, untraditional domestic space—make conjectures about others. Whereas "The Murders in the Rue Morgue" proves Dupin correct in his judgment, however, the unnamed narrator to "The Oblong Box" makes repeated errors in his assessment of his friend, learning the truth only after Wyatt's death. Ascribing this trait of gossiping to men rather than, as has been conventionally associated, with women, Poe may be feminizing these men into flawed characters. This moment, however, also shows Poe's willingness to make such traits gender neutral rather than explicitly gendered as only feminine or only masculine: his literature shows numerous cases of traditionally masculine men who engage in activities and behaviors more traditionally associated in Poe's own time with women, or placed into positions of submissive traditionally associated with women.³⁹

In the final pages of "The Oblong Box," the sentimental influence persists oddly enough through that tale's sensationalism. In the conclusion, the *Independence* is struck by a hurricane, and the passengers are forced to escape by lifeboat. In the last pages, Wyatt cannot bear to part with his oblong box:

Mr. Wyatt, in fact, sprang from the boat, and, as we were yet in the lee of the wreck, succeeded, by almost superhuman exertion, in getting hold of a rope which hung from the fore-chains. In another moment he was on board, and rushing frantically down into the cabin. [...] We saw at a glance that the doom of the unfortunate artist was sealed.

³⁹ Examples include men unmanned in Poe's "Loss of Breath" (1832), "Some Passages in the Life of a Lion" (1835), and "Ligeia" (1848). "The Man That Was Used Up" as well was first published in *Burton's Gentleman's Magazine* (1839).

As our distance from the wreck rapidly increased, the madman (for as such only could we regard him) was seen to emerge from the companion-way, up which, by dint of a strength that appeared superhuman, he dragged, bodily, the oblong box. While we gazed in extremity of astonishment, he passed, rapidly, several turns of a three-inch rope, first around the box and then around his body. In another instant both body and box were in the sea — disappearing suddenly, at once and forever.

We lingered awhile sadly upon our oars, with our eyes riveted upon the spot. At length we pulled steadily away. The silence remained unbroken for an hour, so heavy were all our hearts. (360-361)

This conclusion emphasizes Cornelius Wyatt's intense love for his deceased young wife, which leads him to sneak her corpse onto the packet ship. When Poe had drafted "The Oblong Box," it had been recommended for publication in the gift book series *The Opal*, founded by Poe's future literary executor Rufus Griswold but edited by Sarah Josepha Hale (Quinn 417). As he developed the story for eventual publication in the *Dollar Newspaper*, the story's sentimentality persisted, especially the story's conclusion that serves as a ringing endorsement for love's continuation after death. That Hale was editor of *The Opal* and *Godey's Lady's Book* may clarify the potential discord that works throughout the story: much as the narrator is in combat with his sometimes friend, sometimes antagonist Wyatt, so too is Poe engaged in a struggle with the woman whose journal identifies his boyishness and emotionality. This negotiation between author, editor, and audience can inform Poe studies towards recognizing the similar communication necessary in defining gender definitions. While a morbid story, the description of Wyatt emphasizes a man's devotion to his beloved regardless of the circumstances, a topic that would appeal to the Christian readership for either Hale's *Opal* or the story's eventual home, *Godey's Lady's Book*. The ending not only adheres to Poe's habitual idealization of the dead woman, but suits the overall tone of *Godey's*, what Hale called the celebration of the power inhering in women's beauty.

That is not to say that there is not a good dose of Gothicism to this story, however. The last paragraphs closely resemble Poe's other tales of ratiocination by summarizing how the case was solved, yet the story is punctuated with a haunting conclusion: "[I]t is a rare thing that I sleep soundly at night. There is a countenance which haunts me, turn as I will. There is an hysterical laugh which will forever ring within my ears" ("The Oblong Box" 362). As Elmer argues regarding the seduction story and other alternatively sentimental and sensationalized tales intended to educate women, "In leading a reader's identificatory energy toward the inimitable, the sentimental seduction novel provides training in the liberal self-abstraction by means of which gender division are ideologically (but not practically) subordinated to the affirmation of a unity of human feeling" (100). In "The Oblong Box," Poe engages in similar education, through the affirmation of united sentimental communities centered on feeling. He is teaching proper human unity, but only after a long sensationalized tale. The ending, sitting in such stark contrast to the rest of the story, demands readers to re-read the text, and recognize their culpability in transforming a dead woman into an object to study, and her mourning husband into a spectacle.

While passing his interest as that of a friend, and structuring his narrative like that of a scientific inquiry more befitting of the detective genre that Poe helped developed, the narrator actually comes off like a busybody: he assumes gossipy traits disparagingly associated with femininity, compromising the clinical tone he attempts to maintain throughout his account. He "observed that his name was carded upon THREE state-rooms," then tracked who these occupants were—Wyatt, his "wife, and two sisters-his own"—and which rooms they occupied. His interest in the number of rooms that Wyatt purchased takes on an intense level of scrutiny. When the narrator ribs Wyatt—figuratively and literally—upon admitting he knows what Wyatt has hidden, erroneously believing it to be the painting, Wyatt faints. The narrator admits that he

is “a man abnormally inquisitive about trifles”—that last noun being pertinent to how Poe makes this narrator so feminized in the course of the tale. Wyatt as well uses the word, upon beseeching Captain Hardy to allow the oblong box onto their lifeboat. “Its weight will be but a trifle-it is nothing-mere nothing. By the mother who bore you-for the love of Heaven-by your hope of salvation, I implore you to put back for the box!” Upon a second review of the tale, readers recognize the box hardly is a trifle: it is Wyatt’s entire world. Upon reaching the story’s conclusion, and re-reading the tale, it is more apparent how the narrator is teetering between a desire for control—coded masculine—and a sentimental mourning for his lost friend—coded feminine. Even his friendship with Wyatt seems potentially one-sided, the narrator at best claiming he “entertained feelings of warm friendship” with Wyatt, not that the two were truly friends: his immediately subsequent sentence both praises and mocks Wyatt as having “the ordinary temperament of genius, and was a compound of misanthropy, sensibility, and enthusiasm.” The *Independence* takes on an ironic resonance, as the tale concludes with emphasis on the failure of operating separately: Wyatt cannot separate himself from his deceased bride. In his last paragraph, the narrator focuses on the interconnectedness of the couple. Despite Wyatt’s seeming misanthropy, then, the narrator introduces Wyatt in the earliest pages to his story as having “the warmest and truest heart which ever beat in a human bosom,” without citing proof how this fact is known. Upon reaching the conclusion to the story, this evidence becomes apparent, as this ending revises this tale of ratiocination into a sentimental mourning for the deceased Wyatt and bride. While the ship may have been called the *Independence*, Wyatt was not independent in his plan: he depended on the collusion of Hardy, the captain who packs the corpse in salt, and Wyatt’s family. The narrator works independently— to his detriment, as he is now haunted by that laughter. When contextualized

within the mission statement of *Godey's Lady's Book*, then, the story takes on a resonance warning readers of how they put themselves into detriment should they work independently rather than within the community.

It is not only Wyatt who is at fault for acting for his own benefit regardless that of his peers on his ship: he is mourning the loss of his wife. Rather, Poe directs criticism as well to the narrator for his attempts to peer into the private lie of Wyatt. In the course of recounting his tale, upon reaching his last paragraphs, the narrator realizes his own mistakes in trying to imagine some dark story to Wyatt's secretiveness: within the structure of this tale as a dark sensationalistic detective story, there is underlying its plot a sentimental structure regarding the loss of a loved one. The conflict between the sensational plot and the sentimental plot is emphasized by the narrator as associated with a similar conflict between the public and private spheres, hence applicable to gendered domestic ideology in Poe's time. The narrator concludes his story by emphasizing how "[t]he young husband [Wyatt] was frantic with grief-but circumstances imperatively forbade the deferring his voyage to New York." Wyatt is hindered in his task because of the prying eyes of people such as his friend the narrator: "It was necessary to take to her mother the corpse of his adored wife, and, on the other hand, the universal prejudice which would prevent his doing so openly was well known. Nine-tenths of the passengers would have abandoned the ship rather than take passage with a dead body." Implicit in the narrator's conclusion is the problem that Wyatt faces, between private affairs and public scrutiny. In this private-public division is also a reference to the problems separating his work as an artist and his own interior sense of mourning: his work is in competition with his family life. In the story, the narrator initially assumes that Wyatt is transporting not his wife's corpse but a painting, hence he imagines that Wyatt's focus is on business affairs, not personal ones. This

mystery troubles the narrator for the majority of the story and follows him up to the haunting end, foreshadowed when the narrator claims he has trouble sleeping halfway through the story: he blames it on green tea in the middle of the tale.

The sentimental tone that characterizes some of Poe's works such as "The Oblong Box" reveal his efforts that allowed certain texts be marketed as not only prurient tales of murder but, as appearing especially in women's and home journals, the kind of moral instruction Hale was trying to reinforce. Poe was able to tap into a national interest in such gothic literature, especially as it was able to appeal to readers across gender. The genderbending persists when the "hysterical laughter" follows the presumably male narrator, and as that sound emanated from Wyatt. Poe may not have intended anything deeper drawn from the etymology of the word: "hysterical" is derived from the Greek for "womb," thought to be the source of such madness. Nevertheless, the adjective "womb" emphasizes traits in both the speaker and the listener that can be traditionally gendered as feminine: Wyatt is made hysterical, and the narrator is characterized as gossipy. The willingness to cross those gender boundaries persists in Poe's writing. As in "The Murders in the Rue Morgue," Poe kills off female characters and substitutes male characters who become, in ways, aligned with those deceased women. Yet whereas "The Murders in the Rue Morgue" has men lay claim to a woman's sphere of influence through her death, Poe pursues an even darker narrative in "The Oblong Box," in which Wyatt becomes deceased like his idealized bride. All are equal in death.

What inspires the narrator to regret his behavior is his attention to his own conventional masculine traits: "My own mistake arose, naturally enough, through too careless, too inquisitive, and too impulsive a temperament" (362). His ambition, as it was for Timur, was instrumental to the story's ending. As with much of Hale's domestic ideology as promulgated by *Godey's*

Lady's Book, Poe considers how men left in isolation without more sympathetic appeal to other persons are at risk of obsession, sacrificing their ethics to fulfill their competitive desires.

Interesting, then, that the sound that keeps the narrator awake at night is not a conventionally masculine laugh, but rather “an hysterical laugh which will forever ring within my ears” (362). The laughter is both sensational and sentimental, and the narrator’s reaction to this sound shows how much progress Poe has made since publishing “Tamerlane” in 1827, to integrating aspects of both romantic pining and gothic terror into one story. His success emerges in part from the publishing opportunities he was able to garner from women’s journals, and Poe’s work to write to those audiences allowed him to juxtapose disparate genres into one story. The publishing of “The Oblong Box” in a woman’s journal such as *Godey’s Lady’s Book* emphasizes the cross-gender appeal to these gothic works, and can potentially show how sentimental tropes were appealing to male readers as well. Poe would continue to work through these generic and gendered boundary crossings in his publications in Boston, including the final texts he published in his lifetime.

An Expression of Romance: A Southerner’s Last Publications in the Abolitionist Newspaper *Flag of Our Union*

That Poe was crossing gender lines also had ramifications for how his literature appealed across political and class division, particularly pertinent regarding the periodical in which he published some of the last poems and tales in his lifetime. These works published for *The Flag of Our Union*, an abolitionist newspaper, would bring Poe back to Boston, the site of his first publication and with this periodical his last publications. *The Flag of Our Union* has the misfortune of one of those unwieldy titles expected of nineteenth-century periodicals: in full, it

is *The Flag of Our Union: A Literary and Miscellaneous Family Journal, containing News, Wit, Humor and Romance...Independent of Party or Sect*. The ellipses thankfully do not serve to abbreviate that title of more words. The title's length resulted from struggles the periodical itself had due to its primary goal—it was an abolitionist journal—and its primary execution—it attracted readers beyond just abolitionists through its inclusion of the kind of entertaining written pieces that would appeal to all readers. Founded in Boston in 1846, the newspaper, the periodical was published by Frederick Gleason and edited by Maturin Murray Ballou. While closely aligned with the abolitionist movement, *The Flag of Our Union* strove to be inclusive, presenting a variety of texts drawn from different sources to entice readers to its pages despite its political leanings. The first five words of its long title clarify how *The Flag of Our Union* emphasized unity in times of growing national strife. Part of the strategy to bring itself national attention despite regional and political differences among its readers was to seek out the literature, often highly sensationalistic, of popular American writers. One of the more famous writers for *The Flag of Our Union* was Louisa May Alcott. Long after Poe's demise, she released *Behind the Mask*, a melodramatic thriller that she published in *The Flag of Our Nation* anonymously. Alcott would lampoon *The Flag of Our Union* in the fictional newspaper *Blarneystone Banner* featured in *Little Women* (Stern 178).

An abolitionist newspaper, especially one published in Boston, is one of the last places scholars expect to find Poe's last published works. Poe had taken a hard stance against such anti-slavery movements, thinking them to be mere fads that fascinated New Englanders—a frustrating people, Poe thought them, more interested in style than content, easily deceived by formalistic tricks and ignorant of truly in-depth ideas. An additional contributing factor to Poe's aggression towards abolitionists was his self-marketing of himself as a true southern gentleman.

By erasing his Boston heritage to emphasize his Richmond upbringing, Poe made efforts to develop professional relationships with leading southern editors. In August 1835, he was hired as assistant editor to the *Southern Literary Messenger* in his hometown of Richmond, Virginia. In this position up to his departure in January 1837, he was able to place many of his reviews and premiere many of his poems and tales in the journal: “Berenice,” “Morella,” “Lionizing,” “King Pest,” and “Shadow / A Fable” all appeared in 1835, and portions of *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym* in 1837. He also was able to use the *Southern Literary Messenger* to reprint those texts that premiered in northern journals, such as “The Visionary” from *Godey’s Lady’s Book* and “Metzengerstein” from the Philadelphia *Saturday Courier*. His time at the periodical was tumultuous, however: he was fired after a few weeks upon his initial hiring for drunkenness at work, re-instated a few months later, but already making such a controversial impression that would follow him in his later editorial positions. Hence in the 1840s, short on money and having fractured many of his professional relationships, Poe placed his final writings in *The Flag of Our Union*.

The Flag of Our Union concluded Poe’s publishing career, and as the site for his last publications emphasizes how much work he took to create a literary voice appealing across political and regional divides. The periodical was one of many that inaugurated major changes in American literary publishing, with a shift from genteel magazines that sought to appeal to elitist readers, often in highly urbanized locations, to lowbrow newspapers that sought to attract potential readers across a wide economic and geographical span throughout the nation seeking to attract as many readers in both urban and rural locations. While *Godey’s Lady’s Book* and other magazines boasted high subscription rates, they were aberrations in the larger literary marketplace. By the 1840s newspapers had many benefits over those low-selling and often

short-lived magazines. First, newspapers benefited from lower postage rates. Second, newspaper formats afforded more space per page for advertising. Finally, despite being newspapers, over time they paradoxically published far less news and far more fictional literature (C. E. Clark 162). Enticing readers, *The Flag of Our Union* could put forward its abolitionist arguments while peppering the page with sensationalized literature, such as the kind that, based on both his literary output and the rumors circulating around his personal life, Poe was sure to offer. Yet the texts he actually published in *The Flag of Our Union* seem subdued compared to the more violent tales he included in *Godey's Lady's Book*. Primarily Poe offered not complicated literary criticism but, as if making a return to the kind of writing he did with "Tamerlane," a return to a more sentimental meditation on age, death, and the comforts of a domestic setting.

His final works were printed, and some even premiered, in *The Flag of Our Union* in 1849, the last year of his life. While there were notably dark tales and bitter satires such as "Hop-Frog," "X-ing a Paragraph," "Von Kempelen and His Discovery," Poe's other works for *The Flag of Our Union* included more abstruse poetry such as "Eldorado" or love poems dedicated to the many women in his life: "A Valentine" to Frances Sargent Osgood, and "For Annie" to Nancy Locke Heywood Richmond. *The Flag of Our Union* also capitalized upon Poe's death when its editors realized it had published some of the author's last works, featuring what the newspaper credited as "Poe's Last Poem," "The Bells," printed posthumously. Another of those final works to appear in *The Flag of Our Union*, "A Dream within a Dream," one of Poe's most famous poems, acts as both a beginning and an end to the author's professional relationship with Boston, not just his publishing career: the poem had originally appeared as "Imitation" in that 1827 volume "by a Bostonian" and published in Boston, *Tamerlane*, and now

after years of revising the poem “A Dream within a Dream” took its final form in 1845 in Boston’s own *Flag of Our Union*. For this section, I focus on a close reading of two more of Poe’s last works to premiere in *The Flag of Our Union*, “Landor’s Cottage” and “Sonnet — To My Mother.” Both works bring Poe back to an understanding of home, especially regarding his mother and their shared connection to Boston.

The earlier of these two works, published in June 1849, “Landor’s Cottage” is a sketch of meticulous detail focusing on just one setting. Inspired by Poe’s own Bronx cottage, the sketch allows Poe to present a mostly accurate portrayal of his residence, and thus to present both his aesthetic appreciation and sentimental attachment to this home (Quinn 507; Ultan and Unger 27). The titular cottage is made of “old-fashioned Dutch shingles,” with some “Egyptian architecture” for an “exceedingly picturesque effect” with “gorgeous flowers that almost encompassed the base of the buildings” (“Landor’s Cottage” 413). Compared with Poe’s first fictionalized cottage, that barren one with its mossy door encountered in “Tamerlane,” this last of his cottages possesses a unity that adheres to many tenets drawn from his “Philosophy of Furniture.” The sketch also adheres to another of his “philosophies,” that being “The Philosophy of Composition.” The argument he put forward in that essay, an explanation for how he developed “The Raven,” is transformed by “Landor’s Cottage” into as much a meditation on how proper housing serves as like a perfectly composed poem. The anonymous narrator, encountering the house, notices in it an aesthetic principle that, while seemingly remarked in terms of visual arts, borrows language and ideas specifically from “The Philosophy of Composition.”

“One thing became more and more evident the longer I gazed,” comments the narrator to “Landor’s Cottage”: “an artist, and one with a most scrupulous eye for form, had superintended all these arrangements. [...] It was a piece of ‘composition,’ in which the most fastidiously

critical taste could scarcely have suggested an emendation” (406). He insists upon the “marvelous effect [that] lay together in its artistic arrangement as a picture” (411). While the language identifies the house in terms drawn from visual composition, the word choice especially with “effect” reminds readers of his remarks made in “The Philosophy of Composition”: it is the “effect” from which any literary work begins, bringing with it a “unity of impression” and a sense of absolute originality, both in terms of some feeling of newness emerges as well as being the site that births that same feeling of unity. It is in these terms that the narrator feels a sense of unity and originality upon seeing Landor’s cottage. At this moment the narrator’s previous use of visual aesthetic terminology collapses into one that depends upon visual analytical terms: “On this peninsula stood a dwelling-house—and [...] its tout ensemble struck me with the keenest sense of combined novelty and propriety—in a word of poetry—for than in the words just employed, I could scarcely give, of poetry in the abstract, a more rigorous definition)—and I do not mean that the merely outré was perceptible in any respect” (411). As with many of Poe’s works, “Landor’s Cottage” ends with the narrator meeting with a beautiful woman, who happens to be the occupant of this house. “[A] young woman about twenty-eight years of age—slender, or rather slight, and somewhat above the medium height,” the narrator cannot help but feel an intense emotion that he names such a word as will be apt for considering its deployment in later chapter: “So intense an expression of romance, perhaps I should call it, or of unworldliness—as that which gleamed from her deep-set eyes, had never so sunk into my heart of hearts before” (“Landor’s Cottage” 414). The narrator reminds readers that he means “romance” not only in terms of some feelings of love he holds for this woman. Rather, he draws upon a literary understanding of the romance, as will be analyzed in subsequent chapters, starting

in the next one in which Poe's colleague Nathaniel Hawthorne defined the term most clearly and as originating, as it does here for Poe, out of the household.

However, Poe adds a gendered resonance to his sense of romance that contrasts sharply with Hawthorne's attempts to claim that word as a highly masculine term used for men to produce a form of art that will compete with women writers in the literary marketplace. For Poe's narrator, "romance" is akin to femininity, "provided my readers fully comprehend what I would here imply by the word—'romance' and 'womanliness' seem to me convertible terms." As the narrator concludes "Landor's Cottage," "after all, what man truly loves in woman is, simply, her womanhood" (414). This love, for any woman as simply embodying some aspect of her womanhood, takes an uncanny turn in another of Poe's final publications for *The Flag of Our Union*, his "Sonnet—To My Mother." In his last year of publishing, with a return to Boston as the birthplace and now burial site of his publishing career, with *Tamerlane* imagined in critical discourse as a dedication to his lost mother who gave birth to him in that city and the foster mother he may have felt he abandoned upon his departure for that city, one of the last works to appear in his lifetime was dedicated to yet another one of his "mothers," in this case to his aunt Maria Clemm, the mother of his cousin and his by then deceased bride Virginia Clemm (Sova 182-183).

My mother—my own mother, who died early,
Was but the mother of myself; but you
Are mother to the one I loved so dearly,
And thus are dearer than the mother I knew
By that infinity with which my wife
Was dearer to my soul than its soul-life. (lines 9-14)

His mourning for the loss of his biological mother is foreclosed by the fact that he barely knew her. Read in context with his other publication that year for *The Flag of Our Union*, "Landor's Cottage," this mourning is infinitely displaced across a number of women, so long as Poe, like

the narrator, remembers that it is womanhood that is the only attribute needed for men to feel love for women. In the course of the sonnet, Poe engages in a series of substitutions, from Eliza Poe to Virginia Clemm now to Maria Clemm, in placing himself in relation to numerous women towards some sense of completeness in his life.

“Troubles Made His Manhood Disappear”: Poe’s Legacy in Gendered Portrayals

Almost fifty years after his death, *The Independent* published a series “Reminiscences of Poe,” featuring in one issue an excoriating account by Thomas H. Lane regarding the author’s many vices: drugs, alcohol, and gambling, these habits all becoming more difficult for Poe to support due to continuously diminishing sales for the fewer and fewer works of literature he was producing. “In thinking over the failings of Mr. Poe,” writes Lane, “much consideration should be given to the differences in the circumstances of his youth and those of his later years.” Lane focuses primarily on Poe’s work in 1845. That year had been a momentous one for Poe, including the publication not only of his collection *Poems*, which captured the attention of, among other authors, Elizabeth Barrett, but also the publication of his most famous poem “The Raven.” 1845 was also the year of his address to the Boston Lyceum, a chance to speak to the most elite of New England readers, writers, and editors. Due to a series of publishing missteps, financial troubles, and personal problems, Poe was exposed to the public as a difficult writer to employ. Seen as violent, sexually promiscuous, and even insane, *The Flag of Our Union* was one of the few publications left willing to print his literature, and without enough money from his writing, it seemed like the artist was wasting away in poverty. Lane’s remarks summarize the larger problems in a gendered reading of Poe’s literary output, especially regarding his engagement with contemporary print culture. “During the period when his only resource was his

pen, which gave him but small returns,” writes Lane, “his wants were largely in excess of his ability to procure what they demanded.” Lane concludes, “[N]o doubt, the misery arising from this cause” not only “brought to life all that was ungentle in his nature,” but also “drove him to submerge his troubles in that which made his manhood disappear” (Lane qtd in English, “Reminiscences of Poe: IV” 5).

While referring to Poe’s “manhood” in terms of his lost humanity, now overshadowed by a violent, drug-addled nature, Lane’s word choice illuminates the larger problems in reading Poe’s literature with regard to issues of gender in his time period. Accounts such as this one by Lane, coupled with the portrayals of Poe by Griswold and others, have made it difficult to see the intense professional work he did with many women writers and editors in his time period. Lane draws attention to a popular conception of Poe as a hyper-masculine figure: a caustic critic, an alcoholic and addict, a philandering and promiscuous lover, and a misogynist in his fictional portrayals of female characters. Lane’s remark builds upon one of those earliest reviewers, the one from of all places a lady’s journal, which denigrated Poe as “boyish, feeble.”

Poe’s professional career alongside many women editors and writers reveals an engagement with that content and those forms thought conventionally feminine in his time period. His publications for women’s, men’s home, and abolitionist journals reveal how he could define himself as an artist capable of crossing gender and regional lines. For all his criticism that literary criticism must not praise a United States author simply because that author is an American, his literary career allowed him to emerge as a national artist through careful consideration of the persona he was crafting around his publishing venues, albeit upon factoring the monetary profit he stood to gain. In order to become a national artist, Poe had to be the consummate escape artist. Born to a family of traveling actors, adopted by a foster family

engaged in frequent transatlantic voyages, having to move so often between major sites of literary production and publishing, he hardly kept to any one physical location in his time. His trickster personality, indicated by the confusion regarding whether his failed Boston Lyceum talk was merely a drunken catastrophe or, as Poe himself implied in the pages of *The Broadway Journal*, a premeditated hoax (Ljungquist, “The Poet as Critic” 14), makes it equally difficult to determine how serious he is in his criticism. For example, is his “Philosophy of Composition” a serious essay that shows like *Eureka* the careful combination of art and science towards more complex literary criticism and production, or a satirical example for how poets can fail to produce quality literature when they stick to clichés and mathematically ponderous rhythms?

Poe’s literary career follows a trajectory of men who yearned to return home—Tamerlane as the first—to men who could not help but remove any reminder, particularly female reminders, of those domestic spaces—the anonymous narrator to “The Black Cat,” “The Murders in the Rue Morgue,” and “The Fall of the House of Usher” as examples—and finally to a re-engagement with those domestic spaces now from the viewpoint that was as idealistic as that ambitious anonymous “Bostonian” but tempered with the wisdom of age—as in “The Philosophy of Furniture” and “Landor’s Cottage.” This circuitous path takes Poe away from the city of his birth and back to it, his literary life having such parallels with his personal life that it is little wonder why scholars are so attracted to a popular conception of him drawn from his poems and tales, even when such accounts fail to address the contradicting realities of his life. This combination of both the Actual and the popular Imaginary is how the nineteenth century arrives at an understanding of what is called “the romance,” and as I address in the next chapter, its definition originates from the household of one of Poe’s colleagues, Nathaniel Hawthorne.

Chapter 2

Neutral Territory: Androgyny, Misogyny, and Hawthorne's Development of the Domestic Romance

Wherever he traveled, whatever he wrote, Nathaniel Hawthorne was followed by the association he held with his many American homes. Born on the Fourth of July, he would be remembered by the *North American Review* as closely associated with that bygone patriotic spirit found in the town of Salem, up from its custom-house where he served his government, down to the “wharves, and chandlers’ shops,” and those “plain wooden houses, but [with their] quaint air of past provincial grandeur” (Rev. of *The Works* 539). Hawthorne’s identity would forever be tied to Salem, first from his thirteen years of residence, then from his blistering account of “my native town” as a “dilapidated wharf” in “The Custom-House” (5), the preface to *The Scarlet Letter* (1850). His appropriation of one of that town’s buildings to become the titular abode in *The House of the Seven Gables* (1851) only cemented his association with Salem.

That homes captivated Hawthorne has been a topic of considerable interest to numerous scholars, producing biographical readings into Hawthorne’s numerous homes and relatively under-researched abodes occupied abroad, and readings into the gendered implications that the prevalent domestic ideology had on his literary output.⁴⁰ While his private writings and his peers’ memories reveal his personal intimate engagement with domestic spaces, the many contexts in which Hawthorne is associated with the theme of home evidences a noteworthy ambivalence. Upon first introducing Salem by name in “The Custom-House,” Hawthorne coyly

⁴⁰ See T. Walter Herbert, *Dearest Beloved: The Hawthornes and the Making of the Middle-Class Family* (1993); Gloria E. Erlich, “Hawthorne and the Mannings” (1980); and Robert Milder, *Hawthorne’s Habitations* (2013).

leads his readers to assume his sketch will be a celebration of his hometown, but abruptly begins listing all that is wrong with the town that makes Salem so unappealing. “In my native town of Salem,” he begins, claiming ownership to the city, once great, now wretched,

half a century ago, in the days of King Derby, was a bustling wharf,—but which is now burdened with decayed wooden warehouses, and exhibits few or no symptoms of commercial life; except, perhaps, a bark or brig, half-way down its melancholy length, discharging hides; or, nearer at hand, a Nova Scotia schooner, pitching out her cargo of firewood,—at the head, I say, of this dilapidated wharf, which the tide often overflows, and along which, at the base and in the rear of the row of buildings, the track of many languid years is seen in a border of unthrifty grass. (*The Scarlet Letter* 1334)

Whereas Hawthorne—and scholars—seem fond of claiming that Salem belongs to him, inherent to many of his statements about the town is also a claim of dissatisfaction with its poor conditions. For Hawthorne home is a compromised location, an ideal that cannot meet the realities of his situation. It is like his definition to the romance: home exists somewhere between the Actual and the Imaginary. If one event epitomizes the problematic relationship Hawthorne had with home, as tied into his literary production, it is the rumor passed shortly after his death, that publication delays to his *Seven Tales of My Native Land* led Hawthorne to burn that manuscript (Lathrop 135)—effectively burning the record of his native land, if not symbolically destroying his own native land.

Hawthorne’s fictional homes house environments ranging from pleasant to terrifying: from the warm, close familial life of that cottage in “The Ambitious Guest,” to the gloomy “old, lonely mansion” where Judge Pyncheon’s corpse is discovered in *The House of the Seven Gables* (200). Contained in many of Hawthorne’s homes, because of his insistence on ambiguity in his writing, are both the pleasant household environment, and the dark, frightening secrets confined to its most private rooms. The question for many of his characters is their willingness to cross that “threshold” between the bright rooms into the dark rooms, much as Georgiana does upon

crossing the boundary between the outer and inner apartments to enter her husband Aylmer's laboratory in "The Birthmark"—and just how ambiguous this domestic structure is when Aylmer may so "convert[] those smoky, dingy, somber rooms, [...] into a series of beautiful apartments not unfit to be the secluded abode of a lovely woman" (*Hawthorne's Tales* 156-157). At this imagined barrier between separate spheres his characters hesitate, as Hester Prynne too "paused" at that "threshold" between the public sphere and the private sphere when she returned to Boston, "all alone, and all so changed, [into] the home of so intense a former life" (*Scarlet Letter* 1472).

In "The Custom-House" Hawthorne, like Hester, pauses following his "involuntary withdrawal from the toils and honors of public life," to consider at that moment whether he will cross the boundary between the public and private spheres, to re-enter his Salem house, where he may find "some little space [...] requisite before my intellectual machinery could be brought to work upon the tale, with an effect in any degree satisfactory" (*Scarlet Letter* 1357). As he crosses that divide between the public and the private, he ponders what kind of middle ground may exist between these spaces, so often conventionally gendered—the public as masculine, the private as feminine.

Throughout his life, Hawthorne—and his relatives—meditated on how this middle ground might serve him, as an author, to write, thereby claiming imagined spaces that also eschewed gendered boundaries in pursuit of androgyny. As a boy, Hawthorne used a foot injury to escape sports and retreat to his family's house to continue his reading. Gloria Erlich extrapolates this fact to understand Hawthorne's "unfit[ness] for a life of business" as related to his "habit of reading," "of considerable consequence in the boy's development," perhaps into a real man? Erlich concludes, "The differences in these [his family's] attitudes toward [his sister Elizabeth] and Nathaniel can be partially explained by their naturally different expectations of

the two sexes, the cultivation of sensibility being a luxury that a female could afford, whereas a man must prepare for a serious place in the world” (103-104, 114).

This indecisive gendering, in his life, in his writing, and in the cultural geography in his time, has not been lost on scholars,⁴¹ nor on Hawthorne’s contemporaries. Margaret Fuller referred to Hawthorne as that ideal man, a hermaphroditic or androgynous mix of masculine and feminine qualities: “no wholly masculine man, no purely feminine woman” (1651). Henry Wadsworth Longfellow declared that Hawthorne’s writing “is characterized by a large proportion of feminine elements, depth and tenderness of feeling, exceeding purity of mind” (qtd in Mellow 193). After Hawthorne’s death, James Russell Lowell referred to him as not seeming to be a typical man. In his poem, he writes that Nature, when creating Hawthorne, lacked all the clay needed “[f]or making so full-sized a man as she wanted,” so she supplemented with “some finer-grained stuff for a woman prepared.” While appealing to the same androgyny that Fuller used to describe Hawthorne, Lowell still praises Nature, for this combination of both masculine and feminine traits could not be “a more excellent plan / For making him fully and perfectly man” (lines 13-18). Hawthorne himself once asked, “Why was I not a girl [...]?” (*Centenary Edition* 15:117). Such remarks reveal that, while Lowell may be gently mocking his friend’s femininity, nineteenth-century ideals for American men did not essentialize masculinity and femininity as belonging purely to any one gender. Literary reception and production as well were essentially gender neutral practices, although not for lack of trying on the part of many persons, men in particular, to impose artificial separations between what were considered men’s work and women’s work. Whereas Barbara Welter, Ann Douglas, and Jane Tompkins have insisted upon a masculinized public sphere of market forces and ruthless competition separated

⁴¹ On the remarks of Hawthorne’s peers and scholars regarding his “woman within,” see Hyatt Waggoner, *The Presence of Hawthorne* (1970: 115); and Virginia Hudson Young, “Fuller and Hawthorne: The Androgyny of Genius” (1985).

from a feminized private sphere of domesticity and affection, later scholars have read the “separate spheres” argument as a more complex, often ambiguous separation that emphasizes greater androgyny in all facets of American life. The imagined barrier between the public and private spheres challenged Hawthorne to succeed at what seems paradoxical: to be both a homebody author and a famous author, both masculine and feminine, both public and private.⁴² Hawthorne, his peers, and his scholars identify the close association between femininity, aesthetic appreciation, and even literary production in the nineteenth century United States, despite Hawthorne’s protests to the contrary, or his misogynistic remarks against women artists.⁴³

In confronting his frustrations with Salem, Hawthorne seems to yearn for an escape from the town. He hopes his children would “strike roots into unaccustomed earth” (*Scarlet Letter* 1338). Coupled with those remarks by his peers as to his womanly qualities, having lost his position at the town’s Custom House, his desire to run away may emanate from his estimation of himself as a man: his role as financial provider to his family stymied by his unemployment, his sense of self as a person, and as a man, is compromised. Many of Hawthorne’s stories likewise reveal men who identify their very masculinity through a self-imposed exile away from their homes. The eponymous anti-hero of “Wakefield” runs away from his wife’s house, Richard Digby becomes a hermit in “The Man of Adamant,” and young Goodman Brown escapes his newlywed wife Faith for a final night of satanic debauchery in the forest—only to find his household discomfiting when it is implied Faith engages in the same affairs. The titular

⁴² Hawthorne would have been intimately familiar with such rhetoric, hearing such arguments from his neighbors and family—Mannings, Hathornes, Peabodys—visiting his home. See Norman Holmes Pearson, “Elizabeth Peabody on Hawthorne” (1958); Randall Stewart, “Recollections on Hawthorne by His Sister Elizabeth” (1945); Manning Hawthorne, “Hawthorne’s Early Years” (1938); “Maria Louise Hawthorne” (1939); and Megan Marshall, *The Peabody Sisters* (2006).

⁴³ Nina Baym’s “Thwarted Nature: Nathaniel Hawthorne as Feminist” (1982) traces the arguments reading the implicit misogyny—and feminism—to Hawthorne’s works.

character Ilbrahim from Hawthorne's "The Gentle Boy" initially defines his true home as that consecrated ground upon which his Quaker father was executed, before he would ever surrender himself to the home of any Puritan. As presented in his texts, the home was the natural environment not for men but for women: Hester Prynne sees the cottage in Boston as the destined site for her punishment—"Here had been her sin; here, her sorrow; and here was yet to be her penitence" (*Scarlet Letter* 1473)—and Phoebe Pyncheon is imagined as the idealized angel of the home, "such was the native gush and play of her spirit" and "a spiritual quality in Phoebe's activity," thanks to "the spontaneous grace with which these homely duties seemed to bloom out of her character" (*House of the Seven Gables* 61, 99).

Because of his strong association of women with the home, and his frequent depiction of male characters who long to escape from it, a paradox emerges from Hawthorne's works regarding the home. This ambiguity—Hawthorne's "device of multiple-choice" and "rhetoric of tentativeness" (Bercovitch 21-22; Moore 319)—is an inherent quality of his overall literary production, but scholars have not emphasized how the ambiguity that Hawthorne maps onto this domestic space helped him to formulate one of his largest contributions to literature, the unique definition he developed for the American romance. The romance, as Hawthorne defines it, originates from the domestic sphere, specifically "a familiar room," where strict binaries between public and private, masculine and feminine, and even firelight and moonlight mingle together in such a way that "[m]oonlight [...] is a medium the most suitable for a romance-writer" (*Scarlet Letter* 27). As the American household was oft defined as a women's sphere of influence, Hawthorne contended with views in his time period that saw the space as exclusionary to men. In works such as "The Custom-House," Hawthorne expresses a frustration relating to those masculinized public spaces, notably office settings, which may bring money and attention, but

sap his creativity. At the same time, his association with the household opened him to gentle mocking that he was more woman than man. The literary form of the romance, as Hawthorne developed it, became in part a response to that feminizing portrayal he experienced in popular press, an insistence that a writer of fiction could still be manly.

Hawthorne's "work as a romancer" has been read as compromising his masculinity. In critical discourse, Hawthorne has been alternatively regarded "as the father *or mother* of the sophisticated short story in America" (Wright 439; emphasis added). Because he was publishing alongside women authors, and had some of his works edited and published by those same women, a problem arises concerning those feminine qualities that Hawthorne seeks to disavow in his own writing style and in American literature at large: by choosing to originate the romance from within the home, a site traditionally associated in the nineteenth century with women, Hawthorne's supposed desire to remove himself from the "mob of scribbling women" actually shows how gender, indeed the set of nineteenth-century connotations surrounding femininity, is inextricable from the romance. Hawthorne cannot remove himself from those scribbling women when he is himself writing in women's journals—so his household labors to write and publish break down the binaries of previous generations, fulfilling what Cathy Davidson, Monika Elbert, Glenn Hendler, and others have recognized as the breakdown between the public and private spheres. In competition with women authors, who were also writing in domestic spaces and writing about domestic concerns, Hawthorne strives to distinguish himself as a writer of romances, less inclined to the realities of his surroundings and engaging far more in the ideal.

Apparent in his life and in his literature, Hawthorne's masculinity actually is comprised of femininity as well: locating his romance in the household, in competition with women writers, but defined from a feminized sphere of influence, his unique form of masculinity is

defined by gender blending. Moreover, the pervasive ambivalence about the relative goodness of the home reads more broadly into other seeming contradictions. Simultaneously embracing opposing binaries characterising the home is only a symptom of the larger themes occupying his literature. The associative issues of home—specifically the traditional gendering of the home—addresses a series of interpretive problems that I explore below to question how these oscillations—simultaneously and paradoxically true binaries—frame an understanding of Hawthorne’s particular view of masculinity within the contexts of the home, his theories of the romance, and his personal and professional relationships with women authors. Ultimately Hawthorne uses women, symbolically, as a collective repository onto whom he projects his own simultaneous desires for privacy and fame, denied to him not only by the paradoxical condition of possessing both, but also by gender politics in his time and read forward into twenty-first-century scholarship. Domestic ideology in the nineteenth century maintained that men were to labor in the public sphere to support their families financially. As this labor would leave one sex in the nation morally compromised by sometimes sacrificing their ethics for the sake of monetary profit, it was left to women to fashion the home into a sanctuary that preserved such lost moral and religious principles. Operating within this still persistent construct of separate spheres that insists that he as a man must be in the public sphere and separated from the private sphere, Hawthorne appeals to numerous middle grounds—the parlor, the romance, and androgyny—in order to produce a body of literature that, in spite of his at times misogynistic point of view, reveals an unconventional approach to gender with regard to literature in the nineteenth-century United States.

Hawthorne's Definition of the Romance

As the preface to *The Scarlet Letter* (1850), “The Custom-House” has been a point of vexation for many scholars, struggling to unite this preface, so different in tone and content, with the subsequent longer story of Hester Prynne. Hawthorne explains in the preface that his long description of Salem is to establish the (fictionalized) means by which he came upon the story of (the fictional character) Hester Prynne by way of the (historical) Surveyor Pue. While acknowledging that the problem relates in part to a compromised publication that dashed Hawthorne's original plan to make the volume into a collection of stories beyond those of the Salem Custom House and Hester Prynne, varying interpretations have read parallels between the stories of Hawthorne and Hester as recorded in the book. Given how controversial “The Custom-House” was in mocking the bureaucratic and political structures of Salem during Hawthorne's time living there, the revelation of the author's (supposedly) true self to his reading audience may have attracted more readers to *The Scarlet Letter* than had the book-length romance stood on its own.⁴⁴ Yet from his preface emerges Hawthorne's unique definition of the American romance.⁴⁵ This definition owes a great deal to Hawthorne's complicated history navigating the public and private spheres. Ultimately he uses his persona as a homebody man to clarify just what he means by a romance that exists at the nexus of the Actual and the Imaginary, and is located squarely in his family's parlor. In short, Hawthorne's definition of the romance serves as the exemplar for the blending of binaries that critics identify in his themes of home.

⁴⁴ See Donald D. Kummings, “Hawthorne's ‘The Custom House’ and the Conditions of Fiction in America” (1971); Robert A. Lee, “‘Like a Dream behind Me’: Hawthorne's ‘The Custom-House’ and *The Scarlet Letter*” (1982); and Donald E. Pease, “Hawthorne in the Custom-House” (2005).

⁴⁵ The term “romance” is used in many different ways, even when limited to just the “American romance.” Kenneth Ruthven considers the romance to be “Romance ideology of literary authorship” as defined as the “conce[ption] of the text as an autonomous object produced by an individual genius” (40). Although he himself works with historical events, the American historical romance, as more often associated with James Fenimore Cooper, is distant from Hawthorne's unique definition. See also G. R. Thompson, *The Gothic Imagination: Essays in Dark Romanticism* (1974), and Nina Baym, “Concepts of the Romance in Hawthorne's America” (1984).

Below, I read his theory of romance with an eye toward these contradictions to frame out how they speak to Hawthorne's sexually ambiguous gendering of an androgynous, even feminized form of masculinity.

In the first page of "The Custom-House," Hawthorne gives a lengthy dedication to his hometown of Salem, with attention to his simultaneous attraction to and resistance against this town. As his account continues, Salem appears more and more like an awful community; his coworkers as well are subject to seemingly positive portrayals that actually are passive aggressive mockery based on their ages and laziness. Much of this frustration directed against Salem is the result of his ignominious removal from his position: upon the 1848 election of Whig presidential candidate Zachary Taylor, Democrat Hawthorne was expelled from Salem's Custom-House. Although in "The Custom-House" Hawthorne portrays his dismissal as fortuitous, as he claims it gave him the motivation to abandon mind numbing bureaucracy for the freer expression of his art, before publishing *The Scarlet Letter* Hawthorne took to the press and published harsh periodical articles condemning those who fired him, blasting Whigs for what he told the *Boston Daily Advertiser* was an unfair dismissal (qtd in Cheever 89). Frustrated, he turns his hostilities against the town of Salem itself: it may be his birthplace, but not his home, as its architecture "sunk almost out of sight," and he imagines himself "a citizen of somewhere else" (*Scarlet Letter* 1338, 1358).

While his hostility against Salem seems borne from his political failures in the town, Hawthorne also codes his frustrations against Salem in terms of its failure as an environment to inspire any writer to produce good art. Its local buildings and street layout are uninspiring, "few or none of [them] pretend[ing] to architectural beauty," little changing over generations until falling into architectural ruin, "sunk almost out of sight." Because the buildings lack aesthetic

value and “architectural beauty,” Salem “is neither picturesque nor quaint, but only tame” in a “flat, unvaried surface” (*Scarlet Letter* 8, 10). Salem affords nothing to invigorate him as an artist, yet from his descriptions in “The Custom-House,” the town should be one of those ruins that inspire good literature: as he writes in his preface to *The Marble Faun* (1859), “Romance and poetry, ivy, lichens, and wallflowers, need ruin to make them grow” (3). Salem is a set of ruins, at least a financial ruin, “now burdened with decayed wooden warehouses, and exhibits few or no symptoms of commercial life” whose monetary failure manifests physically in the nature of the town, the form of “this dilapidated wharf, which the tide often overflows” across its “unthrifty grass” (*Scarlet Letter* 1334). It seems that the simultaneous attraction and repulsion to his hometown—out of nostalgia for the past, and out of frustration with the present—hold Hawthorne back from imagining the town as completely ruined. As with much of his literary output, his regard for Salem then is marked by a sense of ambiguity, one that touches upon all his approaches to the home, to gender, and to literature.

Drawing together these miserable conditions of Salem is the Custom-House, located at the center to the town and serving as epicenter of its negative qualities. This bitter portrayal owes largely to Hawthorne’s frustration with his political removal from the Custom-House. As he marks the path from the wharf to the Custom-House to his family’s house, Hawthorne traces the trajectory of the blurred distinctions between the public and the private spheres. “The Custom-House” preface is about the domestic sphere, playing out as a story of Hawthorne’s experiences in two different houses. First, it is about the house of customs, where Hawthorne as agent of the law must insist upon certain facts being brought into the harsh sunlight of the public—a process which inhibits his imagination. His family’s house is a more private sphere for the author, lighted by the moonlight outside his window and the firelight from his hearth, to

meditate on what it means to write romances. When Hawthorne situates his house with respect to the Custom-House—in terms of topography, gender, and the traditional public and private split—he compares the two locations and actually reveals how ambiguous the arbitrary distinction between masculine and femininity is when that binary is mapped along the axis of a similarly problematic binary of public and private. He blurs the distinguishing line between the gendered spheres: he seeks femininity in the public sphere, and masculinity in the private sphere.

This femininity, as present in the public sphere's emblem, the Custom-House, is not without complications. Over the door leading into the building is a statue of “the American eagle,” gendered as female. She is a symbol of liberty for those “citizens [...] seeking at this very moment to shelter themselves under the wing of the federal eagle,” “with outspread wings, a shield before her breast, and, if I recollect aright, a bunch of intermingled thunderbolts and barbed arrows in each claw.” Much as Salem initially appears in his preface as a potentially comforting location that motivates nostalgia and a yearning desire for maternal protection, Hawthorne's account devolves into an anxiety about that same feminine influence—perhaps borne from the author's ambiguous gendering. Despite the eagle's “bosom [with] all the softness and snugness of an eider-down pillow,” Hawthorne imagines this bird as possessing “no great tenderness, [...] apt to fling off her nestlings with a scratch of her claw, a dab of her beak, or a rankling wound from her barbed arrows” (*Scarlet Letter* 5-6). While seemingly maternal, the eagle is a vicious creature. Such maternal comfort is denied in the Custom-House, his own office there “a sanctuary into which womankind, with her tools of magic, the broom and mop, has very infrequent access” (7). In this statement, Hawthorne emphasizes how the Custom-House lacks the stable domestic protection—cleanliness, nurture, and calm—that women provide

to other household spaces. His workplace may have “house” in its name, but it is not traditionally domestic. This eagle is a mother, but she is hardly like those domestic goddesses Hawthorne celebrates in his literature, such as the New Eve or Phoebe Pyncheon, who magically beautify their household settings, even acting as adoptive mothers to more infantile or childish characters.⁴⁶

Hawthorne associates the absence of femininity in the public sphere to lack of inspiration in the Custom House, whereas it is the return to the traditionally feminized household space that reinvigorates him to write. In his work to professionalize himself as an author, to publish in the literary marketplace rather than only write from home, Hawthorne draws a parallel between the types of houses that the public and private spheres offer to struggling writers. When Hawthorne ventures out into the marketplace and his daily office job, the insistently real world saps his capacity to write the kind of fiction he wants. The situation becomes so bad that, upon trying to write *The Scarlet Letter*, he imagines those potential “characters of the narrative” mocking him: “The little power you might have once possessed over the tribe of unrealities is gone! You have bartered it for a pittance of the public gold. Go then, and earn your wages!” (1352). Hawthorne even turns to women—despite pigeonholing them as mere household labor—as his literary collaborators. As Hawthorne wrote to his sister Elizabeth, “No man can be a Poet and a Bookkeeper at the same time” (qtd in Erlich 114). The fierceness of his ambition leads to the moral of his next romance, *The House of the Seven Gables*, as a warning against “the folly of

⁴⁶ In “Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Mother” (1982), Nina Baym identifies this maternal influence on Hawthorne’s recent memories of his tenure as Salem’s surveyor, tracing the chronology of Hawthorne’s dismissal from the Custom House with respect to the passing just a few days later of his mother. On other maternal figures in Hawthorne’s literature, see “Parental and Family Influences on Hawthorne” (1940); “A Glimpse of Hawthorne’s Boyhood” (1947); Gloria Erlich, “Hawthorne and the Mannings” (1980); and Todd Onderdonk, “The Marble Mother: Hawthorne’s Iconographies of the Feminine” (2003). The witch Mother Rigby serves as on such complicated figure in Hawthorne’s last published story, “Feathertop” (1852).

tumbling down an avalanche of ill-gotten gold,” specifically “real estate” (2). Tellingly, it is the influence of Phoebe on Holgrave that makes that man give up his quest to re-acquire his family’s seized land upon which the Seven Gables stands. Both Phoebe and Holgrave may move forward with more productive, happier lives is through that intermingling of separate genders that is marriage. Repeatedly, Hawthorne portrays women like Phoebe pulling men back from the quest for financial and public success at the cost of their morality, their privacy, and even their uncompromised sense of interiority.⁴⁷ In both his life and his works, it is the intermingling of masculinity and femininity, much like the intermingling of the Actual and the Imaginary or the public and the private, that allows Hawthorne a space in which to write what he considers a unique form of literature called the romance.

As the romance as a genre is located between the Actual and the Imaginary, Hawthorne’s practice of writing too was romantic: while the actual circumstances in his life—his poverty, his lack of fame, and his struggles as a good husband and a good father—were not overcome simply by focusing on his own writing, the process of writing had an ameliorative influence, to overcome the doldrums of his bureaucratic labors. Hence too his writing practice occupied a middle space between the real and the ideal. Perhaps informed by his alleged feminine propensities, Hawthorne draws upon customary tenets of the Cult of Domesticity in developing a marked separation between houses as mere real estate and profit, and houses as private sanctums from the miserable outside world. Having expressed his firm dislike for the “dilapidated wharf” of Salem, he pursues the third option, something between his actual surroundings and his imaginary ideals, as he marks the home as that analogous middle ground between the public sphere and the private sphere. Struggling with financial loss and feelings of inadequacy as a

⁴⁷ On how Hawthorne adheres to and subverts expectations of the domestic novel, with Phoebe and Holgrave as “potential heroines of a domestic novel,” albeit in a marriage that risks compromising their future happiness, see Susan Van Zanten Gallagher, “A Domestic Reading of *The House of the Seven Gables*” (1989: 5).

relatively unknown author, the real conditions of his life become so bad for him that he imagines an idealized somewhere else, although one still informed by his understanding of realistic financial, cultural, societal, and hence overall gendered conditions. His expulsion from public office makes Salem, “my old native town,” seem immaterial, no more than “the haze of memory, a mist brooding over and around it.” Rather, he hesitates in preferring fictional settings analogous to those of his stories, as he reforms Salem into “an overgrown village in cloud-land, with only imaginary inhabitants to people its wooden houses and walk its homely lanes, and the unpicturesque prolixity of its main street” (*Scarlet Letter* 34).

Faced with such a violently insistent reality, the literature he writes, and would come to call the romance, allows him to distance himself from, though not necessarily escape, the miserable settings of his reality in Salem. He finds a third option that links the binaries of masculinity and femininity, the public and the private, and the Actual and the Imaginary, in such a way that he produces a three-dimensional map in which the concerns of gender, society, and literary form all speak to each other. While he would eventually move away from Salem, the location’s association with Hawthorne persists to this day, the real-life House of the Seven Gables capitalizing on his popular portrayal by turning the building into a local tourist attraction. Much as the influence of domesticity follows him into the Custom-House—until he is perplexed why such house is lacking those attributes he considers feminine such as the maternal side that the eagle should embody, and the cleanliness that should be provided by a female housekeeper’s hand—Hawthorne realizes how the enervating influence of his masculinized workplace follows him even to his own home. As he tells readers, he hopes that when he enters his family’s house that he may feel again “that invigorating charm of Nature, which used to give me such freshness

and activity of thought, the moment that I stepped across the threshold of the Old Manse”
(*Scarlet Letter* 27).

Upon entering his family’s house, Hawthorne’s fixation is first upon the reality of the parlor, because it is the real-life concerns of the masculinized work space that are immediately on his mind, and are dulling his self-assumed more refined aesthetic insights and talents. The first things he notices amidst the “little domestic scenery of the well-known apartment” are the chairs, with each its separate individuality; the centre-table, sustaining a work-basket, a volume or two, and an extinguished lamp; the sofa; the book-case; the picture on the wall.” Whereas the path from the Salem wharf up to the Custom-House moves from positive details to negative details, the path from the Custom-House to his house moves from reality into a more ethereal, more spiritual viewpoint. In this triangulation of the wharf to the Custom-House to his house, Hawthorne establishes his home as the middle ground, the space between the Actual and the Imaginary—much as the parlor is between the public sphere outside the house and the more private sphere within the house—that constitutes the romance and hence associates it with the domestic. By that association of the home with the feminine, and the workplace with the masculine, the binaries of Actual and Imaginary (literary), private and public (social), male and female (gender), become interrelated to each other. At that moment, Hawthorne allows a more feminine influence to inspire him: moonlight, conventionally associated with femininity, is like the romance itself, because it can shine a light upon a setting, drawing from even the most familiar scene something unfamiliar. When he allows himself to dwell in a space that opposes those attempts present in his overall body of literature, something productive is formed from a less clearly defined space: in the ambiguity between the Actual and the Imaginary, between the public and the private, between masculinity and femininity, the romance is born, and it inspires

in Hawthorne a way to lend something more uncanny, ethereal, even magical to the boring surroundings he encounters daily. He invites his readers into his household to hear, however briefly, about the makeup of his parlor. He elaborates:

Nothing is too small or too trifling to undergo this change, and acquire dignity thereby. A child's shoe; the doll, seated in her little wicker carriage; the hobby-horse;—whatever, in a word, has been used or played with, during the day, is now invested with a quality of strangeness and remoteness, though still almost as vividly present as by daylight. (*Scarlet Letter* 28)

Thanks to the combination of external moonlight and internal firelight, “all these details” of very real things, “so completely seen, are so spiritualized by the unusual light, that they seem to lose their actual substance, and become things of intellect” (28). While not giving readers a tour of the more intimate rooms of his house, such as where his wife and children sleep, Hawthorne uses his own home to illustrate what the romance means to him. By examining small objects present in this private space, traditionally associated with women and children, Hawthorne reveals otherworldly aspects to seemingly mundane household items. He could not etherealize so easily the equally trivial objects in his Custom-House office, where his coworkers are elderly men far past their prime, who are present only for their pay, hardly working, hardly thinking, hardly moving, hardly energetic—hardly living. They are dead because there is no feminine presence: while pursuing a heteronormative argument, Hawthorne implies that the presence of only elderly men without any feminine presence stymies the efficacy of his aesthetic production. At the Custom-House Hawthorne works with elderly men who might as well be dead: they are not productive, they are not energetic. While these ruined men are like the ruins that give Hawthorne much about to write, these “wearisome old souls [...] had gathered nothing worth preservation from their varied experience of life” (1341). In contrast, it is when he rests in his own house's parlor, tended to by his wife and played in by his children, that Hawthorne can find something

new and exciting to write about. It is during his engagement with conventionally feminine imagery—the home, the family, children—that Hawthorne comes across his romance. He is blending genders—the masculinizing work that he thinks he is accomplishing as a writer, and the feminized setting and tropes he uses. “[T]he floor of our familiar room has become a neutral territory, somewhere between the real world and fairy-land, where the Actual and the Imaginary may meet, and each imbue itself with the nature of the other.” The “warmer light” of the fireplace “mingles itself with the cold spirituality of the moonbeams,” and it is here from the household that the Romance emerges: affording an opportunity “to bring out or mellow the lights, and deepen and enrich the shadows” of the writing, the Romance re-shapes thoughts and feelings “from snow-images into men and women” (*Scarlet Letter* 28; *The House of the Seven Gables* 1).

The parlor itself functions as another liminal space within a powerful binary between the public and the private. It is here where Hawthorne “sat,” “the deserted parlour, lighted only by the glimmering coal-fire and the moon, striving to picture forth imaginary scenes, which, the next day, might flow out on the brightening page in many-hued description” (*Scarlet Letter* 1352). The parlor served as well as a testing ground for ideas before presenting them to public audience, and has been studied as a space in which women’s writing emerged. In scholarship, then, the parlor is read as a gendered space.⁴⁸ Because of Hawthorne’s work to dismantle seemingly simple gender binaries, it is tempting to read Hawthorne as living through many of his male characters who run away from home, such as Young Goodman Brown, as that character “could not accept the world as it really is” (Waggoner 210). Scholars have read Hawthorne,

⁴⁸ Lindal Buchanan identifies the parlor as a domestic space that hosted numerous literary salons (*Regendering Delivery* 85). On the feminization of the parlor as a literary site of production in the nineteenth-century United States, see J. D. Hedrick, “Parlor Literature: Harriet Beecher Stowe and the Question of ‘Great Women Artists’” (1992); Robert S. Levine, “In and Out of Parlor” (1995); and Susan S. Williams, *Reclaiming Authorship: Literary Women in America, 1850–1900* (2006).

“especially [in] his prefaces,” as “anxious to escape” his surroundings and into his own literature. Such arguments trace how Hawthorne’s narrators frequently deny ownership for the stories they tell, claiming they are really “anecdotes [...] of some earlier time” that they happened to overhear (Poirier 106). This supposed fictionalized escape is therefore part of the middle ground that Hawthorne struggles to thematize in his literature: while he will not disregard reality itself, especially his obligations to his wife and family, his characters, especially his male ones, serve as an outlet to explore alternative potential lives, the equivalent of how his romance is defined as the Actual meeting the Imaginary, in this case his real-life circumstances and his literary output being mutually influential on each other. But Hawthorne’s definition of the American romance emerges not only by overhearing anecdotes, but by being much more direct with his readers, using his prefaces not only as an escape but just as often as an invitation to readers to join him in some imagined private space, presented in the form of a domestic setting.

As he does in the preface to *The Blithedale Romance*, Hawthorne emphasizes that such a romance is not about having to choose between the Actual and the Imaginary. He refers to the time in “his old, and affectionately-remembered home, at BROOK FARM, as being certainly the most romantic episode of his own life,—essentially a day-dream, and yet a fact,—and thus offering an available foothold between fiction and reality” (2). The Actual, in the form of both Salem and larger contemporary domestic discourse, was hardly anything Hawthorne escaped successfully—or may even have wanted to escape. He expressed the firm wish for his children to depart from Salem, to “strike their roots into unaccustomed earth” (*Scarlet Letter* 11). While his children may have found homes elsewhere, according to popular imagination Hawthorne himself never escaped Salem, already shown in the overall posthumous biography sketched for him by his peers and later scholars. This need not be a tragedy for Hawthorne. Rather, the very

real domesticity of his life, especially as experienced in Salem, was instrumental to his definition of the American romance. This potentially desired (though not necessarily fulfilled) escape from Salem, seemingly away from reality, paradoxically relied upon very real household settings. While dependent largely on coincidence and even debatably fantastic elements⁴⁹—Maule’s curse upon the Pyncheons, shooting stars seemingly in the shape of flaming scarlet “A’s,” and of course animated scarecrows and forest walks with Satan—the romance as Hawthorne defines it is not purely fantasy but a sustained engagement with actual domestic spaces, albeit as presented through an idealized, highly imaginative point of view. “The Custom-House” depends on readers’ familiarity with the real circumstances of his life as native of Salem and recently fired surveyor of that town. While Hawthorne is playful with the gossip surrounding his dismissal, it is important to remember that he is drawing upon real persons and real events in the midst of defining his idealized Romance, all the while adding fantastic elements such as the ghost of Pue visiting him. As coy as he is, he still is opening the door of his own house so that his readers may enter into his parlor, revealing, up to a point, aspects of his private life.

Within this framework of domestic ideology, Hawthorne develops his definition of the romance by comparison to the novel: “The latter form of composition is presumed to aim at a very minute fidelity, not merely to the possible, but to the probable and ordinary course of man’s experience” (*House of the Seven Gables* 1).⁵⁰ The romance need not be held to the rules of the novel, because it may “have little or no reference either to time or space” (*Hawthorne’s Tales* 229). He reflects on how “[i]n the old countries” the romance was not so dissected as he implies

⁴⁹ On the romance’s fantastic or even magical elements, especially as written by Hawthorne, see Arthur Coleman, “Hawthorne’s Pragmatic Fantasies” (1988); and John R. Maier, *Desert Songs: Western Images of Morocco and Moroccan Images of the West* (1996).

⁵⁰ While I will differentiate the Romance and the Novel as Hawthorne defines it, considerable scholarship has considered how much of a difference there really is between the Romance and the Novel as understood in English and American literature. Such scholarship is especially pertinent in regards to middle-class readers and authors such as Hawthorne. See Richard H. Brodhead, *The School of Hawthorne* (1986).

it is in the United States, leading him to question whether “he is allowed a license with regard to every-day Probability” without having his text “put exactly side by side with nature” (*Blithedale Romance* 1-2). In “The Custom-House,” Hawthorne imagines Salem evaporating into a cloud-land. By the time he writes *The Blithedale Romance* years later, now it is the entire nation that: already the United States is imagined as a setting little inclined to romantic flights of fancy, so it is better to be “a citizen of somewhere else” than to name any specific location as his home: therefore, Salem “ceases to be a reality of my life” (*The Scarlet Letter* 34). In defining the Romance, Hawthorne goes on to state that one of his goals is to draw upon events from the past to speak to contemporary audiences. In bringing past events to present audiences, this “epoch now gray in the distance,” arrives into the present, “down into our own broad day-light,” yet displacing that daylight, like “legendary mist, which the reader, according to his pleasure, may either disregard, or allow it to float almost imperceptibly about the characters and events for the sake of a picturesque effect” (*House of the Seven Gables* 2). The Romance need not be so insistent on a fully accurate portrayal of the past, for that past, in Hawthorne’s philosophy, is so distant that accuracy cannot be pinned down. Instead of focusing on only events as they indeed took place, Hawthorne argues that the writer of Romances may alter the accuracy of details and events, as “he may so manage his atmospherical medium as to bring out or mellow the lights, and deepen and enrich the shadows, of the picture” (*House of the Seven Gables* 1).

Richard Poirier argues that, by gendering the romance writer as “he,” Hawthorne, especially in *The House of the Seven Gables*, casts himself as “a worldly and amused skeptic” poring over accounts of “[r]omantic, melodramatic, and supernatural events [that] come [...] in the form of old wives’ tales and gossip” (106). In engaging with such gossip, Hawthorne’s gendering of himself as a man is again comprised by femininity, as he engages in literary

strategies traditionally associated with women. Patricia Meyer Spacks refers to the domestic novel as one born out of more “gossipy,” discursive art forms, including the biography and the epistolary novel. Therefore the domestic novel has a “kind of intense interest in personal detail” that “approximat[es] that of gossip” (10). In light of this argument, Hawthorne thinks what separates professional authors from mere writers are their intended audiences and their genders: men are the writers of romances whereas women are mere gossips. According to Poirier, no matter how skeptical romantic writers may be, those authors (those men?) rely upon those old wives’ tales. Hawthorne, at least as he presents himself, is hardly so cynical as to be a mere “skeptic” of gossip and those old *women*’s tales that he hears. For him, truth as it exists in the romance concerns not only objective facts but something more intimate, more subjective: the romance only “sins unpardonably so far as it may swerve aside from the truth of the human heart” (*House of the Seven Gables* 1). An added benefit of the romance then, as Milette Shamir identifies, is that it provides the best of both worlds, enabling even such a private writer as Hawthorne to enter the public sphere without fearing that his privacy will be violated. “Romance, while desiring to penetrate the privacy of the home, nonetheless carefully distances itself from such a penetration by claiming for itself the supremacy of the imagination. It will ideally retain the novel’s ability to see through the middle-class home without infringing on its privacy and endangering its very existence” (Shamir 168). Whereas Poirier regards this supposedly subjective chatter as only second-hand information, I argue that Hawthorne capitalizes upon such stories told in the privacy of domestic spaces, debatably the private sphere of influence belonging to women. His work to professionalize himself as an author depended on tales if not circulated by women then certainly tied into stereotypes about them and the domestic sphere closely associated with them.

“These Things Hide the Man”: The “Abode” in Hawthorne’s Literature

In arguing that the romance affords an opportunity to re-shape familiar domestic places into fantastic spaces, Hawthorne realizes that he is opening up his private household to the intense scrutiny of public discourse—the same public gossip that circulated about his dismissal from the Salem Custom-House and, evident in his obsession with households in “The Custom-House,” that followed him home as well. In the time period in which Hawthorne wrote, privacy was a concern for many authors. A young nation’s emerging canon led to a certain degree of humility on the part of authors in presenting their works to readers not only in the United States but also abroad. Despite desiring the fame and money that comes with profitable, critically acclaimed literature, Hawthorne’s writings reveal a hope to retain some degree of privacy. This concern is especially poignant in a time period when Edgar Allan Poe, Margaret Fuller, and other writers were subject to gossipers’ close attention as much to their personal lives as their literature. Upon entering the public sphere as a published author, Hawthorne assumes that “veil”—the same one he names in “The Custom-House” and that has been worn by his male characters, varying from literal one’s such as Hooper’s in “The Minister’s Black Veil,” and metaphorically by the secretive Dimmesdale in *The Scarlet Letter*. Whereas veils for these religious leaders concern private relationships between God and humans, Hawthorne’s concern is more secular: the author wears the veil of self-defacement, a gentle mocking of himself so as not to come across as so arrogant to those potential readers he wants to buy his volumes. Much as the veil works both to reveal and to conceal—to keep the reader in the company of the author, but also to separate the author from that reader—so too does this ambiguity have gendered implications for Hawthorne’s work. As with so many of the ambiguous symbols in his works,

the ambiguity regarding what a veil can do makes indistinguishable the gendered differences: the veil clothes both Reverend Hopper and Zenobia—both men and women—so that it is hard to read within context the gender of the veiled person.⁵¹ His performance identifies the difficulty Hawthorne faced in defining himself as a *man* of letters. He needed income to support his growing family, but anticipating mockery that a real man should not be only a writer, he attempts to appear humble to his readers—a “degenerate fellow,” he imagines he would be called by those notorious Puritan ministers who make up his family tree (*Scarlet Letter* 9).

At the time when Hawthorne was writing, the overwhelming majority of printed fiction—almost 80 percent of it before 1840—was published anonymously or pseudonymously (Fay 92-93). Hawthorne himself refused to add his name to *Fanshawe* upon its initial publication, and he published those tales that would later comprise *Twice Told Tales* anonymously. As he shows his readers only the parlor to his family’s house, Hawthorne keeps his readers at arm’s length. One of his vicarious characters, the showman in “Main-Street,” remarks, “meekly,” “[w]e public men must lay our account, sometimes, to meet an uncandid severity of criticism” received because such romantic men eschew accuracy for the sake of speaking to the truth of the human heart (218). Many of Hawthorne’s remarks in “The Custom-House,” then, should be read as an ironic breakdown of that imagined boundary between the private and public spheres: despite, as already noted, how “disinclined” he claimed to be when speaking “of myself and my affairs at the fireside,” he wrote from “an autobiographical impulse [...] twice in my life [...] in addressing the public” (*Scarlet Letter* 4). Here he is referring to the prefaces to *Mosses of an Old Manse* and *The Scarlet Letter*, and both prefaces, “The Old Manse” and “The Custom-House,”

⁵¹ On the gendered separation of private and public spheres regarding the veil in not only Nathaniel Hawthorne’s works but those of his wife, see Christa Vogelius, “‘Folded Up in a Veil’: Sophia Hawthorne’s Familial Ekphrasis and the Antebellum Travelogue” (2013). On the critical history of the veil in Hawthorne scholarship, see Elaine Barry, “Beyond the Veil: A Reading of Hawthorne’s ‘The Minister’s Black Veil’” (1980).

were centered on domestic settings. So much has been overlooked from those books' actual tales because attention was directed too much to those prefaces and even his own life. From the first sentence of "The Custom-House," he emphasizes that domestic space, gesturing to that fireside where he welcomes his readers to rest while he presents these "ordinary facts of life." These facts are always "in a slightly idealized and artistic guise," for the greater "good," because these facts are, like his home, "my own property" (*The Snow-Image* 321).

Two years after publishing "The Custom-House," Hawthorne would gesture again to the domestic space, this time in another preface, that to his 1852 short story collection *The Snow-Image, and Other Twice-Told Tales*. Here Hawthorne elaborates that it is a person's "external habits, his *abode*, his casual associates, and other matters entirely upon the surface" that captivate his readers (*The Snow-Image* 321; emphasis added). Mary Kelley has argued that "[t]he paradox of literary domesticity was that secret writers were not so secret" (128). According to Hawthorne, behind the walls of any house, some secrets must and will persist: "These things hide the man, instead of displaying him" (*Snow-Image* 321). Hawthorne had repeated this point in one of his earlier *Twice-Told Tales*, "Sights from a Steeple," in which the narrator's vantage point from high above the city cannot let him penetrate "the interior of brick walls, or the mystery of human bosoms, [such that] I can but guess." This distance from above even makes it difficult to discern men from boys. All he knows is that, because "[t]he new-born, the aged, the dying, the strong in life, and the recent dead, are in the chambers of these many mansions," it makes sense that "[the] hope[ful], the happy, the miserable, and the desperate, dwell together within the circle of my glance" (*Twice-Told Tales* 231, 235). He refers to such a "psychological romance" as being like the exterior of the household, closed off from the intense intimacy afforded by Hawthorne, whether in his deeply personal writings, his household, or as

often happens in his prefaces (*Snow-Image* 321). Likewise, he addresses the reader of “The Old Manse” to think of both that titular story and the real-life building as a space afforded to the reader. “Let the reader, if he will do me so much honor, imagine himself my guest,” he writes. As he presents himself to be so self-deprecating, he cautions readers not to get too comfortable, for to “intreat his [guest’s] attention to the following tales,” as poor as they are, would be “an act of personal inhospitality” that he would never wish to anyone, “even to my worst enemy” (Preface 317).

If authors’ actual lives cannot reveal themselves to readers, then Hawthorne suggests that it is best to examine any author (again gendered as “he”) not by the life but “the whole range of his fictitious characters, good and evil, in order to detect any of his essential traits”—those aspects of the Imaginary more than the Actual. Even this point is not consistent for Hawthorne, however, because of his continued insistence that the American romance depends upon both the Actual and the Imaginary, not just either one. Emphasizing this point, he addresses the *Snow-Image* preface “[t]o Horatio Bridge, Esq., U.S.N.,” the man whose funding secured publication of his first major collection, *Twice-Told Tales* (*The Snow-Image* 321). In fact, Bridge is debatably the first to introduce Hawthorne by name to the reading public. Up to that point, Hawthorne’s publications in *The Token* and other venues were printed anonymously, until Bridge identified him in the *Boston Post*, “a gentleman whose name has never yet been made public, though his writings are extensively and favorably known” (qtd in Wineapple, *Hawthorne: A Life* 74). By naming Bridge in *The Snow-Image* as the first person to identify him by name to the public, Hawthorne meditates on what it means to come out of the private sphere of the household, and speak to a larger public. The author of romances still must write towards a public audience, yet slightly modifying that actuality as suits the tone and message to the tale. Such a writer “will be

wise [...] to mingle the Marvellous rather as a slight, delicate, and evanescent flavor, than as any portion of the actual substance of the dish offered to the public” (*The House of the Seven Gables* 1).

While crafting *The Snow-Image* preface as a private correspondence intended only for his friend Bridge, Hawthorne claims that he wants only to “address[] a very limited circle of friendly readers, without much danger of being overheard by the public at large” (*The Snow-Image* 321). Then he proceeds to publish this book, to the public at large. Hawthorne is almost a trickster as he stands in that parlor, the nexus between the public and private spheres, choosing when he will emerge in the public sunlight, before retreating to the fireside. Even as he admonishes readers to look beyond the preface and into the tales, Hawthorne implies that the movement deeper into the household is analogous to deeper movement into a person’s heart. There is a reason such a person is cautious in how he proceeds in using houses as metaphors for the sense of privacy he wants to feel as an author. Before he published *The Snow-Image*, in 1831’s “The Gentle Boy” Hawthorne emphasizes the household symbols inherent to so much of his literary production when he describes the happiness of Tobias and Dorothy Pearson, upon the loss of one child and the adoption of another, as “like the memory of their native land, or their mild sorrows for the dead, a piece of immovable *furniture* of their hearts” (“Gentle Boy” 50; emphasis added). Yet there is a dark side to entering such a space, as exemplified by Chillingworth’s intimacy with Hester: “I drew thee into my heart, into its innermost chamber, and sought to warm thee by the warmth which thy presence made there!” (*Scarlet Letter* 53). His style as a romance writer depends not only upon the site he chooses to stage these conversations, but also which guests he welcomes, and how deeply into that space they may tour.

“Before the Public Stark Naked”: Women in Hawthorne’s Homes

It is unavoidable, when discussing Hawthorne’s homes, to consider the women in those homes. Hawthorne focuses on beautiful, young women: Goodman Brown’s Faith, the “New Eve,” *The Seven Gables*’ Phoebe Pyncheon, even his own wife Sophia Peabody. Hawthorne locates these women at the center of the household, the same private space from which the romance springs: “[providing] the example of feminine grace and availability...it should be woman’s office to move in the midst of practice all affairs, and to gild them all—the very homeliest, were it even the scouring of pots and kettles—with an atmosphere of liveliness and joy” (*The House of the Seven Gables* 59). These women’s presence in those households serves as a necessary yet problematic condition for the production of the romance: their role seems limited to being the caretakers who set up the household space to allow male authors to continue to work uninterrupted. Scholarship obsesses with Hawthorne’s comments regarding his competition with women writers in the literary marketplace. Decades after his tirade in “Mrs. Hutchinson” (1830) against “ink-stained Amazons” (68), he would use similar language in writing to his publisher. In a 1855 letter to William Ticknor Hawthorne attacks women writers, including Grace Greenwood, as one of those “[i]nk-stained women [who] are, without a single exception, detestable” (qtd in Baym, “Again and Again” 25). His letter also concerned the high book sales for Maria Susanna Cummins’s 1854 novel *The Lamplighter*, published by Ticknor’s competitor John P. Jewett. Having himself struggled for years to command similar attention and profit, Hawthorne is irate. Staging his argument in nationalistic terms, he opines:

America is now wholly given over to a damned mob of scribbling women, and I should have no chance of success while the public taste is occupied with their trash—and should be ashamed of myself if I did succeed. What is the mystery of these innumerable editions of the ‘Lamplighter,’ and other books neither better nor worse?—worse they could not be, and better they need not be, when they sell by the 100,000. (*Centenary Edition* 17: 304)

Whereas Cummins's publisher claimed to have printed 65,000 copies of *The Lamplighter* in just its initial year of publication (Williams, "Promoting an Extensive Sale" 185), Hawthorne's sales could not compete: 6,000 copies of *The Scarlet Letter* sold in 1850, its first year of publication, a slightly better number of 6,710 copies of *The Seven Gables* in its initial year of publication in 1851. In the decade when he was writing *The Scarlet Letter* and *The House of the Seven Gables*, the American printing industry increased in annual value from \$12 million to \$31 million (Zboray and Zboray ix). In comparison, Hawthorne's works had lackluster sales: he earned only \$150 from 1851 to 1852 for *Mosses from an Old Manse*, and \$1,500 from 1850 to 1864—hence lifetime sales—for all 13,500 sold copies of *The Scarlet Letter* (Crowley, *Hawthorne: Critical History* 11; Bell, *Culture, Genre* 60). In light of the limited roles given to women in his literature, a notable strand in scholarship has been to read Hawthorne's hostility towards Cummins and other women writers as emanating from misogyny. However, these economic concerns in Hawthorne's letter to Ticknor make explicit that, despite his claims against the quality of their writing and the ethics of their ideas, Hawthorne indeed identified such women writers as his literary competitors. While he must see them as competitors if he is to criticize them on the grounds of their literary productions, this admission tacitly indicates that, much as like the household and the romance as he defines it, the literary marketplace in which he wrote was not a purely masculine or purely feminine area of discourse, but an androgynous one.⁵² This letter to Ticknor concerned the high book sales for Maria Susanna Cummins's 1854 novel *The Lamplighter*, published by Ticknor's competitor John P. Jewett. Having himself struggled for

⁵² In *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting* (2003), Meredith McGill identifies how Hawthorne's later literary career worked towards satisfying his goal "to rid his writing of the taint of the feminine, the childish, the regional, and the foreign" of his earlier literary output (220). Whereas I argue that it was in his continued engagement in complex characterization of female characters, and his fixation on traditionally feminine spheres of influence such as those households celebrated in his literature, that associates his earlier literary productions with his later novel-length works. 0

years to command similar attention and profit, Hawthorne is acutely irate. Hawthorne's frustrations with Cummins's book are particularly surprising, as he was competing not only in terms of sales and quality, but in his own genre: Jewett advertised the book as "the most charming of American romances" (Williams, " 'Promoting an Extensive Sale'" 185), and reviewers would emphasize how effectively Cummins wrote in this style. Hawthorne is challenged in his own "home"—in his own literature, in his own domestic sphere—because he fails to attract an audience, which he thought was a problem for Cummins. Hawthorne's complaint to Ticknor is as much one regarding the failure of his publisher to secure his critical and financial success as well as Cummins's publisher Jewett had for *The Lamplighter* (Baym, "Again and Again"; Williams, " 'Promoting an Extensive Sale'" 180-181). Hawthorne is disparaging his male colleague Ticknor in almost the way someone would call an unsuccessful man a "girl."

Yet the question of women's ambitions as writers causes unease in Hawthorne, at least in his narrators. Hawthorne summarizes such fears in "Mrs. Hutchinson." Imagining what the trial must have been like for antinomian Ann Hutchinson, facing prosecution and persecution from Salem's judges, the story begins with a shocking preface concerning how Hutchinson's example inaugurates a path that many women may take—and indeed already had taken by the time Hawthorne wrote—and which can spell doom for the fledging United States and its still nascent literary canon. The narrator fears that, although "[a]s yet, the great body of American women are a domestic race," a time will come when they "shall have turned their hearts away from the fireside, [...] which will render female pens more numerous and more prolific than those of men." Hawthorne's narrator concludes, not asking what men will do when they are expelled from the literary marketplace, but again placing blame on women authors' "ambition": "Is the

prize worth her having if she win it? Fame does not increase the peculiar respect which men pay to female excellence, and there is a delicacy, (even in rude bosoms, where few would think to find it) that perceives, or fancies, a sort of impropriety in the display of woman's naked mind to the gaze of the world, with indications by which its inmost secrets may be searched out" ("Mrs. Hutchinson" 68). Considering Hawthorne's other writing, the benefit in his estimation would be not only to women but men as well. Many of his women characters—Hester Prynne to Arthur Dimmesdale, Phoebe Pyncheon to Matthew Holgrave—act as almost saintly figures to whom men confess their sins. If now women will be blinded by ambition, they become less esteemed in Hawthorne's imagination. Hawthorne explains this fear in his short story, "The New Adam and Eve," emphasizing that without the titular woman's guidance, her male counterpart would fall into the same traps—romantic ones at that—of his predecessors: "She prevails, and rescues him from the mysterious perils of the library. Happy influence of woman! Had he lingered there long enough to obtain a clue to its treasures [...] the annalist of our poor world would soon have recorded the downfall of a second Adam." Identifying in particular how the New Adam risked being misled by "all the specious theories, which turn earth into cloud-land, and men into shadows" ("New Adam and Eve" 154), this language is almost the same that Hawthorne uses in his prefaces to *The Scarlet Letter* and *Snow-Images* to define how he himself writes his romances. Could it be, then, that Hawthorne's concern for having women be pure and not in the literary marketplace was to pull him back from becoming too ambitious? Perhaps shared ambition and supposedly feminine qualities is why Hawthorne identified, at times unwillingly, with so many of his fellow women artists.

When facing the success of such ambitious women writers, Hawthorne claimed his sales were paltry due to his failure to write to a wide audience. In the preface to "Rappaccini's

Daughter,” he explained by way of his pseudonymous counterpart l’Aubépine—French for “Hawthorne”—that he could not appeal to any target audience—“too remote, too shadowy, and unsubstantial [...] to suit the taste of [the multitude], and yet too popular to satisfy the spiritual or metaphysical requisitions of [the Transcendentalists]” (228). That Hawthorne used this French pseudonym in his love letters to his fiancée, Sophia Peabody (“Rappaccini’s Daughter” 228 n1), intensifies just how bound up his identity as a writer was with appealing to not only male readers but those female readers stolen away by scribblers like Cummins—even when abroad.

Hawthorne’s own distance from the United States, at that time writing to Ticknor from Britain, cannot remove him from those “scribbling women”—because they were his fellow writers, his editors, even his housemates, wife, sisters, and extended family. Hawthorne’s writings even imply that to be an artist, one must at times think like a woman. Many times in his stories, a male character, oftentimes an artist, appears like Hawthorne’s avatar, referred to by the narrator and other characters as having the “natural gift of adapting himself to every variety of character, insomuch that all men—and all women too [...]—shall find a mirror of themselves in this wonderful painter” (“The Prophetic Pictures” 200). Whereas Henry James refers to this aesthetic quality in Hawthorne, “contemplator and dreamer as he was,” as “something plain and masculine and sensible” (*Hawthorne* 10), Hawthorne drew this ability from those kind of feminine ideals that James identifies in “The Art of Fiction”—aptly using the example of a young woman for his own ideal: “be a damsel upon whom nothing is lost” (64). Hardly allowing gendered norms to mark out what should be proper aesthetic production, Hawthorne betrayed some of his anti-women ideals and embraced his femininity, at least as far as his friends thought necessary to produce sensitive art speaking to a wide audience.

Hawthorne's fellow male writers did not see his appeal to women readers as a problem. Rather, this "serious place in the world" could be secured by writing to that audience. Even Edgar Allan Poe recognized Hawthorne's appeal to a female audience: one of his major reviews of *Twice-told Tales* first appeared in *Godey's Lady's Journal*, edited by Sarah Josepha Hale. Despite his criticism of women writers in general, the prevalence of Hale and other women as editors of major journals meant that he had to face facts: with the growing popularity of women's journals, it made sense to start publishing in them, starting with *Godey's*. Around this time, Hawthorne had gently mocked that his writing was not befitting of Hale's journal. His readers were aware of a creeping darkness in his literature. One benefactor, George Hillard, begged him to turn away from the topics of adultery as in *The Scarlet Letter*—that "blue chamber in your soul" (qtd in *Centenary Edition* 15:79)—and instead "dwell," so to speak, "more in the seen, and converse more with cheerful thoughts and lightsome images, and expand into a story the spirit of the Town-pump" (qtd in Lathrop 120). As his literature separated between his earlier lighter tales and his increasingly darker romances, Hawthorne's own divided interests may have been articulated through the character of Holgrave in *The House of the Seven Gables*, who says his story about Alice Pyncheon's violent spiritual possession "will never do for Godey or Graham!" Yet the publisher of *Godey's Lady's Book*, Hale, was no stranger to darker literary content, as her readers delighted in such tales of horror—her inclusion in *Godey's* of Poe's "The Cask of Amontillado" speaks to that fact. Furthermore, John Frost, associate editor at *Godey's Lady's Book*, was an old friend of Hawthorne, who commissioned him in 1846 for the short story that would become "Drowne's Wooden Image." The mission statement at *Godey's* had a strong influence on Hawthorne's writing style, both in the literary content of "Drowne's Wooden Image" and the challenge, as he wrote to Frost, of adapting to a new audience that

publishing in this lady's home journal would provide: "Considering it good policy in a writer, to extend and vary his audience as much as possible, I comply with your request for an article" (11 Mar 1844 qtd in *Centenary Edition* 16:17).

Hawthorne's interest in attracting a wider audience, which would have to include women, closely aligns with the plot of "Drowne's Wooden Image." In the story, Drowne, based in part on real-life Boston artist Shem Drowne, is tasked by his financier, Captain Hunnewell, to create a masthead for a ship that, as the Captain says, "old Neptune never saw in his life" ("Drowne's Wooden Image" 218). In creating an image of such a captivating woman for Hunnewell's ship, Drowne struggles, as does Hawthorne, to make something new on this earth. The same dilemma puzzles Owen Warland in "The Artist of the Beautiful," a man who like Hawthorne is at war with himself. Warland is one of those Hawthornian characters that Michael Broek calls a "nearly transgendered" man who struggles to become a "successful" artist while "rejected by the image of female perfection that he seeks" (631). In both stories Hawthorne turns the plot of *Pygmalion* on its head—depicting a man so desiring the beautiful in art that he eventually falls in love with his own aesthetic production, but at the cost of making personal connections with actual women—and thereby fictionalizes the problems that Hale was facing as she struggled to transform the conventions of ladies' journals. As Mary Ryan has pointed out, *Godey's Lady's Book* was instrumental in moving women readers away from rather old-fashioned family household values of self-sufficiency and towards greater interest in the public sphere and mass consumerism (36). Yet, as can be seen in Hawthorne's life and literature, he clung to conservative notions of women as idealized household goddesses. As an author, however, Hawthorne also recognized the need to sacrifice those tenets for the sake of providing for his ever increasing family, which is why, despite the character's own desires to be loved by a

woman, Drowne ultimately sacrifices family togetherness for profit. Whereas Drowne fails to attract Captain Hunnewell's mysterious Portuguese female companion, who closely resembles the resulting figurehead for Hunnewell's ship, Drowne does end his story receiving payment from Hunnewell while he sits alone in his shop, surrounded by those initial trial figures that he carved, which Hawthorne aptly calls "a whole progeny of blockheads" ("Drowne's Wooden Image" 228). Now this extensive family exists as only figures for sale, almost a gentle mocking of Hale's similar difficulties in drawing forth a sentimental women's readership who would be interested in the issues of raising a family, while confronting the reality of advancing consumerism and entrepreneurship.

Even after his successful publication of *The Scarlet Letter* in 1850, Hawthorne would return to *Godey's Lady's Book*, where he published an excerpt from his sketch "Main-Street." Titled "The Witches—A Scene from Main Street," this short selection—barely a page—is like an abridged version of Hawthorne's "Young Goodman Brown": the vagabond Satan tempts a homebody husband into losing his faith. In appealing to Hale's intended audience of housewives, Hawthorne chose an excerpt from "Main-Street" set not in the dark forest but, as the sketch's title suggests, squarely in one domestic household on that street. As he once told Emerson that he would lose his home should he ever lose Sophia Peabody, so this story in *Godey's* shows what is lost when a man's wife is lost. The excerpt begins: "Ah! but when that blessed woman went to heaven, George Jacobs' heart was empty, his hearth lonely, his life broken up; his children were married, and betook themselves to inhabitations of their own; and Satan, in his wanderings up and down, beheld this forlorn old man, to whom life was a sameness and a weariness, and found the way to tempt him" ("The Witches" 192). "Main-Street" was first published in the 1849 anthology *Aesthetic Papers*, edited by his sister-in-law Elizabeth Peabody.

He re-printed “The Witches” excerpt in 1851 for *Godey’s Lady’s Book*, edited by Sarah Josepha Hale—coincidentally the same year he published *The House of the Seven Gables*. Two years later he included the full text of “Main-Street” in his next volume of “twice-told tales,” *The Snow-Image* in 1852. The publication history of this story reflects Hawthorne’s dependence on women editors with close associations to prevalent domestic ideology. Hawthorne uses the story to reflect what influence these women have on the men in their lives, when their departure risks leaving idle men to more dangerous enticements. The nearly simultaneous publication of “The Witches” and *The House of the Seven Gables* also clarifies the themes likely on Hawthorne’s mind as he prepared both texts for publication: in particular, what happens to men kept alone in houses, often without the influence of their wives or children. This would include Clifford Pyncheon, but also Hawthorne himself, when we remember how he describes his state of mind every day at work in “The Custom-House.” The idleness he felt at work resembles that with which George Jacobs struggles in “The Witches,” and it is what allows Satan and his witches—metaphorically or otherwise—to drag Jacobs out of his barren house, itself reflective of his lonely heart, and into a life of sin.

The same year he excerpted “Main Street” for *Godey’s Lady Book*, Hawthorne repeated a similar plot in *The Scarlet Letter*, with Roger Chillingworth substituting for Satan in his attempt to torture Reverend Arthur Dimmesdale. Much of *The Scarlet Letter* plays upon the fact that while Dimmesdale’s torture is primarily self-inflicted, the serpentine Chillingworth is sharing lodgings with the guilty reverend, who lacks the positive influence provided by his impish (admittedly at times frightening) daughter Pearl and her mother Hester Prynne. *The Scarlet Letter* was said to have given headaches to Hawthorne’s wife Sophia Peabody upon her reading the story. While headaches were nothing new for her—she suffered chronic pain since she was

nine years old (Valenti 9; McFarland 26)—it is a well circulated story that Sophia suffered a particularly bad one when her husband finished reading to her his completed draft of *The Scarlet Letter* (Leverenz, “Mrs. Hawthorne’s Headache” 552). While he privately referred to his wife’s debilitating pain as indicating “a triumphant success!” (i.e., having written such an emotionally moving piece), the experience also caused Hawthorne to go through his own emotional breakdown, if not for his wife’s suffering then for “my emotions when I read the last scene [...]—tried to read it, rather, for my voice swelled and heaved, as if it were tossed up and down on an ocean, as it subsides after a storm” (qtd in Leverenz, “Mrs. Hawthorne’s Headache” 552). At this moment Hawthorne seems to be struggling between being like Chillingworth, toying with his wife’s emotions, or Dimmesdale, suffering himself from the emotions drained out of him. Critics have read this moment as indicative of Hawthorne’s need to construct his literature out of the pain felt by numerous women. David Leverenz’s argument was a strong addition to this debate, although similar readings can be drawn from the female characters in his stories who are either martyrs, sacrificial lambs, or at the very least outcasts: Georgiana, Beatrice, Hester Prynne, Alice Pyncheon, Zenobia, and Miriam, to name a few. It is hard to imagine an audience of women wanting to read about—and in some cases vicariously experience—this kind of suffering.

Yet Hawthorne’s decision to publish a similar story in *Godey’s Lady’s Book* identifies the varied interests of that journal’s women readership, and suggests how Hawthorne used the more terrifying moral anxiety of his writing to find a potential new market of readers through a journal trumpeting domestic ideology. While hardly as terrifying as other works published by *Godey’s Lady’s Book*—Poe’s “The Cask of Amontillado” (1846) setting the bar pretty high—“The Witches” does contain grim imagery, albeit highly allegorized compared to Poe’s more terrifying

description of Fortunato's premature burial. Hale's inclusion of "The Witches" along with works by Poe reflects complicated problems in defining what women readers wanted in the nineteenth century, especially compared with what Hawthorne thought that same audience wanted—as evidently many women readers did not mind getting the kind of headaches from reading his literature as Sophia felt. Compared to Poe's "Cask," Hawthorne's "The Witches" more substantially fulfills Hale's stated mission to promote traditional family values. The enemy here is not an ambitious murderer like Montresor; it is debatable whether Poe's story imparts any substantial moral to its audience. In comparison, in Hawthorne's tale, the enemy is isolation. Embodied by Satan in "The Witches" and Chillingworth in *The Scarlet Letter*, isolation threatens the very souls of vulnerable characters. As in many of his other writings, Hawthorne identifies the household as that central location from which people derive their proper morals, and the noticeable absence of a woman's touch within a household would speak to the readers of *Godey's Lady's Book*, reminding the domestic caretakers among that readership of the value Hale and evidently Hawthorne thought they had in protecting the men in their lives by providing moral improvement and maternal nurturance. As Hawthorne concludes in "The Witches," such men "had better have stayed at home" (192).

Hawthorne's choice to publish in women's journals—for women readers and with the input of women editors—indicates that, whatever his misogynistic argument with women writers, his literature does break down the gendered binaries at times inherent in previous literary markets in the United States and abroad. Hardly limiting himself to a traditional definition of masculinity, Hawthorne produced works of literature for women audiences, and his anticipation of their responses informed the final drafts of those works. As time passed after his tirade against that "damned mob," Hawthorne would modify his thoughts about women writers. He

would add in a follow-up letter to Ticknor, inspired by reading Fanny Fern's *Ruth Hall*, which he "enjoyed a great deal": "Generally, women write like emasculated men, and are only to be distinguished from male authors by greater feebleness and folly; but when they throw off the restraints of decency and come before the public stark naked, as it were—then their books are to possess character and value" (Hawthorne, *Letters of Hawthorne to Ticknor* 1:78). His private rumination to Ticknor is surprising because in "Mrs. Hutchinson" he noted the "impropriety in the display of woman's naked mind to the gaze of the world" (68). Yet Hawthorne concludes in the last sentence of "The Custom-House" that he has minimal expectations for his literature being remembered by later generations. After decrying those women "scribblers," he uses that apt word to refer to himself as no more than "the scribbler of bygone days" (*Scarlet Letter* 34). He may have thought of himself as not so different from other writers, women included.

"The First Time That I Ever Came Home": Sophia Peabody and Her Husband

Writing in March 1856 to his wife Sophia, Hawthorne thinks again about the literary output of that "ink-stained wom[a]n" Sara Jane Lippincott, alias Grace Greenwood. In a marked change from his previously quoted remarks about Sara Willis, alias Fanny Fern, Hawthorne says how happy he is that Sophia never "prostituted" herself like Greenwood, making her ideas bare to the public, like walking through town "stark naked" (*Centenary Edition* 17:308). This letter to Sophia prompts a question, about what Hawthorne wants: is it good for women to write as if their minds are laid bare to the public, or to practice propriety and cover up those ideas? Hawthorne uses women as a repository for his own ambivalence, projecting onto these persons his desire for a domestic sphere that shields his privacy, and a longing for success in the public sphere of literary publishing. Hence he feels hostility towards women writers who abandon the

domestic and dare to enter the public sphere with their literary productions—more financially and critically successful than his own. Much as those veils worn by his female characters—such as Zenobia—but also his male characters—Reverend Hooper and even Hawthorne himself in “The Custom-House”—both conceal and reveal veiled subjects to their audiences, Hawthorne draws upon these traditionally feminine cultural objects—the veil, the home, perhaps literature and the romance themselves—to tease out the complexities of gender in the nineteenth century. It has been difficult for scholars to agree upon any answers, because Hawthorne could write such statements to his wife, yet create dynamic characters such as Hester Prynne and Zenobia, the latter herself channeling Margaret Fuller when she decries “the injustice which the world did to women, and equally to itself, by not allowing them, in freedom and honor, and with the fullest welcome, their natural utterance in public” (120). While *The Blithedale Romance* offers a satirical view of persons such as Fuller, nevertheless Hawthorne’s overall ambivalence toward these women writers presents a problem in reading his literature. His literary output was bound up in his relationship to his wife and, I argue, how masculinity and femininity were defined—at times, ambiguously—in his time around the domestic space.

As soon as Hawthorne invites his readers into his parlor, he makes his private life subject matter to be read, while not exactly in the same way, as his fiction was read. Yet his noticeable dependence on Sophia as literary confidante and, upon his death, editor of his private journals, presents problems in reading his tirades against women authors seriously. That he writes this letter to his wife about Greenwood and other women writers is significant, based on how often he discussed aesthetic philosophy with her, while simultaneously expecting her to be the domestic goddess who kept home and family so well maintained. Nathaniel Hawthorne’s fear that Sophia would ever “prostitute[.]” herself is telling in light of so much criticism against him,

especially that written shortly after his death. In the *Oneida Circular*, John Humphrey Noyes claimed readers must “have no faith in the permanence of Hawthorne’s reputation,” save that it would be remembered poorly because, in using his literature for political means to advance Franklin Pierce’s career, Hawthorne engaged in “shameless prostitution of [his] high literary talent” (qtd in Bosco and Murphy ix). Again, the popular press seemed to love to remind Hawthorne that he was regarded as hardly that different from those women writers he chastised, often for the same flaws he found in their writings.

Yet Sophia Peabody was also a writer, a notable one at that, hardly only a homebody and certainly not a prostitute. She was an accomplished artist, well known among her social circle for her writings and in the public for her illustrations. Before her marriage, her journals, privately circulated among family friends by her sister, the publisher Elizabeth Peabody, documented Sophia’s travels in Cuba. While she was not walking naked through town, the exposure was more public than she would have preferred. Like her future husband, Sophia wrote in outrage against Elizabeth’s violation of private trust, telling her—using a metaphor similar to, though far more graphic than, that employed by her future husband—“If I were stuck up bodily upon a pole & carried about the street I could not feel more *exposed*” (qtd in Valenti 82; emphasis in original). Despite Sophia’s anger, the supposed damage had already been done, the copies disseminated among Elizabeth’s friends—including Nathaniel Hawthorne. Through the journals, Hawthorne had an excuse to start a conversation with Sophia. Despite Hawthorne’s invasion of her privacy, his shared concern with her about exposure to a discerning reading public and their eventual marriage shows they had much in common to discuss. As with the characters he portrayed and those domestic spaces in which he set his stories and in which he

wrote, Hawthorne's literary production comprises of a set of both masculine and feminine qualities that works within ambiguous critical binaries and culminates in his literary androgyny.

While both Sophia Peabody and Nathaniel Hawthorne thought women should not present their *written* ideas to the larger public, the couple did not mind the presentation of their *illustrated* ideas to that public. This exception for women visual artists owes to a conventional gendered separation that saw visual art as feminine and oral and written texts as masculine.⁵³ Peabody's illustrations attracted much attention, and Hawthorne capitalized on the opportunity provided by that attention. Before their marriage, Hawthorne commissioned Peabody to illustrate *Grandfather's Chair* (1840) and then an expanded book copy of his short story "The Gentle Boy." The latter, with a new subtitle as "A Thrice-Told Tale" (1839), was pivotal in returning Hawthorne to the literary marketplace, it having been two years since he had published any volume. Megan Marshall argues that Hawthorne's triumphant return owed much to Peabody, part of her personal "scheme to establish Hawthorne as an author worthy of illustration—an American Shakespeare, Homer, or Goethe" (371). Her illustrations attracted much critical attention to Hawthorne's revised book. Park Benjamin in *The New-Yorker* identified Peabody's illustration as "a display of the most exquisite genius" (301), and Washington Allston in the *Christian Register and Boston Observer* said the marriage of "the young artist['s]" illustrations suited "Hawthorne's exquisite fancies" (1). Aware of his debt to Peabody, Hawthorne dedicated *The Gentle Boy: A Thrice-Told Tale* to her, "her kindred art ha[ving] given value" to the story (qtd in Marshall 372). The literary content of his works are not his own but part of a collaborative endeavor with the women in his life—Peabody as his

⁵³ In " 'Folded Up in a Veil'" (2013), Christa Holm Vogelius reads this ekphrasis in conversation with Sophia Peabody's intermingling of her domestic and family life with her visual productions.

illustrator, she and his sisters as his editors, correspondents, and audiences, all informing the final draft.

Despite Peabody's critically acclaimed and commercially successful illustrations, and the evidence of her considerable editorial oversight of her husband's later publications, the latter has earned her considerable condemnation. Upon the death of her husband, Peabody edited and published his *American Notebooks* in 1868. Randall Stewart then edited a revised edition in 1932. This man's edition received praise from the *New York Times* and other periodicals, albeit by denigrating Peabody in the process. As one early twentieth-century reviewer puts it, "the bite and tang and elemental rusticity and congenial pessimism of Nathaniel Hawthorne were carefully eradicated from the American notebooks when Mrs. Hawthorne 'edited' them for publication." Herbert Gorman writes off Peabody as "his loving editor," too biased to correctly edit his writings, especially when, in Gorman's estimation, a critic such as Randall Stewart supposedly saved Hawthorne's writings from his wife's poor editing. Interestingly, whereas Gorman chastises Peabody as "ultra-idealistic," he resists similar descriptions for the romance writer Hawthorne.

I argue that this strain of literary criticism to admonish Sophia Peabody's editorial work of her husband's texts has resulted in attempts to masculinize Hawthorne by removing any supposedly feminizing influence circulating around him, particularly as regards his choices to write in the form of romance and from the originating site of the domestic sphere. This attempt to masculinize Hawthorne must not overlook how his gendering depends upon his very engagement in femininity: Hawthorne defined masculinity in his life and in his literature in communication with, not only resistance against, femininity. Hardly compromised by his femininity, it was his engagement with women that defined his form of the romance. In a time

period in which femininity was closely aligned with the household, Hawthorne embraced numerous domestic spaces in defining what makes himself a man and an author—sometimes conflating those two roles, hence potentially overlooking just how dependent authorship was upon women and not just men like him. If Nathaniel Hawthorne needed his family’s parlor to serve as that space from which his literary romance could emanate, he needed a wife like Sophia to provide that space. Recalling one walk with Emerson, he writes, “I longed to turn back, and bring them to my little wife. After our arduous journey, we arrived safe home in the afternoon of the second day—the first time that I ever came home in my life; for I never had a home before” (10 Oct 1842 qtd in *Centenary Edition* 8:362).⁵⁴ Like his fictional domestic goddesses—such as Phoebe Pyncheon, whose name is inspired from Sophia’s own—his wife defines a space that Hawthorne can claim as his home, but one that, as shared with women, hence influenced by women, would influence his own form of the romance. For all his insistence on gendering the romance writer as “he,” it was the influence of women that comprises how such a man can write in the form of the romance.

Nathaniel Hawthorne would pass away not at home with his wife but while on vacation with old friend and former president Franklin Pierce. Upon receiving news of his death, Sophia Peabody wrote from afar: “He fell asleep softly, and waked in the heavenly world, without a sound or a struggle, and without the pain of bidding us farewell.” Even when she cannot see how he died, like her husband she can exercise her imagination to describe actual events, albeit through the filter of other witnesses: “He was very grand and beautiful as he lay there, they told me.” In her remarks Peabody attempts to dull the pain of physical separation from her husband, almost drawing from Emerson’s remarks on self-reliance to say that Hawthorn could die

⁵⁴ His traveling companion Emerson made a similar observation, claiming that one can be “at home still,” despite changes to one’s physical location (“Self-Reliance” 1173).

independently of other people, feeling a sense of home even when away from his family. “No one needed to close his eyes,” she wrote, “for he closed them himself” (Letter to Anne O’Gara, 4 Sept 1864 qtd in McFarland 295-296). While she could not be present upon his death, her influence, and the influence of many women in his life, colored the kind of romantic literature Hawthorne produced, and it was that domestic sphere he credited as women’s domain that afforded the space to produce such literature. He may have died with only another man (Franklin Pierce) in the house, but the influence he drew from women and conventional feminine identities persisted into postbellum reception of his literature. Regardless of his frustration with women artists, Hawthorne recognized his literature was directed to an audience that, as domestic, would have to include women. The sense of a home grounds his literary identity as a public writing figure, at a time when the household was traditionally associated with women.

Throughout his literary career, Hawthorne was in conversation with his readers to pursue his own personal vision of what the romance could accomplish, at a time when what it meant to be an author was changing as well. One of these changes concerned who Hawthorne’s intended readership would be. The moment he chose to depart from his family’s house and have his writings published in the literary marketplace, he participated in a conversation with a diverse set of readers and fellow authors. Despite how much animosity he addressed to women authors, the moment he defined the romance in his terms, he sent it out into a nation of authors ready to use it to approach their own questions about how it felt to be at home in the United States. The domestic setting provided the space for Hawthorne’s most characteristic genre, the romance, to emerge—and it was through both the romance and its association with larger issues of home that other writers, including George Copway, Sojourner Truth, and Mark Twain were able to approach questions regarding just who was allowed to feel at home in the United States.

Chapter 3

“To the Fireside of the Paleface”:

Domesticity and Native American Identity in the Works of George Copway

With his first book, the 1847 autobiography *The Life, History, and Travels of Kah-Ge-Ga-Gah-Bowh*, Ojibwe (Anishinaabe) writer George Copway became the first published First Nations (Canadian Native American) author. “I am a stranger in a strange land!” as Copway writes in the introduction to his first published book. “And often, when the sun is sinking in the western sky, I think of my former home; my heart yearns for the loved of other days, and tears flow like the summer rain. How the heart of the wanderer and pilgrim, after long years of absence, beats, and his eyes fill, as he catches a glance at the hills of his nativity, and reflects upon the time when he pressed the lips of a Mother, or Sister, now cold in death. Should I live, this painful pleasure will yet be mine. *Blessed be the Lord, who hath helped me hitherto*” (vii). Upon encountering this early portion of his book, his readers recognize how Copway uses tropes traditionally associated with Native American literature, specifically an ecological reading of his surroundings, in order to make intelligible to his largely white audience how he stakes a claim to a native American (as opposed to Native American) identity that, in his time, was seen as antithetical to being indigenous. Whiteness had become analogous to nativeness, as numerous writers including Thomas Jefferson, James Fenimore Cooper, Philip Freneau, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow considered white Americans to be the inheritors of that close association with nature and with the New World, at the same time that these authors also eulogized the lost native populations—lost primarily because of a willfulness by those authors to recognize Native

Americans in the past but not the present, and because of a national politics and culture responsible for the diminished numbers and influence of indigenous persons.⁵⁵

Copway's passage also identifies how he positions himself in a liminal space—a child of the forest, now a Christian convert; someone who remembers his former home at Rice Lake near present-day Ottawa, but who now writes and published in New York City. In considering this middle ground, he refers to himself as “wanderer and pilgrim,” yet his mind and his heart reside in that lost home. Likewise, he both engages in and subverts traditional tropes employed by white authors—like Jefferson, Cooper, Freneau, and Longfellow—to consider the idealized Indian as physically dead yet culturally transcendent. His mourning over lost Native Americans sounds like the kind of work by white authors to eulogize the deceased indigenous populations and to recognize their influence as will be carried forward by his white readers. Yet in this passage, and throughout his published works, Copway uses the symbol of the home to ground his potentially cliché tropes in his own life, lending a strong sense of realism to his literature and forcing his white readers to confront the realities of their time period.

By identifying his mother and his sister, now dead, for example, Copway pivots from this passage to consider the gendered constructions of white, Ojibwe, and Native American homes at large in order to bridge an imagined gap between himself and his readers. His focus in this passage on a departed mother and sister is in context of other writings in the time period that not only mourned the death of a woman—epitomized in the poetry and philosophy of Edgar Allan Poe—but also identify women with home. The loss of his former home is the loss of women, as Copway engages in conventional gendered separations: he is a man who emphasizes the loss of

⁵⁵ See John T. Frederick, “Cooper’s Eloquent Indians” (1956); Roger Kennedy, “Jefferson and the Indians” (1992); Gary Ashwill, “Savagism and Its Discontents” (1994); Susan Scheckel, *The Insistence of the Indian* (1998); Theresa Strouth Gaul, “Romance and the ‘Genuine Indian’” (2002); David Kazanjian, *The Colonizing Trick* (2003); Drew Lopezina, “‘The Whole Wilderness Shall Blossom as the Rose’” (2006); and Gordon M. Sayre, “Jefferson and Native Americans” (2009).

home, at the same time that he is torn away from that home by the realities of his life—his internationally-known activism on behalf of indigenous populations throughout North America, and his tumultuous and controversial life, as a defrocked Methodist minister, and as a Native American willing to work against numerous indigenous populations in order to have their land seized by the United States federal government. This seemingly internal conflict for Copway—to be a representative individual desiring a space to call home, even as he is willing to seize the land from others—corresponds with a similar conflict between his work life and his home life: beginning with his first publication, Copway acknowledges the opposed goals of desiring a home and needing to travel to support himself and his family—and it is this tension that is at the heart of his entire body of literature.

Domestic ideology is one Native American cultural signifier not immediately acknowledged in Copway's writing. Copway identifies the sources of some, not all, of his domestic ideological statements as coming from journals primarily edited by, written by, and marketed to whites. However, his writing draws upon contemporary arguments cited by Native American writers and white ethnographers of indigenous cultures, most notably Henry Rowe Schoolcraft. When speaking about how he feels as Ojibwe while residing in Canada and the United States, Copway frequently mentions home. Copway asks his readers to imagine what place an Ojibwe such as himself has within United States society. When Copway refers to both the images of homes and the societal roles available to North American Indians, he asks his readers whether they can imagine someone like him—a Native American—living in the kind of household more commonly thought to be occupied by white Americans, or whether they can imagine hosting someone such as him as a guest in their homes. He calls to his readers to remember their own sense of home as they read his texts, as when he dedicates his last book by

writing, “I send forth this volume to the fireside of the paleface” (*Running Sketches* iv). Having already taken on roles traditionally held by whites, including roles as Methodist minister and published author, Copway next situates himself as sitting by his own fireside, described much like that belonging to the derisively named “paleface,” to reveal how similar the Ojibwe households he occupied are to those of his white readers in North America and Europe.

When Copway claims that America is his home, he establishes a basis from which to make an activist intervention against removal ideologies, which had locked indigenous peoples into an unchanging and unchangeable historical position in relation to an ever evolving nation: the idealized Native American was almost always held as primitive—fixed to one particular moment in time—compared to a white Euro-American civilization almost always held as modern—hence re-imagined every few years as changes occurred in culture, politics, society, and technology. His publishing successes, however short-lived, put him in contact with popular ministers, politicians, and writers in his time, provided him with opportunities to lecture through parts of North America and Europe, and culminated in a body, albeit small, of literature that reveals complications in United States domestic discourse and national politics. In approaching difficult questions regarding the “place” of Native Americans —as individuals in households and as a people in the nation—Copway frequently used domestic settings in his writings as physical or even imagined spaces for meditating on solutions to ongoing challenges that indigenous populations faced regarding assimilation and United States federal policies.

From Ojibwe Homes to White Homes: Copway’s Early Life and Entrance into Publishing

In the 1820s and 1830s, it was to the advantage of many Ojibwe, including Copway’s parents, to convert to Methodism. After his parents’ conversion in 1827, young Kah-Ge-Ga-

Gah-Bowh, now George Copway, went to the Methodist school; it was not until his mother's death in 1830 that he formally converted. Conversion provided not only, as Copway described it, spiritual elevation "from darkness, to the marvelous light of the gospel" (*The Life, History* 43), but also an escape from the poverty and alcoholism poisoning many Ojibwe communities. After attending the local Methodist mission school at Rice Lake, in 1834 he began the training that led to his eventual frocking as a minister. During this missionary education, he met Elizabeth Howell, daughter of English farmers residing in Toronto. Herself a poet and later Copway's editor, Howell married him in 1840. The two traveled through western Canada and the United States as part of his missionary tour. After being stationed at various missions, he was elected in 1845 to be vice president to the Ojibwa General Council. Unfortunately, upon allegations he embezzled from the Methodists, he was imprisoned, defrocked, and expelled from the Canadian conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. Shortly thereafter Copway moved his family to New York to publish the autobiography he had been writing up to that time.

"Copway is a contradictory figure," argues Maureen Konkle, "because of who he is and what he is trying to do with writing" (195). An Ojibwe writer born in Canada but living in the United States, he alternates between which of the three nations he considers to be his true home, the choice dependent on whichever political cause he is taking at that time. At times in his speeches and texts, Copway defines himself as a fellow Christian American, suppressing his identity as a Native American, criticizing what he himself sees as their seemingly uncivilized fantasies directly opposed to Christian doctrine and beliefs, so that he may emphasize how assimilated he is to a United States way of life. Still at other times, he chastises fellow Christians and United States residents, as he sentimentalizes the lives of Ojibwe, celebrates the originality of Native Americans, and yearns for the close kinship he imagines indigenous populations have

with Nature itself. Due to his tendency to change to new political agendas as they became popular, scholars have read Copway's unsettled identity as the result of the author's own lack of authenticity. The questions concern how authentic he is as Ojibwe.

Part of the problem determining a stable identity for Copway also concerns his penchant for traveling. His last published book, *Running Sketches of Men and Places*, is considered the world's first travelogue written by a Native American. While Native Americans had earlier published accounts of their travels in larger books, including Hendrick Aupaumut's 1827 *A Short Narrative of My Last Journey to the Western Country* and the 1833 *Life of Black Hawk*, Copway's 1850 book is the first by a Native American to adhere to tropes commonly associated with travelogues (Sweet, "George Copway" 68). Unfortunately, poor critical reception of *Running Sketches*, combined with declining sales of his texts, made it his last published book. Copway was not writing what popular readership desired. Assimilationist arguments concerning Native Americans had changed in Copway's time. Earlier popular opinion in much of North America was that indigenous populations could convert to Christianity in order to become civilized. When Copway was writing, popular opinion now suggested there was no possibility for such persons to civilize themselves. Konkle emphasizes that the dualities that Copway occupies compromises his effectiveness to speak for himself or anyone else. The presupposition that Native Americans are incapable of producing art as understood by whites should prevent Copway from ever succeeding as a writer to Western audiences. Copway pursues paradoxical roles: he sentimentalizes the lives of Native Americans as the original occupants of the land and much more in harmony with nature, but as a Christian, "by the end of the passage [he] must make sure to condemn Indians for being so misguided, which would seem to be a violation of sentimental conventions." As Konkle concludes, "The only literary imagery available for

[Copway] to describe his experience essentially denies that an Indian could produce literature in the first place or that his experience even exists”: he dismantles the lives and aesthetic productions of Native Americans, at the same time that he speaks from the acknowledged perspective as an exemplary Native American artist (195).

Whereas Copway occupies these seemingly opposed poles that should undermine the existence of a Native American artist, his literary career actually emphasizes the commonality between Native Americans (regardless of tribe) and his own readers in North America and abroad. As he emphasizes the seemingly irreconcilable cultural differences, his literary output speaks to such a diverse audience that he actually shows in both his life and his work the possibility to occupy multiple gendered, racial, and national perspectives. In much of *Running Sketches*, as in his larger literary output, Copway navigates through issues of identity as concerning his Ojibwe background, his current residency in the United States, and his travels abroad. As such, in this travelogue, Copway even goes so far as to quote from attendants at his speeches who later wrote reports for notable newspapers. One reviewer wrote about him, “He did not speak of North America as the country of his adoption. It was America [...] that he called his home” (qtd in *Running Sketches* 326). Another reported that he argued that “the Indians occupied no half-way ground. When they professed to be Christians they would be found to be so” (qtd in *Running Sketches* 59). The re-circulation of reporters’ own accounts about him were used to cement the character he tried to fashion in speeches and then in his writings.

Upon his entrance into the publishing world, however, Copway also made a concerted effort to emphasize difference. While consistently referring to himself as Christian, hence coded as civilized, in literature and in public presentations Copway draws upon popular interest in

Native American cultures. As the first Native American to publish a book on the history of the Ojibwe (Ruoff, “Nineteenth-Century Autobiographer” 12), Copway opened opportunities for other Native Americans to write for themselves, not only providing accounts for white authors to re-publish but writing their own books about themselves as individuals, and writing autoethnographic accounts of their own communities. In these efforts, however, his critics claimed then and claim now that he made a spectacle of himself, to the embarrassment of both his contemporaries and many scholars today. He was “[a]n avid self-promoter with a strong desire to achieve literary fame and fortune” (Hutchings 61), even titling his first book as written by “a Young Indian Chief of the Ojibwa Nation”—when he was nothing of the sort. Periodicals that reported on his public speeches emphasized how “this son of the forest,” while still wearing a business suit, would wear traditional Ojibwe headwear or even “appear[] in full costume” (MBS 22). But his emphasis on racial difference did not constitute only identifying himself as the other, but also re-presenting such a characterization to his largely white audience. He drew upon his formative years to position himself as an outsider, with an intensely close ethnographic analysis of Ojibwe lives that served as reference for many of his friends in the literary world, including Henry Rowe Schoolcraft and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Copway knew so many of these white authors—not only Schoolcraft and Longfellow but also Washington Irving and James Fenimore Cooper—that he has been considered a “satellite” member of New York’s literary circle. He provided these authors with more information about Ojibwe, which Longfellow himself drew upon when writing *The Song of Hiawatha* (Knobel 187-188). He also drew upon those experiences so that his own writings could stand on their own merits, as the ethnographic accounts of Ojibwe life as written from within such communities.

Yet Copway has been plagued with accusations—many well supported—of plagiarism, as well as his alleged dependence on his wife, Elizabeth Howell, a notable author in her own right and likely the editor (if not ghost writer) of many of his texts. As he admits, writing frustrates him due to his feelings of inadequacy. He emphasizes that this is so because, as Tim Fulford describes it (289), he is writing in a foreign language to a foreign audience: his readers in North American and Europe can become as foreign to him as he imagines he is to his readers. In light of his portrayal of difference, the charges of plagiarism against him, and the sensationalistic element of his life, Copway's literature reflects his complicated relationship with his readers, one that has translated into difficulty for many scholars in approaching his writings. The criticism stems largely from Copway's complicated relationship to his own biography: at times he appears to exaggerate his Ojibwe identity in order to sell books; at other times he decries his fellow Ojibwe as enslaved to archaic ideas while he strove to make himself white; and still at other times he criticizes the same white readers he ostensibly imitated for their ancestors' crimes against Native Americans at large. In his attempts to appeal to a wide reading audience, Copway comes across as opportunistic because of his shifting alliance to numerous, often competing interests: he helps white politicians to take over indigenous lands, while protesting such seizures when speaking to fellow Native Americans. Because of his financial problems, he ends his years estranged from family and peddling himself as a medicine man and ultimately a quack.

Scholars have focused on how Copway humbles himself to his white readers, a rhetorical strategy to appeal to the publishers, readers, and even politicians with whom he associated. This rhetorical strategy has implications for how he crosses the boundary between the separate spheres of the public and the private, as he prefaces his first published book with an appeal

asking forgiveness for this boundary crossing: “In presenting my life to the public, I do so with the greatest diffidence, and at the earnest solicitation of numerous friends” (5). He emphasizes how poor a writer he is, in part based on limitations that he assigns to his own culture: “It would be presumptuous in one, who has but recently been brought out of a wild and savage state; and who has since received but three years’ schooling, to undertake, without any assistance, to publish to the world a work of any kind. It is but a few years since I began to speak the English language” (vi). Even as he belittles himself for his seemingly paltry talents, he emphasizes that Ojibwe culture is worth preserving, hence he acts at the behest of friends, especially as he does not know what awaits him in his future as one person, and for fellow Ojibwes at large. Copway admits “a friend [...] kindly corrected all *serious* grammatical errors, leaving the unimportant ones wholly untouched, that my own style may be exhibited as truly as possible.” He adds, “The public, the printers, and myself, are indebted to him for his kind aid, and he has my most sincere thanks” (vi). Copway both claims ownership of his writing and credits his editors—although he does not extend credit to those writers from whom he quotes at length without attribution, or sometimes without even quotation marks. Part of this lack of attribution is a trait of the time period: as Meredith McGill has documented, it is difficult to ascertain the sources of many nineteenth-century texts because they were written anonymously or pseudonymously, a problem exacerbated by a contemporary print culture in which, without copyright protections, published works were re-printed in competing journals, sometimes without credit to the source. “I am too well aware of the many faults which are still to be found therein” (vi). “All along, have I felt my great deficiency; and my inadequacy for such an undertaking. I would fain hope, however, that the kind Reader will throw the mantle of charity over errors of every kind. I am a stranger in a strange land!” (vii)

Through these rhetorical devices, Copway identifies both Native Americans and whites as responsible for the successful assimilation, and eventual home-building, of Ojibwes and other persons. Copway holds Native Americans as responsible for their own efforts—and failures—to assimilate. To do otherwise would be to undermine Native American claims to agency: if individual persons do not influence the path of their own lives, then they are not agents but objects. Yet as agents, Native Americans are entering into agreements with each other and with individuals from external communities—whites—who must be held to the same expectation to deal fairly. All obstructions by white politicians throughout North America have hindered Native Americans' progress to assimilate, and as Copway argues, this hindrance harms both Native Americans and the nations of Canada and the United States towards forming more stable communities. Negotiating between competing goals, like many Ojibwe writers Copway struggled to argue that Native Americans were equal to white Americans, while having to make those arguments within an ideological “colonial discourse” that equated “difference” with “inferiority” (Brownlie 23).

Copway's political advocacy work required frequent travel away from his home—and given how often he was removed from religious and literary communities, there were many places he would call “home”—to campaign in the United States and abroad to find political financing and popular support to make this dream into a reality. A. LaVonne Brown Ruoff has read Copway's literature as predicated upon that travel but as originating from his childhood entrance into the Methodist religion. His earliest narratives, told from the perspective of an Ojibwe author, appear more like earlier “confessional narratives” by white missionaries entering Native American lands to convert indigenous populations. As a result, his first autobiography focuses upon the act of “[l]eaving the safety of his home, [to] journey[] into the wilds, where his

spiritual and physical courage are tested.” Copway’s accounts of such “harrowing adventures among the Great Lake Ojibwes appealed to his audience’s taste for the sensational and are comparable to those in the popular Indian captivity, slave, and missionary narratives of the period” (“Nineteenth-Century Autobiographer” 11). In these rhetorical performances, Copway recognizes that racial difference prevents him from feeling at home within the United States. Beyond the fact that he was raised in Canada, upon his move to New York, he became infuriated with national United States policies that repeatedly removed Native Americans from their lands to make way for white settlement. Eventually he took action in print, campaigning for particular politicians who promised to secure more stable territories for Native American populations without fear of another move. Copway even entered politics himself, advocating for his own personal project: to establish a permanent territory within the United States for only Christian Native Americans.

To overcome the problem of appearing inferior to his readers, Copway appealed to a diverse audience, carefully performing as not only Ojibwe but also a patriotic United States resident (despite being from Canada), a devout Christian, and above all else a committed advocate for improving the lives of Native Americans (Schacht 195). These performances are not mutually exclusive, but up to today they produce problems for scholars reading Copway’s life, whether to indemnify him as an inauthentic Ojibwe, as an opportunistic speaker and writer, or as a troubled soul divided by competing interests. At all times, he is trying to find an audience where he can feel welcomed. To house so many identities, Copway tapped into the popular imagery and language of his day. Part of that process was to assume a particularly masculine posture, as associated with indigenusness in prior images of Native Americans, in literary works by James Fenimore Cooper and political speeches by Andrew Jackson. In many of his

speeches, he presented himself as an Ojibwe chief—which was a lie—dressed in full costume. In assuming the role of chief, Copway followed a consistent pattern of taking on roles beyond just that of himself: he not only was writing of his own life as a single, solitary man but, as subtitled in *Running Sketches*, “of men and places.” He was writing himself as a representative man, who could speak beyond his experiences in North America to write of a global sense of self and illustrate how a person should act anywhere in the world. At the same time, he also deployed a domestic language that was popular with both politicians and members of the women’s cultural and literary household movement that Barbara Welter has referred to as constituting “the Cult of Domesticity” or “the Cult of True Womanhood.” In expressing his sense of isolation and homesickness as related to his identification of himself as a man, Copway turns continuously to domestic language at a time when such ideological discourse was traditionally associated with women. Bound up in his definition of being a displaced Ojibwe is what it means to feel like a man, writing about content and in a style generally reserved for women.

Although publishing only in the 1840s and 1850s, Copway’s comparatively short literary career reveals how he draws upon his own life and contemporary discourse about Native Americans to trace his constant search for a home. He described his fear that such an “isolated condition” will persist for indigenous persons such as himself, until they “will perpetuate the peculiarities which characterize them as a nation apart from others,” never able to adapt to whatever surroundings into which federal governments thrust them next (Copway, “Address Before the Legislature” 178). Scholarly discussions of Copway’s isolation have focused primarily upon the man himself, while often overlooking how isolation influences his distinctive writing style. Of course, referring to Copway’s style as “distinctive” poses a problem, given how

imitative it is of (and how much he plagiarized from) popular literature in his time. Struggling to define himself as an indigenous author appealing to a white audience, this divisiveness—Is Copway really native enough? Is he really American enough?—has recently come to a head in Tim Fulford’s argument that, “because Copway is not secure in either Ojibwa or white communities,” he cannot define a sense of self except as a perpetual condition of “isolation” that prevents him from knowing “an appropriate social or literary discourse for [each] event” he represents (289). He has been accused of being “overwhelmingly romantic and nostalgic” (Ruoff, “Nineteenth-Century Autobiographer” 9), to the detriment of accuracy in his literature. If he cannot even define his own identity, his literary style becomes compromised, as Fulford and other scholars have all identified Copway’s collected texts as constituting a poor imitation of British romanticism in both style and content. Kevin Hutchings, for example, argues that Copway was very familiar with the political campaigning of Sir Francis Bond Head, governor of Upper Canada at the time when Copway was resident, whose letters on Native American policies used “Romantic concepts of nature and culture” to “celebrate[] Ojibwa people as moral exemplars that British citizens and Canadian settlers would do well to emulate for the sake of their own improvement” (32).

Such criticism often overlooks not only Copway’s own initiative as a writer but also how, in shaping a variety of literary forms to his own end, Copway was able to use popular styles to articulate his own feelings of homelessness. Scholars have read how white authors attempted to “accomplish[] a political reconciliation of Indian sovereignty and colonial settlement, of republican values and imperial history” by drawing upon motifs, symbols, and narrative drawn from indigenous literature (Sayre 26). This is parallel to Copway drawing upon Euro-American motifs and literary forms. As Copway reminded his readers, not many white readers had the

intimate detailed knowledge of Ojibwe culture that he could draw from his own life, because “[t]he *traditions* handed down from father to son, were held very sacred [and thus] one half of these are not known by the white people, however far their researches may have extended” (*The Life, History* 43). What happens when an Ojibwe writer uses literary forms more traditionally associated with white authors? What opposing values and histories are brought together? How is reconciliation established, if at all? As Cathy Rex asks, what is wrong with interpreting his literature as revealing “an Ojibwe person can also be both British and American,” hence at home in any of the three communities, “as well as a creative, intellectual figure and a devout Christian” (3)? Whereas scholarship emphasizes the influence Copway’s knowledge of Ojibwe culture had on the works of Schoolcraft and Longfellow through his friendships with both, I propose that the influence was bi-directional. Copway hardly served as only a source of information for white authors. While often drawing upon the assistance (and even verbatim, unquoted language) of his peers, Copway himself was a writer of his own life and the lives of other Native Americans.

Kah-Ge-Ga and Boston: Lost and Failed Native American Communities

Defining Copway’s politics, Dale T. Knobel writes that, “[l]ike other reformers, he argued that Indian culture was a product of Indian condition and that if the latter were altered, the former, in time, would be changed also” (183). Copway’s rhetoric depended upon situating his argument within a firm sense of place, for the benefit of his audience to imagine the highly idealized portrayals he presented of Nature, and for provoking discussions regarding which opportunities and challenges he and other Ojibwe persons faced compared to other communities in North America and abroad. By emphasizing a sense of place, Copway frequently drew upon the idea of home, especially in advocating for a national territory reserved for Native Americans.

In his writings, he imagines Native Americans as hunters, whose assimilation into United States “civilization” (in other words, white society) requires that they work their lands first as farmers, eventually entering the public sphere of urban communities. This process also would require a change from communal control of land towards private ownership of partitioned land and eventually houses. He developed this plan through years of speeches and eventually publications for what he called Kah-Ge-Ga, a semi-autonomous territory within the United States that would consolidate all Native Americans within the nation’s borders—upon their conversion to Christianity. The plan has been read by critics less as a solution for Native Americans and more as Copway’s vanity project: the territory’s name derives from his own Ojibwe name, Kah-Ge-Ga-Gah-Bowh, “He Who Stands Forever.” But despite how uneven his life and character were—in all his geographical movements, in all his different jobs, even in re-imagining himself with different names, nationalities, and religions—the problem of finding an ideal home is intimately tied to his life, even to his name. Criticism about the territory Kah-Ge-Ga as merely a vanity project is flawed, as such criticism overlooks the import of that name: if Copway’s Ojibwe name means “He Who Stands Forever,” then for remaining a notable and accomplished writer and advocate for Native Americans, he made good on that name. “Kah-Ge-Ga” therefore meant “The Place That Stands Forever”—the name was not only to immortalize Copway but also to imagine a space for Native Americans that would persist despite whatever struggles awaited.

Advocating for this territory in “The American Indians,” an essay appearing in the conservative nativist journal *The American Whig*, Copway assumes a humble voice, on behalf of Native Americans about to be expelled from their tribal lands. He fears that upon this removal, indigenous populations will revert to traditional ways, rather than, as many white politicians hope, continue to improve in white ways. “They have hunted for a living,” he writes, “and thus

perpetuated that independent, roaming disposition, which was their earlier education. Their fathers having been Nimrods, in a literal sense, they followed in their steps” (“The American Indians” 632). This presentation of other Native Americans, as if naturalized to revert to older ways, is part of a larger nativist policy that Copway advocated. In his campaign publications on behalf of Know Nothing Party candidates, Copway appropriated Indian iconography in order to re-define “Native American” as white citizens of the United States. Copway hypothesizes that Ojibwe’s claims to land necessitated that they “fought with the original inhabitants; and having overpowered them, became the owners of the soil” (*The Life, History* 43). Likewise, nativism in Copway’s estimation is defined as the stronger group supplanting the older outdated ones. While Copway’s anti-immigration ideas come across as offensive, these arguments are the culmination of work he did towards the formation of a Native American home—by making sure he made certain Native Americans appear as enemies to the United States itself. Copway then could justify the seizure of those tribes’ land, which then could be settled by the nation’s peaceful indigenous allies. For example, Copway volunteered himself to help the United States government expel Seminoles from Florida, with the likely benefit that he himself could be seen as an ally to the nation. Therefore despite how often he himself was expelled from the many homes he attempted to create in shared communities—Ojibwe communities lost upon his entrance into the mission and publishing circuit; Methodists communities lost upon his defrocking; and writing communities upon low sales of his last publications and accusations of plagiarism—Copway hypocritically tried to expel other marginalized groups (Carlson 76; Copway to J. B. Floyd qtd in D. B. Smith, “Kahgegahbowh” 46). Not even the dead have a resting place, as he assisted in stealing the remains of Red Jacket from Buffalo in 1852, ostensibly to prevent their seizure by white thieves (D. B. Smith, “Kahgegahbowh” 45; Konkle

223; Peyer, *American Indian Nonfiction* 220). In advocating for the Know Nothing Party and presidential candidate Millard Fillmore, in exchange for support of his Kah-Ge-Ga territory, Copway's arguments came to rely on anti-Catholic rhetoric (Peyer, *American Indian Nonfiction* 220; Knobel 183-186)—but Copway, in his last years, converted to Catholicism (Konkle 223)!

Despite his advocacy for nativist policies, to the detriment of many non-white Americans, there is more to his article in *The American Whig* than racist rhetoric. While seemingly debasing Native Americans, in particular defining adherence to tradition as somehow an inborn condition, Copway's article identifies a similar problem among the readers of *The American Whig*. He turns his argument upon his white readers to ask difficult questions: how would those white readers feel, if they had been so frequently and quickly displaced as Native Americans? Is that not the feeling they have at that moment in the face of increased immigration? As Copway's unknowingly anticipates Booker T. Washington's similar arguments in his 1895 address at the Atlanta Exposition, should not white Americans turn to the indigenous populations they have known for so many years, before putting trust into foreign interlopers?⁵⁶ His work for the Whigs and the nativists is in keeping with his larger project of defining spaces for Native Americans to occupy in the United States—unfortunately, in the process creating a new scapegoat in the form of immigrants, in order to appeal to white readers to see indigenous populations as more American than these foreign interlopers. His alignment with nativists therefore is born of sharing one common goal, even if Copway's additional goals are not necessarily aligned with those of nativists. In all of Copway's writing, then, is the persistent effort to hold seemingly opposed binaries simultaneously. Copway does not choose to be only indigenous or only white; rather, he appropriates aspects drawn from many lived experiences in numerous white, Ojibwe, and other Native American communities, and is willing to alternatively criticize and praise

⁵⁶ On Copway's transformation into an advocate for nativism and the Know Nothings, see Knobel.

occupants of those communities. His pursuit of his own arguments depends on allowing himself to engage with individual persons on multiple levels of kinship and antagonism, to be as willing to celebrate as to chastise. Rather than a seeming contradiction, his work with the Whigs and his engagement in racist rhetoric, while certainly hypocritical, is very much a paradox.

The political struggles that Copway faced emerge in part from earlier historical instances that placed Native Americans in close proximity to Christian communities, including missions. Discourse regarding Native Americans depended on Christian arguments defining indigenous populations as differing from white Christian populations in terms of culture, not race: “culturally but not biologically inferior and, therefore, potentially capable of equality.” However, by the 1840s discourse had shifted to locating the key difference in race, an immutable condition preventing any Ojibwe from claiming equality to any white person (Brownlie 23). This condition of otherness becomes more apparent upon Copway’s travels away from his Ojibwe home, as when he struggles to consider himself an American.

Copway’s status as an outsider, both to European societies and to many North American communities, allows his travelogue to re-present what should be familiar settings for many of his European and American readers, from the de-familiarizing eye of a supposedly foreign visitor. Such self-awareness of his foreignness, combined with his work to make his readers aware how foreign they seem to him, sets the stage for his next goal: after what he thought was his rather lackluster presentation to the General Peace Congress, Copway held speeches in Scotland and England to advocate for an autonomous Christian Native American territory within the United States. “[T]he Indian’s wigwam has been destroyed,” he told these European audiences, as “the wicked white man has pawed and gnawed the property of the Indian, [...] crying every day, ‘more land, more land.’ [...] The Ojibways are [...] perpetuating pure principles in our country;

and if living in brick houses, and having farm-yards [...] are no signs of civilization, the Indians will never become civilized” (*Running Sketches* 317, 314). Casting fellow Ojibwe as the true inheritors of their land because they stick to the “pure principles” of their agreement with Canadian and United States governments, whereas “wicked white[s]” cannot broker an honest deal, Copway advocates for a plan that he hopes force whites to fulfill their promises. Upon his return from Europe, Copway presented his proposal to Congress in 1850 for Kah-Ge-Ga, a territory he had been planning since publishing an 1848 pamphlet on the topic. With the support of the United States government, the proposed plan would move Native Americans to a 150-square-mile territory east of the Missouri River. With time, the territory would even have its own representative sent to Congress.

Copway’s proposal in many ways resembled many earlier plans proposed by both whites and Native Americans in Canada and the United States. In them, territorial status and eventual legislative representation necessitated that Native Americans convert to Christianity and adopt traditionally white housing and labor such as farming, while Native Americans would benefit from having a permanent territory to settle as home and as a buffer against seizure by white settlers. The plan was inspired in part by Britain’s plot during the War of 1812 to establish a neutral Native American territory in the Midwest, both as a home for Britain’s indigenous allies, and as a buffer against the United States. Although Britain continued to push for this territory even in peace negotiations following its military defeat, the plan was eventually dropped, due in part to British alliances with many Native American and First Nations tribes—including Copway’s fellow Ojibwe—in fighting the United States. Decades later, the plan reemerged, now drafted by the United States as part of the forced relocation of Native Americans to “Indian Territory” under the 1834 Indian Intercourse Act. Copway and others identified that violent

relocation as unproductive, for both Native Americans and whites. According to their arguments, so long as Native Americans continued to live such different lives from white Americans in terms of work and housing, the latter would continue to appeal to the government to take more Native American lands for farming and cities, eventually taking Indian Territory with it. Alternative plans would be proposed to both the United States and Canadian governments for Native American settlements that would overcome the problem of cultural differences by ensuring that territorial status would move forward only with the conversion and “civilizing” of any indigenous persons moving to that land. In 1836, four Christian chiefs sought a territory in Upper Canada. In 1840, Indian Commissioner Hartley T. Crawford received presidential support for an Old Northwest territory. In 1841, Wisconsin territorial governor James Duane Doty negotiated with Sioux for an “Indian blood” territory in the Dakotas. In addition, “removal advocates” such as Jedidiah Morse and Isaac McCoy proposed their own plans for western Native American territories that had the options for eventual statehood (Ruoff, “Nineteenth-Century American Indian” 220; Peyer, *Tutor’d Mind* 245).

As Bernd Peyer emphasizes, Kah-Ge-Ga was born from Copway’s increasing sense of personal homelessness: “ostracized from his own native community,” Copway felt “compelled to experiment with more abstract reformist ideas in his new and self-appointed role as pan-Indian spokesman” (*Tutor’d Mind* 245). Despite the precedence of similar plans and his emotional investment in the project, Copway’s campaign for Kah-Ge-Ga failed even to be heard by Congress. Nevertheless, the speech that Copway gave in Europe arguing for Kah-Ge-Ga is reprinted towards the end of *Running Sketches*, and its placement in the book’s conclusion serves as an ironic echo to how he begins his travelogue, with his visit to Boston. In the acknowledgements for *Running Sketches*, Copway dedicates the book to his white readers, as he

“send[s] forth this volume to the fireside of the paleface.” Having ended his book focusing on the need for an autonomous Native American territory where “the Indian with the white man shall be blessed with a home like this” (*Running Sketches* 320), this dedication to the “palefaces,” focusing on white Americans’ peaceful domestic spaces, forces his readers to imagine how insecure many Native Americans must feel at their own firesides, and whether they feel safe knowing that their legal claims to any home are tenuous within the United States. If white Bostonians could feel secure within their own houses, why should Native Americans not feel likewise? Would a place that stands forever—as Kah-Ge-Ga promises in its name—not offer such security? In the book’s earliest descriptions of Boston’s households up to his concluding advocacy for the Native American territory, Copway establishes a pivotal link between two different connotations of home in antebellum literature: first, the home as defined as a sense of national affiliation, and second, the household home as defined as private domestic bliss.

Occupy the State House: Domestic Ideology and Politics

An understanding of Copway’s writings benefits from reading his arguments within the larger discourse of his time, particularly as such discourse increasingly depended on a language drawn from domestic ideology. Copway’s use of such language is surprising when criticism has imagined domestic ideology as having divided American society along sharply defined gendered lines: women’s private sphere in the household, and all else—factories, offices, and politics—in the masculinized public sphere. But as many scholars have pointed out, the affairs of one sphere had implications for the other: those politicians working in the public sphere had homes to return to, and not only the practical matters in that private sphere but also its ideology and the

symbolism of the domestic influenced how many of these men and women guided political campaigns towards enacting policies in the public sphere. For example, domestic language and the image of the American household was used to define which places Native Americans could come to occupy, within the nation and even inside American households. Copway's repeated descriptions of households among Ojibwes, Americans, and Europeans is to be expected due to the formal elements of his preferred modes of writing: an ethnography about Ojibwes must, in its very form, describe the natural and manmade surroundings of any settlement, and travelogues similarly describe the history and aesthetics of these foreign settings. Copway uses these domestic spaces beyond their necessary presence in his style of writing, staging his arguments regarding Native American homelessness within the privileged domestic spaces of his largely white audience. As Ruoff argues, Copway's autobiographical writing style is somewhere between the "spiritual confession[], which described the subject's private or inner life, [and the] memoir[], which chronicled the subject's public career" ("Literary and Methodist Contexts" 2). Like any writer in this time period, Copway had to balance his personal goals with the realities of the publishing world, to appeal to as wide an audience as possible.

Domesticity is pivotal to how Copway introduces *Running Sketches*. This book's initial chapters focus on detailed descriptions of the houses he can see while walking through Boston—or even as he stands atop Boston's State House, occupying that space of United States, hence largely white, governance. I read this moment of occupation as an ironic response, reversing the work done by North American, largely United States, politicians such as Andrew Jackson in removing Native Americans from their lands. As Thomas Jefferson had done with his teleology of Native American life, Jackson sought to claim not only the history of indigenous populations but the very word "native," shifting the word from indigenous populations to revolutionary

United States citizens, particularly those who were white and male in search of what Michael Rogin refers to as a home, a “birthright” (113). Concerning policies regarding how the United States federal government should negotiate—or remove—Native Americans from their lands, those debates spilled over into literary communities as well. Both nonfictional and fictional texts in the marketplace sought to offer solutions directed not only to white readers but to Native Americans themselves, and those arguments were primarily assimilationist. But these authors had to navigate through the competing interests: many writers such as Cooper and Jefferson wished to preserve, even claim, individual tribes’ traditions; these readers were the kind who would find enjoyment reading the works of Cooper and Jackson, whereas John L. O’Sullivan, upon inaugurating the term “Manifest Destiny,” focused simply on the land itself, which white settlers deserved to possess by any means necessary, with much less concern regarding how this settlement would affect indigenous populations.

Sometimes the competing interests were paradoxically one in the same. Throughout *The Indian in His Wigwam*, but especially in the chapter “Domestic Condition and Constitution of the Indian Family,” Schoolcraft identifies similarities in décor, layout, and gendered household roles shared between white and Native American homes. Schoolcraft states that, while Ojibwe and other Native Americans habitations “present very different pictures of home and comfort” than white readers are accustomed to, “they really present the same idea, the same sentiments, and the same round of duties and obligations, of father and mother, sister and brother, wife and husband” (*The Indian in His Wigwam* 71). Copway would have been familiar with the work by Schoolcraft and his wife, Ojibwe writer Jane Johnston, concerning the kinds of Native American domestic settings described in his books. Copway would learn from Schoolcraft—or perhaps Schoolcraft learned from Copway—that Native Americans and white Americans could find

common ground through the image of households and an appeal to contemporary domestic ideology that idealized such homes. Like Schoolcraft, Copway attempts to make Native American domesticity appealing to white readers by emphasizing as much its similarities with white domesticity as its differences.

Copway's friendship with Schoolcraft also would make him aware of the latter's involvement in other projects towards providing permanent housing for Native Americans, such as Michigan's Mackinac Island Indian Dormitory. Working on behalf of the United States government, Schoolcraft had negotiated for this dormitory during Andrew Jackson's presidency. The project was finally completed in 1838 but ultimately not used due to lapsed treaties. The dormitory was part of Jackson's larger policies advocating that Native Americans move away from, as he understood them, their traditions of communal land use, itinerant hunting, and ambiguous property lines. Instead, politicians in Jackson's time wanted Native Americans to focus more on permanent housing and a fixed agricultural schedule tending to privately held tracts of land. To advance such plans, Jackson capitalized upon prevalent domestic ideology at the time to justify what often became violent removal of indigenous populations from long-occupied land.

In his professional work experiences with Schoolcraft, as well as Cooper, Copway is responding to decades of political and literary discourse that appropriated images of Native Americans to define a new idea of "the native" that became afforded only to whites, and that also imagined a home that was explicitly defined as denied to indigenous persons within the borders of the United States. Rogin has noted how Jackson's political appropriation of domestic language ultimately characterized Native Americans as mere children. In particular, in his 1830 address to Congress, Jackson argued that Native Americans required the firm paternal hand of

the federal government to set straight such supposedly erstwhile youngsters. “Doubtless it will be painful to leave the graves of their fathers; but what do they more than our ancestors did or than our children are now doing? To better their condition in an unknown land our forefathers left all that was dear in earthly objects. Our children by thousands yearly leave the land of their birth to seek new homes in distant regions” (Jackson 115). In Jackson’s conception, “children” refers to Native Americans, imagined in a perpetual state of infantilization. As Rogin has traced in Jackson’s speeches and letters, the Indian, the “primitive man,” was not considered to be as far along in the societal evolution of human history. Much as domineering fathers expel their sons to coerce them to learn independence and build their homes elsewhere, so must the “Great Father”—the federal government, popular writers portrayed Native Americans referring to the President, a discourse in which Copway engaged to his advantage—expel those erstwhile Native Americans to make their own home (Rogin 7). As Jackson argues, it is because of governmental assistance at their reservations that Native Americans have depended upon free land and funds to support themselves—conveniently overlooking that while monetarily free, individual Native Americans have sacrificed freedoms, employment, and other opportunities as held by whites and that they themselves held before agreeing to move to, or being forced to move to, reservations. However, Jackson overlooks the advantages that the federal government provides to white Americans at the expense of providing similar opportunities to indigenous populations. Without these opportunities, these legal protections, and this support received by whites who happened to be settling in the West—on lands previously occupied by Native Americans—and without those whites having to sacrifice their rights in exchange for frontier protection and support that they were receiving from the federal government, Native Americans are kept at a disadvantage: while frontier whites receive protection to make possible an otherwise impossible life in forming new

communities in the West, Native Americans, who have lost rights, opportunities, and lived necessities, face a nearly impossible task to main their current homes or to build new ones. Jackson overlooks this problem, for the convenience of strengthening the mythology he has developed, surrounding a necessary homelessness that each person must experience in order to claim himself—notably gendered primarily in his arguments as masculine—an American. In Jackson’s opinion, these Native American “children” must be removed from their ancestral homes—out of the forest and onto farms or into cities—in order to mature into a more advanced stage of development represented by white civilization. As Jackson concludes, lawmakers, as paternal figures, must expel indigenous populations off tribal lands. Like all Americans, Jacksons seems to propose, Native Americans must learn at some point in their lives what it feels like to be homeless. Jackson claims that forced removal of Native Americans from their ancestral homes will not only protect them from “utter annihilation” but will provide them with “a new home” (Jackson 115).

Whereas Jackson used domestic language to move from the public to the private sphere—from federal policies into households—Copway moves from the private to the public sphere. In many ways Copway agrees with Jackson’s overall sentiment that a sense of home is intimately tied to one’s sense of self as a human, as a man. Such a home cannot exist when persons are repeatedly displaced. The ramifications of losing home are to lose any progress in assimilation: “in going from one place to another, the Indian loses all that he had previously learned” (Copway, “Address Before the Legislature” 180). To this logic from Jackson, Copway responds that pushing indigenous populations west must reach termination, “till the last Indian shall stand on the barren peaks of the Rocky Mountains, and gaze on the land which has been taken from him.” With nowhere else to settle, those indigenous persons will die out (“Address

Before the Legislature” 177). Quoting a review from the *Liverpool Mercury*, in a speech Copway opined how “no sooner had they a school established, and they began to cultivate the ground, than [Native Americans] were forced to give up their land and go further west” (qtd in *Running Sketches* 60). In contrast, in his proposed Kah-Ge-Ga, a Native American settler “could till his land and impart instruction to his offspring; fearing no removal.” Copway concludes such a plan is truly how a paternal figure would want to build Native Americans up to realize their humanity, albeit in gendered language that can be read as awakening the masculinity among those persons: “When he had the fee simple of this land he would feel himself treated as a man, and he would act as a man.” Effectively, by working the land, “[t]he Indian would then have a home” (*Running Sketches* 62).

Actions such as those by Jackson, Copway implies, are not befitting a man, and certainly never a father. Copway argues that it is the fault of certain forms of white intervention into Ojibwe lives, especially alcohol, that weakened family cohesion and hence the idealized domestic lifestyle Jackson and others imagined for white households but could not provide in indigenous areas: “But, ah, alcoholic spirits have cut of the existence of those nations who have left the records of their existence upon their rivers and their mountains” (“Address Before the Legislature” 187). While not naming Jackson specifically, Copway’s remarks in general do not accept without question the image of any government as a father guiding indigenous populations like children living in the same house: as he writes elsewhere “The government and its agents style us ‘My children’[,] [a phrase that] comes with an ill grace from those who seem bent on driving them from their father’s house” (Copway, *Traditional History* 201). He concludes his legislative address, “When you give [Native Americans] a home, you will find contentment around their firesides” (“Address Before the Legislature” 181). By appropriating that same

domestic language that Jackson already used, Copway re-contextualizes the larger political debates regarding where to place Native Americans, staging that argument squarely in American households.

On his first trip to Boston, emphasized in *The Life, History and Travels* but also touched upon again in *Running Sketches*, Copway made a visit to the State House. From his vantage point atop the state house, Copway is so surprised at how the smaller residential houses around the area look. From the Boston State House, he spends more time “gaz[ing] with wonder and astonishment,” commenting how this governmental building lords over the “chimneys” of all other houses (*Running Sketches* 15). Looking from this vantage point as “a solitary Indian” (*Life, History* 131), he challenges Jackson’s claim about American progress. Copway admits that indeed Boston’s residents are blessed, because such industrialization prompts him to pray, “while tears filled my eyes, ‘Happy art thou, O Israel, who is like unto thee, *O people saved by the Lord!*’” (*Life, History* 134). While accepting this progress as part of God’s plan, however, he immediately adds that seeing such progress reminds him of what is lost. “When I thought of the noble race of red men who once lived and roamed in all the land,” he asks, in verse,

O! tell me, ye ‘pale faces, ‘tell,
Where have my proud ancestor gone?
Whose smoke curled up from every dale,
To what land have their free spirits flown?
Whose wigwam stood where cities rise. (*Life, History* 134)

In comparing the dwellings of the past and the present, Copway’s description makes unfamiliar such a familiar setting for his American readers, in this travelogue re-making Boston into a foreign location just as foreign as any sites in Frankfurt, Edinburgh, or Liverpool.

“Domestic Life Among the Indians”: Copway’s Critical Intervention into Publishing

In 1845, Sarah Josepha Hale edited an issue of *Godey’s Lady’s Book* that would define her idealized American domestic intimacy in opposition against a sense of Native American domesticity. The article, “Domestic Life Among the Indians,” while not identifying its author,⁵⁷ excoriates a number of young Americans who fall victim to the “absurd” idealization of Native American living, as immortalized by an unnamed “set of philosophers of the last century, [in] praise [of] the innocence and happiness of savage life.” We can only imagine that those “philosophers” would include among them such romanticists of the departed Indian populations: William Cullen Bryant, James Fenimore Cooper, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, to name a few. Granted, the article does much to dispel such idealized and exaggerated images in order to emphasize very real problems for indigenous populations at that time: “The real forest life of the poor Indian is now known to be one of hardship and suffering” (Patterson 138; “Domestic Life,” *Godey’s* 252). But the article then takes a very negative view of their habitations and even calls into question their civility: “According to their theories, every Indian hamlet was a paradise of domestic enjoyments, and the hunting-ground a theatre where men attained the perfection of the human character—that of sovereign over the animal creation, or rather the dignity of brute destroyers.” By including “Domestic Life Among the Indians” in her edited journal, Hale admonishes against any “son or daughter of our country to leave their homes of civilization for the sake of enjoying domestic life among the Indians,” hoping that readers will “not sigh for the

⁵⁷ Cynthia Lee Patterson assumes Hale wrote the article, based on its accompanying illustration and Hale’s own work in similar engravings (140).

delights of the wigwam or envy the simplicity of the wild Indian, with his painted skin and plume of eagle's feathers" (252).⁵⁸

As presented in this article from *Godey's Lady's Book*, this argument emphasizes that Native Americans lack a traditional sense of white domesticity, yet does not respond to contemporaneous claims put forth regarding such commonalities between white domesticity and indigenous domesticity. In Hale's own time, Schoolcraft argued that there were commonalities between the domestic ideology that defined the American household as a woman's purview, and the actual domestic arrangement of most Native American homes that made it "the precinct of the rule and government of the wife." In fact women's dominance of the domestic space complicates any claim by a Native American man—or even, as Schoolcraft seems to imply, a white man—to be considered the "lord" of his house. Rather, this title is conferred *by the woman*, only because her control of the house allows her to bestow such a title. "He may, indeed, be looked upon rather as the guest of his wife, than what he is often represented to be, her tyrant; and he is often only known as the lord of the lodge, by the attention and respect which *she* shows to him." While Native American women, according to Schoolcraft, did engage in work traditionally performed by white men, such as wood chopping, he reinforces the Euroamerican gendered separation of spheres: "The lodge is her precinct, the forest his" (*The Indian in His Wigwam* 73, 76).

Schoolcraft's argument was reprinted in numerous editions of his books under many different titles, and this chapter in particular was excerpted in numerous periodicals at the time when Hale was editing *Godey's: The American Penny Magazine and Family Newspaper, The*

⁵⁸ This characterization is odd, as contemporary articles did much work to emphasize the similarities imagined between white households and Native American homes. For example, *The Poughkeepsie Casket* published its own article, also titled "Domestic Life Among the Indians," in June 1838, which emphasized a Native American husband's role in the public sphere was to provide the food and funding necessary for his wife's work to reform their home into pleasant domestic space.

Delaware Register and Farmer's Magazine, *Dwight's American Magazine*, and *The Percy Anecdotes*. Like his wife, Jane Johnston, Schoolcraft identified commonalities between Ojibwe and white American households, presenting “a picture of an Indian world that was part of the American culture’s mainstream, that joined in national and international reading, thinking, and writing about the cultural, political, and domestic concerns energizing the broader populace, and that at the same time remained deeply engaged in Native language and story” (Parker 3). Despite Schoolcraft’s oft-cited argument, the author of this article exhorts female readers of *Godey's Lady's Book* not to sympathize with these Indians, not even the wives among them, because “woman always remains where the Creator first placed her—by the side of man” (“Domestic Life” 252).⁵⁹

While Hale may deride Native American domesticity as mere savagery that should be shunned rather than idealized by white authors, at least Copway can say he has now found a sense of home—by coming to occupy, if not the fireside of the palefaces, then at least their nation as his home. For as “[t]he rocky Island loomed far off in our view,” he is inspired to poeticize “my native land”—the United States itself, no longer just his Ojibwe home at Rice Lake, his numerous missions, or his publishing home of New York, but the entire nation itself. He is now willing to defy pacifism and fight anyone who would “defame her.” As he writes in his poem,

America, America, Heaven’s blessing attend her!
While we live we will cherish, and love, and defend her.
Tho’ the scorner may sneer at, and wirlings defame her,

⁵⁹ Writing to his wife that it is by “providence that man should be active, & woman quiescent” (qtd in Parker 37), Schoolcraft’s insistence on gendered spheres enacts similar tactics as Hale, albeit to the benefit of a married man like Schoolcraft not available to a widow like Hale. It is not to say that Schoolcraft’s gendered view was by any means progressive, nor to denigrate unfairly Hale’s work to improve the condition of many women in households—except insofar as she, like Schoolcraft, used Native Americans and their domestic arrangements towards justifying her privileged view of what constitutes an acceptable (often coded as white) household. On Schoolcraft’s advantage in publishing thanks to his wife’s domestic labors, see Robert Dale Parker, *The Sound the Stars Make Rushing Through the Sky* (2007: 43-44).

Our hearts swell with gladness whenever we name her. (*Running Sketches* 17)

Miriam Helga Schacht argues that it is only when the “real” Boston disappears, along with the “real” continental seashore of the United States, that Copway may romanticize this native home as his “idealized America” (198). Much like other white writers portraying Native American lives, Copway strives to push away the real towards an ideal that can allow him to hold seemingly paradoxical binaries—whiteness and indigenous Americanness, the city and the forest, the real and the idealized—simultaneously and without undermining the separateness of the two.

Dwell in the Heart, Stand Forever

Unfortunately, the reality of the marketplace cannot be avoided: *Running Sketches* sold few copies and became Copway’s last published book. Likewise, the book itself ends anticlimactically. After his opening chapter’s concise criticism against Boston, the rest of the book includes lengthy descriptions of foreign locations largely cited from other people’s books, and extended extracts from newspaper articles reviewing and even quoting Copway’s speeches abroad. Worse yet, in the years after publishing *Running Sketches*, Copway would be plagued by family break-up, poverty, and a series of awkward attempts by the lapsed Methodist Ojibwe to integrate himself into new homes in a variety of Native American and Catholic communities.

Nevertheless, true to his Ojibwe name, Copway remained steadfast in his fight to define a Native American sense of home, revealing to his readers that strain of nineteenth-century domestic ideology that could be found as often in Ojibwe homes as in white Christian homes. Much as Schoolcraft identified the Ojibwe household as the domain of the woman, so would Copway use that gendered understanding of separate spheres to draw upon popular ideology at

the time—and use it for dramatic effect. In his first published book, Copway describes his mother's death as predicated on domestic ideals. It is upon her death that he begins to “look[] around the wigwam; my father, sister, and brother sat near me, wringing their hands; they were filled with bitter grief, and appeared inconsolable, I then began to understand and appreciate fully her kindness and love.” Looking at this domestic scene, he questions, “Who, who can, or will, take the place of a *mother*? Who will pray for us when we are sick or in distress?” (*The Life, History* 59). Almost in reaction to Hale's publication in *Godey's Lady's Book*, regarding the brutish domesticity of Native Americans that is supposedly so different from that in Christian United States households, Copway emphatically asks, “Who will now say that the poor Indian cannot be converted?” (*The Life, History* 59). Copway shows that indigenous and Euro-American authors share understandings of gendered roles in the household that are incredibly similar despite supposed cultural differences. Furthermore, while it may be, as Hale suggested, the wife's role to accept whatever consequences result from her marriage to her husband—to die for the sake of her family—that implied fact does not dull the pain that a husband, or a son like Copway, would feel upon the loss of this domestic goddess in his life.

Copway even shows he can out-do such domestic ideological rhetoric by taking on the voice of mothers like Hale. Upon the death of his mother, he must meditate on what kind of a “home” heaven can afford to her. While not citing the source—passing off the writing as his own, without even adding quotation marks—he quotes “Home,” an original piece published anonymously in the May 1844 issue of *The Mother's Magazine*, one of Hale's competitors: “There is one spot where none will sigh for home. The flowers that blossom there, will never fade; the crystal waters that wind along those verdant vales, will never cease to send up their heavenly music; the clusters hanging from the trees overshadowing its banks, will be immortal

clusters; and the friends that meet, will meet forever” (“Home,” *The Mother’s Magazine* 141 qtd in *The Life, History* 59). Ignoring the obvious plagiarism on Copway’s part (and justifying quite a bit of the criticism against him),⁶⁰ his decision to excerpt this passage reveals how mutually influential masculinity and femininity were in shaping the rhetoric through which he describes his pain. Writings such as “Home,” appearing in both women’s journals and Copway’s text, were received by both men and women, thereby addressing a sense of homelessness felt by both whites and Native Americans to an audience across gendered lines. Quoting extensively from the text “Home,” Copway draws upon a domestic ideology traditionally associated with women, but to show how difficult it is for a man like him to feel isolated from his home. Copway internalizes—and ventriloquizes—the messages of ladies’ magazines, re-directing their message to his own concerns as an Ojibwe publishing in the United States.

The fear of homelessness persists, a fear that Schacht has traced in many traditional Ojibwe stories, one telling how “the people were forced to leave their homeland a long time ago because they angered the Creator” (194). As Copway himself narrates in his first book, the Great Spirit had come upon him in a dream, to tell him, “You will travel much” (*The Life, History* 40). Even though it is the Great Spirit in Ojibwe religion that speaks to him, Copway’s oft cited allusions to Judeo-Christianity, particularly to Israel, reveal how he draws upon a long history of

⁶⁰ As an anonymously published text, “Home” enjoyed a long afterlife in periodicals and school readers—but surprisingly many reprinted copies remove its last paragraph, the one Copway quotes without attribution. “Home” appeared the same year as in *The Mother’s Magazine* in *The Rover*. It next appeared in 1846 in issues of both *The Christian Witness* and *The Advocate of Moral Reform*. When Copway excerpted it for *The Life, History and Speeches* in 1847, that same year Salem Town included “Home” for its lesson book *The Fourth Reader*. Then it was reprinted again as “Love of Home and Country” in Matthew Denton’s 1850 *A Book of Anecdotes, Religious, Interesting and Practical*. It was quoted, again uncredited, in George Pepper’s 1868 sermon “Themes of Happiness” to the North Carolina legislature. “Home” was later reprinted in Phineas Garrett’s publications, including numerous volumes of his *One Hundred Choice Selections for The Speaker’s Garland and Literary Bouquet* from the 1880s to the early twentieth century. In 1895 it appeared in the *Young American Speaker* textbook, and in 1898 teacher Orison Sweet Marden included “Home” in his pedagogical book *The Secret of Achievement* (314-316), subtitled *A Book Designed to Teach [...] Noble Manhood and Womanhood*. It also appeared in a 1900 issue of *Young People’s Speaker*. “Home” was finally attributed to George Dumas in the 1943 book *New Declamations: Modern Short Speeches on Current Subjects*.

narratives from diverse cultures in describing his sense of homelessness. Thrust out of so many communities—Ojibwe, Methodist, Canadian, United States, European—it makes sense that his literary references would also be so diverse.

Perhaps fatalistically, this overwhelming feeling of permanent isolation leads Copway to imagine that in his search for a home only one thing is certain: Nature is such a sublime force that, at any moment, it can destroy any place a person assumes to be a permanent home. All that a person has is a feeling of home, not a forever lasting physical place to identify as that home. Copway feels comfort living with the awareness that no home is permanent, because at least Nature is everlasting: “It is thought great to be born in palaces, surrounded with wealth—but to be born in Nature’s wide domain is greater still! [...] Nature will be Nature still, while palaces shall decay and fall in ruins [...] while the work of art, however impregnable, shall in atoms fall!” (*The Life, History* 18). Copway’s Ojibwe name, translated as “He Who Stands Forever,” and the territory of the same name he desired to establish, both speak to the position in which Copway found himself when engaging with his readers. While tapping into a popular impression of Native Americans’ closer alignment than whites to Nature, Copway’s argument is also an almost Emersonian refutation of how tangible holdings are nothing compared to that overwhelming force of Nature. By drawing upon both Ojibwe and Euro-American ecological conceptions, Copway responds against the kind of consumerist focus that guided Hale and other Boston-area domestic ideologists in their promotion of proper household maintenance. This appeal to idealism over realism is similar to that feeling Copway describes as he sails for Europe and sees the very actuality of the United States fade away into the imagination. Home becomes an idea written upon any space he occupies, whether Rice Lake, the Boston State House, or a crowded convention hall in Frankfurt. This ability to categorize any space as a potential home is

helpful for Copway in becoming a prolific writer directing his works to numerous international audiences. Copway concludes *Running Sketches* with a call to his readers to sympathize with numerous persons across national and racial boundaries, as well as gender boundaries, because he recognizes how much “I love to see in any one a love of country, so much as to weep at the mention of one’s birthplace” (294). His satisfaction in witnessing such longing for home is deeply personal for him, and is the conceit by which he can effectively address a variety of audiences.

Before his departure for Europe, Copway had advanced his argument for the territory of Kah-Ge-Ga. Writing for the *American Whig Review* in 1849, Copway concluded his article with the following: “It is hoped that, without making any special plea for the red man, that sense of justice which dwells in the heart of every *true American* will lead them to give this article a passing consideration” (“The American Indians” 637). Whereas Copway emphasizes the “true American” in appealing to this conservative political audience (Knobel 184), I would emphasize Copway’s domestic language—as the failure to secure Kah-Ge-Ga meant that his fellow Native Americans indeed would only “ *dwell* in the heart of every true American,” a memory only as people became untethered from their homes. After his travels through foreign, even exoticized (by his own pen) communities including Boston, Frankfurt, Edinburgh, and Liverpool, Copway makes another round of revisions to *Running Sketches* and, seeking a strong introductory chapter, looks back upon the Bunker Hill Monument to see it not only as a symbol for United States independence. By referring to those firesides as belonging to “the paleface” who “expelled the red man from his native soil,” Copway disrupts the connection Jackson, Hale, and others made between American liberty and Americans’ firesides by calling into question who gets to feel free “at home” in North America.

Chapter 4

The Question Before the House: Sojourner Truth's Public Home

In the second edition of *The Narrative of Sojourner Truth* (1881), the book's editor Frances Titus includes a letter from William Hayward addressed to William Lloyd Garrison, regarding an 1858 speech by Truth in Silver Lake, Indiana. The letter, which first appeared in Garrison's newspaper the *Boston Liberator* on October 1, 1858, emphasizes how Truth subverted gendered conventions through her body, her presentation, and her authorship. Truth claimed public spaces as private spaces, thought by her white audiences to be a violation of the imagined boundary between those separate spheres—yet a boundary compromised by the attitudes of that same white audience regarding enslaved black women. “A rumor was circulated that Sojourner was an impostor; that she was, indeed, a man disguised in woman's clothing,” Hayward writes. “Confusion and uproar ensued. A gun or pistol was fired near the door. However, the tumult was soon suppressed by Sojourner rising in all the dignity of womanhood, and demanded why they suspected her “to be a man?” and was answered, “your voice is not the voice of a woman; it is the voice of a man” (Hayward qtd in *Narrative* 138). This gossip was nothing new. At another appearance in Massillon, Ohio, for a women's rights convention, a newspaper reporter wrote that Sojourner Truth's androgynous outfit, “neither male nor female, nor yet a bloomer, ma[de] it somewhat difficult to determine to which of the sexes she belonged” (qtd in Mabee, *Sojourner Truth: Slave* 188). This particular speech in Indiana, however, forces Truth to move beyond only rumors and use her own body as a site for discourse on the constantly shifting borders between the private sphere and the public sphere.

Sojourner told them that her ‘breasts had suckled many a white babe; that some of those babies had grown to man’s estate, and that they were far more manly than they (her persecutors) appeared to be.

In vindication of her truthfulness, she told them that she would show her breast to the whole congregation; that it was not to her shame but to their shame, that she uncovered her breast before them. Two young men [...] voluntarily stepped forward to the examination. (Hayward qtd in Truth, *Narrative* 138-139)

Carleton Mabee interprets Truth’s action as a claim to public spaces for private concerns: “She could have refused to respond at all. She could have responded only verbally, or she could have consented to show her breasts only privately, to a few women” (*Sojourner Truth: Slave* 189). By transforming her body into a site for exploring both her masculine and feminine propensities to her overwhelmingly white audience, Truth used her gender and race to explore problems about who was allowed to speak in the public sphere.

Under the violent institution of slavery, numerous black women were forcibly undressed in public in order for auctioneers to present these women’s bodies to show the presence or absence of scars as indications of their obedience, and to show their muscles and physical attractiveness as suitable for the labors expected of them. When Truth reveals her breasts, she risks reducing herself to an object for racial or sexual subordination. Titus likely was aware of this danger, as she removed some objectionable material for its reprinting in *The Narrative* (Washington, *Sojourner Truth’s America* 286; Painter 141), such as insults that Hayward quoted from racists in her audience—particularly one man who referred the exposed Truth as “a sow, for I see the teat.” Yet Truth looks at her accusers in their faces, infantilizing them as mere babes whom she could nurse: “As Sojourner disrobed her bosom, she quietly asked them if they too “wished to suck” (Hayward qtd in Truth, *Narrative* 139). Truth’s decision to bare her breasts turns the tables against her white male opponent, taking command of the public space as a performance site in order to force her audience members to address their own discomfort at

seeing violence against women and African Americans, overlooked as private concerns between husbands and wives, and masters and slaves, as public violence that must be stopped and punished.

Much as she subjected herself to public exposure as a reminder to her audience of those dehumanizing experiences felt by herself and others, Truth was also subject to a set of other stock tropes persistent in many narratives about slavery—ranging from fugitive slave autobiographies to plantation romances. While her performances did serve as sentimental entertainment for many audiences, the tension within her speeches and the popular press's record of those performances concerns the harsh historical and political realities she addressed in those speeches. When we hear that Truth's life was made into sentimental entertainment in the popular press, we usually think of accounts written by white authors, including women such as Frances Dana Gage's "Ar'n't I a Woman" and Harriet Beecher Stowe's "The Libyan Sibyl." Rather than resisting Truth's emergence as sentimentalized icon, her editor Titus embraced it, including Gage and Stowe's essays in later editions of *The Narrative*. Wendy Hamand Venet and Maria Harlowe have concluded that Truth's literary and spoken productions, directed by her white managers, in some ways continued her enslavement. Despite being "an effective and eloquent crusader," "[f]or most of her career [Truth] did not have a formal identity with organized abolition" (Venet 12), an identity imagined to be compromised by her illiteracy as she supposedly simply adhered to the performed model of black femininity as endorsed by her books' editors Olive Gilbert and Frances Titus. This editorial intervention risked transforming Truth, or at least the totality of her words, into an appetizing object for public consumption. This transformation of Truth into a marketable author, therefore, required in many ways drawing her away from the itinerant lifestyle she led, so she could appeal to women readers conventionally

imagined as part of that domesticated “Cult of True Womanhood,” as defined by Barbara Welter. As Naomi Greyser argues, Truth’s public image, guided or even controlled by her managers, was now tied in to a literary marketplace of white northern editors who were profiting from her suffering, and a white readership that wanted to hear a sensationalized, overly sentimental account of her life, rather than the bare facts of that story. Joan Dayan also identifies that many slave narratives were written at a time when many popular literary works “idealiz[ed] women, [and] narrowed their realm to the domestic haven of home—a pristine place of comfort and compensation.” These slave narratives transformed each black author and subject into “a figure for romance” and “an object in someone else’s story, deprived of the possibility of significant action” (Dayan, “Romance and Race” 91). Coincidentally, even as she toured the nation, Truth still took on extra work as a household servant in order to fund these travels (Harlowe 174).

The debatable authenticity of Truth’s account need not be read as only an attempt to censor her, however, or even to make her argument palatable to a literary marketplace that expected certain portrayals of African Americans, especially women. Actually, such sentimentalized and sensationalized forms were celebrated by literary critics in Truth’s time as some of the most accurate portrayals within slave narratives—given that these particular critics, overwhelmingly sympathetic to the abolitionist cause, found it too unrealistic and unbelievable that this nation would continue to condone the immoral institution of slavery.⁶¹ It is difficult to trace how much of this seemingly inaccurate portrayal of Truth emerges through the work of her transcribers who may have understood some details improperly, and how much of these exaggerations emerged from Truth’s own choosing as editor, alongside Gilbert and Titus, of her

⁶¹ On the work by abolitionists such as Ephraim Peabody and Theodore Parker to refer to refer to the slave narrative that would not only serve the abolitionist cause abroad but would be the most uniquely American literary form that the nation had to offer to an international audience, see William L. Andrews, *To Tell a Free Story: The First Century of Afro-American Autobiography, 1760-1865* (98).

own printed and performed narratives, whether in her publications, speeches, or life itself. This task requires work on the part of readers to, as Margaret Washington advises, “read between the lines” as they should do “whenever reading narratives of black women unable to write for themselves” (“Introduction” xxxi).

While her work may have entertainment value, Truth’s editorial control over her authorship, her performances, and her life did identify cultural limitations hindering many individuals from feeling at home in the United States based on, among other factors, race and gender. As the Cult of True Womanhood was defined around an ideal of free, white, Christian femininity, numerous Americans were notably absent; a black woman and former slave such as Sojourner Truth was rarely included. While the influence of domestic ideology may not be immediately apparent based on how much Truth emphasizes her itinerant lifestyle, when reading her works more deeply, the texts reveal Truth’s emotional, conventionally feminine engagement with households—at the same time that she claims such engagement in ways conventionally understood as masculine. By reading Truth as largely an itinerant figure in the nineteenth-century United States, scholarship has overlooked how much of her advocacy work itself was performed in numerous households across the nation. After all, the alleged shamelessness by which Truth exposed herself in public was mitigated when Hayward’s letter emphasizes how “well recommended by H. B. Stowe” that Truth was—supported by a notable icon in domestic ideology and the Cult of True Womanhood. While Truth played with domestic discourse ironically, in pivotal moments in her autobiographical accounts and her popular speeches, Truth’s deployment of the language of domesticity shows an awareness how both to use and to subvert expectations of the larger abolitionist movement, as well as domestic ideology, in order to achieve her goals. These concurrent literary forms in the nineteenth century—domestic

literature, as understood as both the domestic treatise and the domestic novel, and the slave's narrative—were mutually influential upon each other. How did Truth, as the subject of her own narratives, complicate this argument that women were relegated to an idealized household space, and made into not subjects but objects? Truth's agency as co-editor and co-publisher of her own accounts, as well as a public speaker, put into question how much she was truly the object in someone else's story. Truth complicates boundaries between the public and the private, written narrative and oral narrative, white and black, and male and female.

Based upon her name and deeds, Sojourner Truth may be the last person one would associate with a traditional antebellum household. She was an itinerant minister and abolitionist, in her lifetime traveling through twenty-one states and the District of Columbia to preach for the rights of women and African Americans throughout the United States (Venet 12). At the time when Truth spoke, and in the time since, she was the subject of voluminous writings by others—supporters and critics alike—who portrayed her to appear however she wanted her to be: a militant abolitionist and feminist, a spiritual minister, even an “auntie” figure from the old plantation tales. Across a spectrum of distinct representations, a consistent inherent claim is that Truth hardly adheres to any image of traditional nineteenth-century American femininity. Critics in her own time chastised her, and contemporary scholars praise her, for shunning roles expected of women: rather than letting her male peers be the only persons to guide conversations regarding rights conferred to women, and her white peers regarding rights conferred to African Americans, Truth moved beyond traditional roles for women, through both her actions and her words, not only in the public sphere but also in that private sphere with which this wandering minister is so rarely associated in American studies. While abolitionists (many of them feminists as well) such as William Lloyd Garrison and Frederick Douglass admired Truth and welcomed

her support, her public activism was seen as unseemly. During her lectures, attempts were made by local police to keep her locked in households, returning her to the previous life of homebound enslavement she had suffered while growing up in New York.

While capitalizing upon other writers' portrayal of her—and sometimes including their accounts in reprinted editions of her *Narrative*—Truth had to manage numerous idealized images of herself. While some of those portrayals pointed to Truth's ability to resist traditional roles afforded to women and African Americans, she also contended with accounts that appealed to more stereotypical archetypes, in particular those of plantation slave and household servant. I will address the former portrayal more extensively in the concluding section on Truth's dealings with Abraham Lincoln, but as concerns the latter, her appearance as domestic caretaker has much to do with the compromised position in which she found herself when associating with an abolitionist movement closely aligned with prevailing domestic ideology at that time.

Libyan Sibyl: Sharing a Home with Stowe

In 1853, a year after she published *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as a collected volume, while hosting her husband's fellow clergymen at her Andover, Massachusetts, home, Harriet Beecher Stowe was interrupted by the arrival of Sojourner Truth. "Knowing nothing of her but her singular name," Stowe admits at the beginning of the article for *The Atlantic Monthly* documenting this visit "Sojourner Truth: The Libyan Sibyl" (1863), Stowe proceeds to make every attempt possible to fit that name into some preconceived literary archetype available to her. The very first description she gives of Truth is to present her not as a African American—for that would mean acknowledging her as a fellow American citizen—but as born and raised in Africa itself, "evidently a full-blooded African," her head adorned with "a bright Madras

handkerchief, arranged as a turban, after the manner of her race.” This image, almost of an African Madonna, is emphasized by Truth’s accompanying guest, her ten-year-old grandson, described by Stowe as a giggling “African Puck,” “the fattest, jolliest woolly-headed little specimen of Africa that one can imagine” (Stowe, “Libyan Sibyl” 473-474). Despite Truth’s own published narrative providing strong evidence to show her grandson would have been born in the United States and not in Africa, such a thought is impossible for Stowe to imagine: the racial divide between whites and blacks extends to a national divide as well, with the United States seemingly affording no home to anyone who is black.

Regardless how Stowe appealed to simplistic racial archetypes to fit her within the larger national antebellum discourses concerning slavery and race, Truth nevertheless reprinted this article in a revised 1875 edition of *The Narrative*. Stowe’s article serves as a concise case study for how Truth re-deployed the accounts of others in order to define her place in American households. Reading Stowe’s account of her time with Truth clarifies the problems in placing a black woman such as her into that cultural movement, largely based on Truth’s own unwillingness to be identified as only belonging to the household, especially after years of torturous experience and psychic guilt, as she tells Stowe, regarding how unjustly privileged she would feel should she only spend her time indoors rather than engaging with the larger public.

Upon the success of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, serialized from 1851 to 1852, Stowe was presented in the popular press both in the United States and abroad as being at the forefront of the battle against slavery. Critical readings of her texts have suggested that Stowe claimed book-writing as the female equivalent to men’s work in ministry (Ammons vii)—an interesting binary, as it emphasizes how much Truth, although illiterate, was claiming a masculine position when she became an itinerant minister. Stowe pursued fugitive slaves to hear their stories for herself—

and then edited them into a collection titled *A Key to "Uncle Tom's Cabin"*, which she sold in 1853 as a companion to her already highly profitable book. Rather than allowing those slave narratives to stand on their own merits, or in the authors' original words, Stowe heavily edited their stories. Stowe faced sharp criticism in her own time for her unwillingness to assist many black authors in publishing their own accounts, instead using their conversations as material for her own novels. Her desire for ownership of black authors' narratives is one reason why Harriet Jacobs, although initially excited at the prospect of collaborating with the author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* to publish her account, was ultimately happy with Stowe's rejection. Although impressed with Stowe's books, and following the model that Truth had used in collaborating with white women editors such as Gilbert and Titus, Jacobs did not want her eventual book, the 1860 *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl* edited by Lydia Maria Child, just to become more fodder to prop up sales for Stowe's own books (Yellin xvii-xxiii; Laird 60-61).

Stowe defined her protest against slavery in terms of the violence it produces within the homes of whites and blacks. Having seen one of her own young children die, Stowe remembered that feeling of a mother's loss and found in it a common ground with many enslaved women as they faced the separation of their own families on the auction block. In her work against slavery, Stowe appealed to a dominant strain of abolitionism that was based in domestic ideological discourse, and she filled a gap in nineteenth-century literature by taking readers into black persons' households. Stowe's work was praised by contemporary and later reviewers for her ability to portray black domesticity sympathetically, even if highly romanticized. Part of this process necessitated invasion into the privacy of the homes of slaves. As her peer William Wells Brown wrote, "*Uncle Tom's Cabin* has come down upon the dark abodes of slavery like a morning's sunlight" (qtd in Donovan 18).

In both the content of her fictional novel and the reception of that same book, Stowe was able to trouble distinctions for men and women, regardless of gender, regarding where it was proper to cry. Private spaces such as households afforded locations for not only women but also men to feel free to express their feelings, as with Senator Byrd's tears in his house over the loss of his child.⁶² With her attention to place as concerns gender and emotional expressions, Stowe serves as a strong candidate for approaching similar concerns about just what should be kept private and made public, especially regarding Truth's allegedly controversial public actions and discourse.

Stowe's larger literary discourse clarifies how strenuously she disassociated African Americans from her conventional understanding of whiteness as being a precondition to belonging in the United States, emphasizing their African ancestry despite their American birth and even their legally supportable claims to United States citizenship. For example, at the end of the novel, protagonist George Harris and his family depart for Africa, where he promises "[a]s a Christian patriot, as a teacher of Christianity, I go to *my country*,—my chosen, my glorious Africa!" Although remarking that his journey to Liberia will "not [be] an Elysium of romance, but as to *a field of work*" (*Uncle Tom's Cabin* 376), there is something unrealistic about Stowe's ending: there are so few opportunities in which Stowe is willing to imagine African Americans, upon emancipation, as remaining in the United States, despite very clear and present evidence in her own time. Instead, Harris and his family are sent off at story's end to another country, and the abolitionist work performed by Truth and others is not alluded to in the novel, not even in imagining what the future holds for someone such as Topsy. Stowe's later novel, *Dred: A Tale*

⁶² Byrd's reaction was later actualized in real life. While riding the railroad from his home in Boston to his office in Washington, DC, Congressman Horace Greely passed the time by reading *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. The book struck him so forcefully that Greely, having cried too much in public, had to stop his train trip to stay overnight in Springfield, Massachusetts (Ammons viii).

of the Great Dismal Swamp (1856), similarly de-emphasizes the possibility of integrating African American—whether or not they were enslaved beginning at birth—into United States society. Instead, her novel capitalizes on the sensationalized tale of the titular character finding life in backwoods marshes, far from the cities of Virginia and North Carolina.

When Stowe associates Truth with the continent of Africa itself, at the cost of seeing her as an actual person, Truth transforms into a metonymic work of art worthy of written analysis. Stowe claims she chose the title of her article for *The Atlantic Monthly*, “The Libyan Sibyl,” based on the statue of the same name as created by her friend William Wetmore Story. In fact, Stowe alleges, her own story about Truth that inspired Story to create his famous work, which, according to an advertisement quoted by Stowe in her article, was to be representative of that “African mystery deep in the brooding brain that looks out through mournful, warning eyes” (qtd in “Sojourner Truth: The Libyan Sibyl” 481). Although in this moment Stowe acknowledges the pain felt by numerous people such as Truth, albeit through the mode of highly symbolic art, she flattens Truth herself and her own experiences into a set of readable symbols, effectively transforming a complicated human life into an intelligible narrative that adheres to prevailing societal expectations regarding race and the gendered spheres of influence.

After meditating for ten years since this meeting with Truth, Stowe still is at a loss over how to describe the enigmatic minister. To “recall the events of her life, as she narrated them to me,” Stowe can at best “imagine her [Truth] as a living, breathing impersonation of that work of art” (“Sojourner Truth: The Libyan Sibyl” 473). Introducing the seemingly elderly Truth to her readers based on her first impression of the noted abolitionist and women’s right activist, Stowe focuses not on her acclaim but on her appearance, to mark her not as a person but as an object worth of lengthy description. “Her tall form, as she rose up before me, is still vivid to my mind,”

writes Stowe. “She stood [...] calm and erect, as one of her own native palm-trees waving alone in the desert”—evidently, one of those palm trees common to Africa and not, say, upper New York where Truth was born and raised. At least she remembers this woman named herself a Sojourner for a reason: “She was dressed in some stout, grayish stuff, neat and clean, though dusty from travel.” Stowe cannot help but imagine how she must have looked “in early youth.” Without a doubt she “must have been as fine a specimen [...] as Cumberworth’s celebrated statuette of the Negro Woman at the Fountain” (473-474).

To justify her conception of Truth as a work of art, Stowe attempts to rob this woman of any voice. Already treated in the popular imagination as illiterate, Truth, under Stowe’s pen, is now imagined as being so quiet that the author “do[es] not recollect ever to have been conversant with any one who had more of that silent and subtle power which we call personal presence than this woman” (473). Any voice that Truth has, initially, is celebrated only in how she sings, “with the strong barbaric accent of the native African.” With Stowe so focused on Truth’s body, she cannot help but see Truth’s ability to sing not as a self-produced action, but rather as if the song is the agent and Truth is its vessel: she is possessed by a “wild, peculiar power” until her “hymn seemed to be fused in the furnace of her feelings and come out recrystallized” (477). Because of the “indescribable upward turns and those deep gutturals” in her singing, it depends on a trained writer in the English language such as Stowe to make the enigmatic, foreign Truth sensible to an American reading audience. Stowe cannot help but emphasize how poorly Truth speaks, “mispronouncing the English, but seeming to derive as much [spiritual] elevation and comfort from bad English as from good” (476), so she might as well stay quiet while Stowe waxes poetically about the life of this romanticized black figure.

If Stowe's portrayal of Truth is so problematic—especially in more recent scholarship documenting how racist are her literary portrayals of blacks—why did Truth include “The Libyan Sibyl” as supplementary reading in revised editions of her *Narrative*? Rather than imagining her as a passive work of art to be regarded by Stowe, it must be remembered that Truth commanded influence over the publications representing her, through her collaborations with Gilbert and Titus, who printed numerous editions of her *Narrative*. These collaborative efforts—even this one with Stowe—benefit from Truth's ability to use the writing skills of her colleagues to add an iconic dimension to her persona that will increase ticket sales to her speeches, and sales of her books and photographs. As Stowe herself observes of their first meeting, which interrupted her house party, Truth thrives on attention: “An audience was what she wanted,—it mattered not whether high or low, learned or ignorant” (474). Immediately Stowe runs to bring her family and friends into the room, while regal Truth sits at her throne: “No princess could have received a drawing-room with more composed dignity than Sojourner her audience” (474).

Depending on the authenticity of Stowe's record, it is debatable how much Truth played into her audience's expectations and gave the performance expected of her. Stowe quotes her as describing herself as indeed full-blooded African—“Ye see, we was all brought over from Africa, father an' mother an' I, an' a lot more of us” (474)—although whether Truth is speaking literally or symbolically is unclear. Despite how fallacious Stowe's account might be—and how complicit Truth was in that portrayal—Truth still included “The Libyan Sibyl” in her revised *Narrative*. This decision may be based upon the success afforded to Truth by seizing control of how she was portrayed in literature, by tapping into those portrayals in her own published accounts and in her public performances. Regardless what power Stowe holds in controlling this

narrative of her life, however, Truth's work in the public sphere could overcome the limitations of the printed word. Because Truth frequently toured the nation, regardless whatever Stowe might have written about her, it only took another lecture or household visit for Truth to contradict those simplistic literary portrayals of her and lend greater complexity to those archetypal representations. Stowe admits early in her account that she found it difficult to read Truth: "She seemed perfectly self-possessed and at ease,—in fact, there was almost an unconscious superiority, not unmixed with a solemn twinkle of humor, in the odd, composed manner in which she looked down on me. Her whole air had at times a gloomy sort of drollery which impressed one strangely." Describing how Truth "looked down on the floor, and appeared to fall into a sort of reverie," Stowe witnesses how she fell into "some undercurrent of feeling" until she "broke out,—'O Lord! O Lord! Oh, the tears, an' the groans, an' the moans! O Lord!'" (473-474). Presenting Truth as such a larger than life figure, Stowe's scrutiny of her appearance and behavior risks presenting Truth as more fictional than realistic. With so much debate in Truth's own time and into contemporary scholarship about her illiteracy, Stowe could have made her appear as a romanticized figure, a mouthpiece for whatever her author wants this figure to reveal. Stowe then shifts her portrayal of Truth to emphasize how she guides the conversation inside Stowe's own residence. Arriving in Stowe's house uninvited and seated in her downstairs parlor, the itinerant Truth essentially turns into a squatter in someone else's residence, and as Stowe presents her to *The Atlantic Monthly* readership, Stowe did not know how to respond. She considers that, if she is hosting a party for clergymen, she might as well include this clergy woman. Truth also turns back Stowe's aesthetic eye upon her, sizing up this white woman and, in her first words addressed to Stowe, asking, almost as if expecting something more, "So, this is you?" Even funnier is her reaction upon meeting one of Stowe's relatives, himself a clergyman:

“*Is he?*” she said, offering her hand in a condescending manner,” before going on to brag about her own successes at ministry despite her illiteracy and lack of formal education (474). As Nell Irvin Painter argues, Truth “avoided the mammy snare through disinterest in the needs of [...] young white women.” She adds that “[w]hen Truth spoke to white women, she spoke as an equal, not as a mammy—no mean feat considering the strength of stereotype” (140). It is almost as if Truth is telling Stowe and her family that they are just another congregation of sinners to whom she must preach as part of her self-described mission—forgiving Stowe’s transcribed dialect—of “go[ing] round a-testifyin’, an’ showin’ on ’em their sins agin my people” (qtd in “Sojourner Truth: The Libyan Sibyl” 473).

Stowe next attempts to situate Truth within the more traditional roles expected of women within the domestic sphere. “There was at the time an invalid in the house,” Stowe writes, “and Sojourner, on learning it, felt a mission to go and comfort her. It was curious to see the tall, gaunt, dusky figure stalk up to the bed with such an air of conscious authority, and take on herself the office of consoler with such a mixture of authority and tenderness.” Even when recognizing the conventional masculinity (“authority”) and femininity (“tenderness”) encompassed by Truth’s actions, Stowe reads her as another black domestic servant, obsessing upon her “tall, gaunt, dusky figure” rather than directing attention to the specific words of comfort that Truth spoke to this ill person to hear how this celebrated orator and author presents herself verbally. Whether Stowe could comprehend such speech, however, she admits is unclear: Truth “talked as from above,—and at the same time, if a pillow needed changing or any office to be rendered, she did it with a strength and handiness that inspired trust” (479). As Truth used her career to deny an association with the domestic sphere traditionally associated with women, she has in many ways surpassed Stowe’s own work as family matriarch, taking over her

responsibility to this sick woman and re-organizing the arrangement of her house. This author and this mother is superseding Stowe at her own work.

After describing several days of hosting Truth, Stowe struggles in her account with how to end the story. Stowe decides to emphasize her body again but also her travels, in hopes that these seemingly more masculine traits will explain why Truth stands out as such an anomalous woman figure. “There was both power and sweetness in that great warm soul and that vigorous frame,” Stowe reflects, again directing attention as much to Truth’s seemingly masculine body as to those underlying emotions she has identified as traditionally feminine. Truth stands for Stowe as a figure whose gender remains at story’s end divided between masculine and feminine qualities, that can only be summarized in two key words, “dark” and “strange”: “One felt as if the dark, strange woman were quite able to take up the invalid in her bosom, and bear her as a lamb, both physically and spiritually” (479). Stowe is confused by Truth’s ability to possess seemingly opposed qualities that unsettle conventional categories of gender and power. If Stowe is going to compare Truth to a nation onto herself (as she already did), then she has to contend with the ramifications of seeing this black woman take on almost sublime qualities. Mimicking a bit of Truth’s lapsing into descriptions more suited to tall tales, Stowe describes her “solemn power of voice, peculiar to herself,” as being able to “hush[] every one in the room” (474). If Truth represents all of Africa itself, then it is not surprising that no New England house can contain her within its walls.

As she continues her account of residing in a Quaker household, Truth undermines the sanctity of the domestic sphere and instead associates mobility with godliness. Hearing God speak to her, “the Lord made a house appear to me, an’ He said to me that I was to walk on till I saw that house, an’ then go in an’ ask the people to take me” (qtd in 475). In her narrative, this

event is the start of those travels that transformed Isabella Baumfree into Sojourner Truth. Continuing her tale, she notes, “I travelled all day, an’ did n’t come to the house till late at night; but when I saw it, sure enough, I went in, an’ I told the folks that the Lord sent me.” Receiving room and board from the Quaker family, Truth is initially grateful, but she did not feel comfortable in the large bedroom provided for her. “[T]hey left me alone with that great white bed,” but thinking herself as a black woman unworthy to sleep in the bed provided by the white couple, she refuses. Her presence in any white household seems to remind Truth of a traumatic history of racial inequality, one that must be overcome by God’s call for her to continue to travel and minister throughout the nation.

Eventually Truth comes to see her continued occupancy in someone else’s house as a sin against God Himself. “Well, ye see, honey,” she continues, “I stayed an’ lived with ’em. An’ now jes’ look here: instead o’ keepin’ my promise an’ being good, as I told the Lord I would, jest as soon as everything got a-goin’ easy, *I forgot all about God*” (475). Truth is actually telling Stowe—the sister of one of the nation’s top domestic ideologists, and someone at the center of an intensely popular religious family—that one of her greatest sins was to forget God due to the material comforts afforded by a white household, the same material comforts Catharine Beecher, Stowe, and others were celebrating in their discourse. It took God’s visit upon Truth, as she sits in that bedroom, for her to realize He “was [...] all around me. I could feel it burnin’, burnin’, burnin’ all around me, an’ going’ through me; an’ I saw I was so wicked, it seemed as ef it would burn me up” (476).

In narrating her own life, through the filter of Stowe’s transcription, Truth appears as a complicated figure torn between the world of traditional domestic ideology more suited to women like Stowe, and the world of homelessness felt by many African Americans. Concluding

her argument, Truth argues that while “[m]y name was Isabella,” she gave it up “when I left the house of bondage”—and ostensibly that Quaker house, too. Having “asked Him to give me a new name[,] the Lord gave me Sojourner, because I was to travel up an’ down the land, showin’ the people their sins, an’ bein’ a sign unto them” (478). At this moment, Truth reconfigures all the work that Stowe undertook to reduce this woman into some readable archetype. Instead, Truth seems to be saying, if she is going to be some readable sign for the audience of *The Atlantic Monthly*, then she might as well be a religious sign unto the people, to show them their sins. At most Stowe can mention that, “[a]t length, Sojourner, true to her name, departed.” Stowe allows the question of Truth’s identity to hang, a set of contradictions that cannot be answered except to make them part of an anecdote, a blending of objective reality and subjective point of view by which Truth appears as a figure constantly on the run from attempts by Stowe to fix her to any one identity. As Stowe concludes, “Where now she is I know not; but she left deep memories behind her” (479). With such an ending, Truth, a shrewd public speaker and publisher, can rest comfortably knowing that, regardless how racist much of Stowe’s account may appear, its tantalizing ending will serve as a good addition to a revised printing of her *Narrative*.

Sit in at the White House: Freedman’s Village and Meeting Lincoln

On October 25, 1864, accompanied by her 14-year-old grandson Sammy Banks and her friend Lucy Colman, Sojourner Truth met with President Abraham Lincoln at the White House. Colman, a teacher from Massachusetts, had arranged the meeting through Elizabeth Keckley, head of the Freedmen and Soldiers’ Relief Association as well as dressmaker to Lincoln’s wife (Mabee, “Sojourner Truth and President Lincoln” 520; Murphy 90-91). Less than a month later, Colman and Truth would co-author letters describing the meeting. One of those letters,

addressed November 17, 1864, and published in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* on March 1, 1865—about a month before Lincoln’s assassination—has long captivated scholars in documenting this meeting of two powerful figures in antebellum American culture.⁶³ Many critical assessments overlook the interestingly named location from which Truth recorded that letter: Freedman’s Village, Virginia.

A sanctuary for African Americans against the threat of enslavement or, in many cases, re-enslavement, Freedman’s Village was located just across the Potomac, easily seen outside the windows of Lincoln’s White House and both houses of Congress. On April 16, 1862, Congress emancipated slaves from Washington, DC. Almost immediately, numerous runaway slaves from Virginia, Maryland, and as far as the Carolinas arrived in Washington to claim their own freedom. The newly freed slaves were placed into the only deserted locations already existing in the District of Columbia, including the former Capitol Building—and its prison. Until new camps could be built, the federal government created housing in pre-existing locations, which tended to be far enough away from Washington, DC, to avoid overcrowding the seat of federal power—and those camps available tended to be military ones in order to maintain order. The Union Army had recently acquired land near the District of Columbia—from the Confederate military leader himself, Robert E. Lee. Arlington House, previously belonging to his father-in-law and George Washington’s own relative George Washington Custis Lee, was seized upon Lee’s defection to the South. His wife Mary turned the literal keys of their plantation to one of their slaves, her head housekeeper Selina Gray. For a brief period, Gray held onto the property of Arlington House—until the Union Army arrived, established its military camp, and eventually created the refugee camp Freedman’s Village. Located across the Potomac River, providing a

⁶³ On the political debates surrounding this important meeting, see Dorothy Porter, “Sojourner Truth Calls Upon the President: An 1864 Letter” (1972), and Carleton Mabee, “Sojourner Truth and President Lincoln” (1988).

view of both the White House and the Congressional houses, Freedman's Village was close enough to Washington, DC, to allow both federal oversight, and publicity opportunities for congressional members to show foreign visitors the successes the United States was making in race relations.⁶⁴

Freedman's Village also was intimately tied to concerns about home ownership in the nineteenth century. Upset with the treatment that black refugees suffered in their own houses in Freedman's Village, Truth brought the issues of black domestic life to that most public of houses, the White House. In the years before and after her meeting with Lincoln Truth had filed complaints with local Washington, DC, officials, arguing that rather than wasting money to imprison black refugees for homelessness—a homelessness exacerbated by the failure of the federal government to provide proper housing for the very people it just freed from slavery—federal efforts should focus on using those same “funds to provide adequate money and education for Freedmen” (qtd in Jenkins 88). She entered Lincoln's house—the people's house—to ask for assistance in improving the lives and the homes of many newly freed African Americans who had sought asylum in the Washington, DC, area, but were moved to Freedman's Village.

Lincoln did do something: he had the National Freedman's Relief Association appoint Truth to be a neighborhood counselor serving Freedman's Village. Her responsibilities—some assigned, some taken on independently—included teaching her neighbors about religion, job placement and, perhaps most surprisingly for this military-run camp, civil rights advocacy. Despite defining herself as a woman excluded from domestic ideology, Truth led women's classes on household chores. Much of her work at Freedman's Village required compromising

⁶⁴ For more information on Freedman's Village and the emancipation policies of Washington, DC, see Thomas G. Mitchell's *Antislavery Politics in Antebellum and Civil War America* (2007: 200), and Jesse J. Holland, *Black Men Built the Capitol* (2007: 81, 156-157).

her previous image as a traveling woman without a home: in fulfilling her office, Truth had to find more permanent housing for the next year among her new neighbors in Freedman's Village (Schildt 14; Jenkins 88). Regarding that momentous meeting with Lincoln, Truth concluded her letter by stating that the President's commission allows her to "obtain[] a little house here, through the kindness of the Captain of the Guard," and from this house she planned to teach her neighboring freed Americans "in habits of industry and economy" (qtd in Porter 299). In sacrificing the relative freedom she had while traveling around the northern United States, her confinement at the border between the North and the South put her at the same risk as many other African Americans, whether they had been born free or born enslaved. When Truth complained to the local military police about local slave owners' kidnappings of black persons in Freedman's Village, it was Truth and other protesters—not the kidnappers—who were threatened with imprisonment (Jenkins 88; Holland 87).

While keeping her confined to one domestic space for about a year, Truth's labors in Freedman's Village were consistent with her defiance of categories, to blur distinctions between the public and the private, the workplace and the household, and by extension the assumption of gendered spheres. She acted as another kind of female minister, guiding women in their household affairs, while instructing men and women in their searches for professionalization and advocacy. The history of this camp serves as a site at which to consider the larger issues of domesticity as related to black communities in the antebellum United States. Securing stable housing in Freedman's Village had to be particularly important for this itinerant minister. After she changed her name from Isabella Baumfree to Sojourner Truth, the village was one of the few places she lived for any extended period. Even after she secured the mortgage to her Northampton home in 1854, she did not remain in that location for long, moving her extended

family to Battle Creek (Mabee, *Sojourner Truth: Slave, Prophet, Legend* xiv). On the other hand, she moved to Freedman's Village when, after moving her family to their new house in Battle Creek, she had just filed paperwork with the city to be deemed a permanent resident of the state of Michigan. Colman even introduces Truth to Lincoln by emphasizing how far away from home this activist had to travel, telling the President, "This is Sojourner Truth, who has come all the way from Michigan to see you" (qtd in Porter 298). Perhaps Truth's decision to have an extended stay in Washington, DC, for the sake of fighting for housing for African Americans and against prevalent racism and kidnappings in the area, was as much part of the public persona she was advertising as a woman who just would not stay at any home for an extended period. While she was going to reside in Freedman's Village for about a year, by having Colman emphasize that Michigan was her home, she could continue to appear as a wandering soul even as she stayed for so long in Arlington, a home away from home. She was still actively seeking that itinerant life, claiming to have a home far away in Michigan, and treating her time in Freedman's Village as part of her itinerant lifestyle, a temporary (albeit year-long) stop on her journey. She did not stay in Michigan for long, having relatives occupy that house while she traveled throughout Washington, DC, to find anyone who would host her at the White House. Her public performance as a person just trying to help her Freedman's Village neighbors clashes with what had been up to that point the public presentation of herself as an itinerant minister who had no need for a house.

The history and significance of Freedman's Village is easily overlooked, as it has long since disappeared, its houses torn down, the land replaced with graves as part of Arlington National Cemetery and, of all things, the Robert E. Lee Museum. Both replacements were the result of a postbellum desire by the federal government to ignore the problems of African

Americans following Reconstruction's failure, in order to focus energies on burying the large number of Civil War veterans and to capitalize upon the increasing value of land in the surrounding Washington, DC, area. The Supreme Court closed Freedman's Village in 1882, although people continued to reside there until 1887, when the United States government finally bought the land—and turned it over to the military. Residents were ordered to leave in 60 days. By 1900, Congress offered a total \$75,000 to all residents, which they accepted and finally left Freedman's Village. The estimated number of families at that time was 170, about 800 residents total, hence each resident received less than \$100 in exchange for their land and homes. Meanwhile, Robert E. Lee's oldest son posthumously received at least some lasting payback from the federal government. In 1883 the Supreme Court found in favor of Lee's son, George Washington Custis Lee, based on confiscation of property without due process. Whereas all 800 black residents received less than \$100 each to expedite their removal, Custis Lee alone was paid \$150,000 by the federal government. Property rights were violated against Lee but with compensation to his family and now a national federal memorial dedicated to him. Free African Americans were removed from their homes with considerably less compensation per person (Brooks 7; Coulling 186; Reidy 421, 426).

When he met with Truth in his White House office, Lincoln made an odd remark that suffers from pronoun trouble. According to Truth, Lincoln humbled himself, identifying how much he owed to previous presidents, as she said "his predecessors, and particularly Washington." Quoting Lincoln, Truth records the following: "[T]hey were just as good, and would have done just as I have, if the time had come. And if the people over the river," pointing across the Potomac, "had behaved themselves, I could not have done what I have" (qtd in Porter 298). "The people" is a vague referent—to whom is Lincoln referring? Is he referring to his

opponents in the Confederacy, across the Potomac and further down in the South? Or is he referring to those black refugees and soldiers across the Potomac? Had they somehow failed to “behave themselves” while Lincoln, with his strong paternal hand, was trying to institute order in a divided nation and come to the most peaceful solution possible regarding southern aggression and the problem of slavery? Or is he arguing that the refusal of those officers and those runaway slaves to behave was the very impetus needed to justify his legislative and military actions against secession and slavery? Furthermore, Lincoln’s claim to Washington’s mantle is an ominous echo to both Custis and Lee’s claims to their adopted ancestor. If we remember that Freedman’s Village was just across the Potomac from his White House office, then Lincoln’s remark to Truth gestures to a larger history of black home ownership and occupation in the great Washington, DC, area. As this site of African American domesticity has been erased in order to inaugurate a federal memorial dedicated to Lee as the top general of the Confederate Army, it is our responsibility as scholars to refer back to Truth’s words and remember that her association with Freedman’s Village clarifies some of the larger work that she accomplished, regardless how many of those houses occupied by runaway slaves have been torn down to place more graves in Arlington National Cemetery. Serving as both a community organizer to Freedman’s Village and a domestic ideologist to women specifically, Truth addressed not only the complex gendered divide between the private and the public, but also the difficulty for her and many freed slaves to feel at home in a divided Union and after the Civil War in a still unwelcoming United States.

Truth’s last years had many successes in Washington, DC, in particular her fight against segregated mass transportation. After the Civil War, Truth was still haunted by difficulties in negotiating with the federal government to securing more permanent housing for African Americans, now recognized as free citizens of the United States. She had met with President

Ulysses Grant to secure land grants for African Americans, but the meeting was a failure. With such difficulties in her political labors, it is oddly fitting that her last moments of life were directed not to legislative action or organized activism, but a turn away from public concerns and back to private matters, in particular her individual relationship with God. As her death neared she told one friend, “I ain’t gonna die. I’m goin’ home, like a shootin’ star” (qtd in Butler 96). After a life defined by a refusal to be bound by limiting categories, or to rest before her mission to serve God and her fellow African Americans was completed, in death she identified home as the ultimate goal of her work. But even as she imagines herself finally at home, it is on her own terms—still in motion, still defiant, still “shootin.’”

Chapter 5

Why Is Huck Silent?

Fatherhood, Slavery, and Domesticity in the Works and Life of Mark Twain

I conclude this study with a consideration of what it means to be a man at home in the antebellum United States, albeit looking not at a man but a boy, and not looking to the literature before but from after the Civil War. *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1884) provides to this study an example of postbellum re-assessment of the domestic ideology that author Mark Twain experienced firsthand as a child, and can be read for how Twain's memories of that ideology carried forward with both negative and positive implications for Huckleberry Finn not only resists but engages with a variety of households. For a novel that has received so much attention for how Huck enjoys the more idyllic setting along the Mississippi River, I argue that the novel also draws upon Victorian American domestic ideological ideas that in many ways Twain took seriously—because to write a satire of the antebellum South, Twain had to be intimately familiar with that which he mocked. In reading how Huck engages with households traditionally considered women's sphere of influence, and actually find them enjoyable, I identify as well how the character's participation in domestic settings can clarify the overall narrative structure of Twain's book, especially as regards what little Huck has to say about a major male figure in his own narrated tale: his father.

It is understandable why Huckleberry Finn has nothing to say upon learning of his father's death. Pap Finn was an illiterate drunk who abandoned his son to his dying wife and left the boy to be raised by others in Hannibal, Missouri. Only upon learning about Huck's newly acquired wealth does Pap return to his son—to kidnap and beat him for the money. With Mark

Twain's trademark wit, Huck finds some comfort while kidnapped in the old man's uncivilized shanty, having a "lazy and jolly" time with rules laxer than those at the Widow's residence.

Huck even finds some parental guidance, albeit in keeping with Twain's satirical tone, in Pap's advice on the best type of "borrowing" (34; 265). We cannot ignore the fact that this drunkard beats his son, as well as encourages him to be illiterate and unethical to the point that the young man feels discomfort in this same homely shack in the company of this abusive, racist man.

Nevertheless, Huck says little to indemnify his father. It makes sense, then, why he is silent when Jim reveals that he discovered Pap's corpse in the floating house: as the cliché goes, if Huck has nothing good to say, better to say nothing at all. Because Huck writes retrospectively, recounting past events that have already taken place, hence knows the outcome to his own story, his story poses a problem: Why is it that Huck, recounting his story, well after the event, still writes nothing overt concerning his father's death? How do we understand Huck's silence?

Huck's silence suits Twain's satire, especially as pertains to Huck's ignorance on how to behave in accordance with contemporary social standards. As Leslie Fiedler and others have argued, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is part of a larger movement after the Civil War to criticize antebellum literary styles that featured unrealistic, melodramatic stories. Twain directs his satire against the sentimental branch of antebellum romanticism from which his own realistic tone emerges. In the context of this mockery against earlier nineteenth-century literary styles, the relationship between masculinity and the romance results in a complex gendering of this literary form. Although Eric Haralson finds examples of a romantic masculinity developing before the Civil War, he argues that this literary style more closely aligned with women than with men: authors "conformed more to period stereotypes of femininity and owed more to domestic ideology than to the rugged-male discourse of steam power, commercial enterprise, and

‘action.’” Such feminization of male authors tainted their romantic literature as “verse that has no prospect of aesthetic profit” and worse “come[s] at the expense of cognition or reflection.” In other words, when men wrote romances, they were writing of their emotions without constraint. As Twain writes after such romantic notions were shattered by the Civil War, he has been read as conventionally responding against outdated literary models and pursuing a new literary style that “sanction[ed] [...] the right way, the manly way,” of emotional expression through “solitary, inexpressive stoicism,” Huck’s silence being indicative of this mode of masculinity (“Mars in Petticoats” 330; “Manly Tears” 89-90).

Huck Finn is not only a realist text but one of the best examples of a post-bellum romantic text to offer a sentimental portrayal of domesticity and masculinity. While artless Huck’s appreciation of for inartful Emmeline’s poetry clarifies how Twain mocks sentimentalist conventions, the author is criticizing the tropes of such emotional outpouring, not the emotions behind such outcries. Whereas Haralson focuses on the perceived critique against literary sentimentalism, I suggest a different reading of Twain’s novel that reveals *Huckleberry Finn* draws upon tropes closely associated with sentimentalism, including the romance and the domestic novel. Twain approaches these tropes with an ironic self-awareness for how inauthentic they may seem when poorly used. Twain’s text can be read not only as it conventionally has been—as an example of literary realism in the style of Howells, James, and even more naturalist authors such as Crane and London—but also as a self-aware, hence ironic, yet nevertheless authentically romantic text in the style of Irving, Hawthorne, and Poe. This text is like a romance because it engages with men’s emotions, often by appealing to sentimental tropes of characters struggling to resist their urge to cry, but as he is writing a satire, Twain

maintains the book's realistic by underplaying such emotionality, thanks largely to Huck's seeming unawareness as to the irony of his own words.

It is through his use of this romantic literary style to portray fictionalized and autobiographical childhood reminiscences about home, fatherhood, and slavery that Twain reveals the development of a post-bellum romantic masculinity through the American household. I begin this chapter looking at how Huck's ambivalence towards the idea of home clarifies the problem men felt in nineteenth-century America, even after the Civil War, to define a space inside the household and the family. Joseph Allan Boone's response to Fiedler's well known scholarship on *Huck Finn* clarifies definitions of masculinity that emerge from resistance against the household. Reading against this grain, I read Twain's text as more closely aligned with his personal and autobiographical writings and find in *Huck Finn* a celebration of certain forms of domesticity, as they contribute to the development of boys into men. Next, I examine Twain's interesting choice to reveal so many feelings not through dialogue but in Huck's silence. Although Twain is writing after the Civil War, Huck's silence reveals that antebellum American society sanctioned many socially acceptable forms of masculinity as developing not through rugged rural stoicism but through sensitive domestic sentimentality. As often as Twain excludes Huck from many households, the domestic pleasure he feels both on the raft and in some houses reveals the roles that boys and men held in households before the Civil War. Finally, I conclude by looking at Twain's private writings about his childhood, and exploring how these memoirs align with arguments that he raises in his published fictional and nonfictional writing. In this autobiographical writing, Twain reveals how young Sammy Clemens slowly realized a link between silence, mourning, slavery, and a sense of home, all of which culminates with a re-connection made to the parent—not to a father like Pap Finn but to a mother like Jane Clemens.

This inspiration from his mother develops as a complication for a form of masculinity that emerges not only on the Mississippi River but also in one of Twain's childhood homes.

Travel without Charm: Twain's Itinerant Life

Twain's life provides a context in which to understand how his regard for both home and travel, and his orientations to both stasis and movement, domesticity and cosmopolitanism, define forms of masculinity, in particular forms of paternity. In his private writings, he includes detailed passages about his home in Hannibal, his memories of his uncle's farm, and the initial pleasures of his first childhood house. But the pleasures of this first household soon turn to fear upon the discovery that he remains home alone, his parents and siblings having locked the house before moving out, forgetting this youngest of their many children. In Twain's earliest memories of domesticity, there is a mixture of pleasure and terror: "I was having a good enough time playing by myself until I found that the doors were fastened and that there was a grisly deep silence brooding over the place. I knew, then, that the family were gone, and that they had forgotten me. I spent the afternoon in captivity and was not rescued till the gloaming had fallen and the place was alive with ghosts" (*Autobiography* 209). This loss of his family would become a recurring theme in his writings, always connected to the loss of his various households. He had lost parents and siblings as a child, which inspired his decision to form a new family and find a permanent household in which to feel the security missing during his own childhood. To fund such a household, Twain engaged in frequent journeys, of which he had found himself enamored yet wary since his first major books, *The Innocents Abroad* and *Roughing It*, as well as his transatlantic lecture tours after the publication of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. The author did enjoy such journeys, once stating, "I like history, biography, travels, curious facts and

strange happenings, and science” (qtd in Paine 512). His time away from home appropriately led to the loss of home, both household and family. He would lose this house due to expenses, and the decision to travel abroad to pay for an abortive attempt to reclaim the house concludes with the death of his favored daughter, Susy, herself found dead in their Connecticut home, much as Twain wrote years earlier of Jim finding Pap in the floating house. As travel makes the home unfamiliar, and as health problems within his family persist, it is understandable why Twain would realize that “[t]ravel has no longer any charm for me” (qtd in H. N. Smith and Gibson 645).

Twain’s private writings reveal his comfort with domesticity, which resists attempts by Fiedler and other scholars to masculinize his travel against some supposed feminizing affront that households present to men such as Twain. As reflected in Twain’s autobiography, he often refuses to celebrate only mobility as Fiedler imagines him to; Twain actually is as likely to be in agreement with prevalent antebellum domestic ideology as with contemporary male colleagues such as Stephen Crane, Ambrose Bierce, and Jack London who idealized more nomadic and rustic outdoors lifestyles. If the “Twain” featured in Clemens’s biography is so willing to find comfort in households, however, the question that Fiedler presents must be revised: rather than ask why Twain excludes Huck from domestic settings, it is important to ask why such domestic settings are not made comfortable for Huck—why this child who does indeed seek a home is denied one at all times. The floating house of Pap Finn guides us to see how domesticity is denied to this boy.

The Floating House

As epitomized by Fiedler's "Come Back to the Raft Ag'in Huck Honey," many scholars emphasize Huck's choice as between the idyllic travel of the raft at the cost of maturing into an adult thereby resisting his father's model, or the civilizing but constraining lifestyle of domesticity, notably represented at book's end Aunt Sally's house. Another house found during Huck's voyage on the Mississippi further clarifies the darkness that Twain locates in these domestic spaces. "The Floating House," so named in Twain's subtitle to Chapter 9, is fitting for a Freudian reading of the uncanny, as this house is both homely and unhomely, embodying first the paradoxical romantic ideas of the actual and the imaginary as defined by Nathaniel Hawthorne, and for antebellum gender theoreticians like Margaret Fuller, both the masculine and the feminine. For a post-bellum, realistic pessimist such as Twain, households embody both lightness and darkness. Despite romantic and sentimental hopes that the home would be a convergence for the sake of joy, Twain makes such a house embody things that should not be seen. This complexity of ideas corresponds with the complex emotions that Huck feels upon looking at that floating house, and when he learns that it is in this house that Pap Finn has died.

In fact, Huck resists domesticity not by principle but by pragmatism, because he finds comfort in particular types of houses: he enjoyed his time at the Widow's up until his father kidnapped him, and even then he required rewards by Tom Sawyer to stay at the house; he enjoyed his time at his father's shanty until the abuse became too much; he admired the furnishings of the Grangerford residence; and when impersonating Tom Sawyer he felt some sense of community with "my family — I mean the Sawyer family" (237). In his conception of himself as a man, Huck's relationship to the idea of home is not simply an antagonistic desire to sail away on the Mississippi. Instead, the types of homes that Huck enjoys, and the length of

time he is willing to tolerate in each space, is contingent on the comfort he feels within those spaces. His paradoxical and capricious appreciation and frustration with homes serves as an organizing motif for the river-based and land-based chapters to Twain's book.

The fact that Jim discovers Pap's dead body in a floating house—removed from its moorings and sailing down the Mississippi—connects not only to domesticity but also to travel itself, Huck's redneck father dying in a mobile home is appropriate even if the coined term is anachronistic for Twain's text. The house's movement contradicts the stability that Twain described in his private writings as the basis for such a household. Innocent Huck's narration understates the surprise at seeing this "frame house [...] a two-story, and tilted over, considerable" (60). More importantly, the presence and the absence of darkness and lightness upon Huck and Jim's entry into the house is a relevant throwback to Hawthorne's conception of the Romance:

But it was too dark to see yet, so we made the canoe fast and set in her to wait for daylight.

The light begun to come before we got to the foot of the island. Then we looked in at the window. We could make out a bed, and a table, and two old chairs, and lots of things around about on the floor; and there was clothes hanging against the wall. There was something laying on the floor in the far corner that looked like a man. (60)

Whereas an author from the earlier romantic era such as Hawthorne would seek comfort with the arrival of ghostly guests, Twain presents Huck not an idealized and inspiring ghost to pass along a story but a corpse—not some figment of the imagination but a rotting body of real flesh. The body is hidden by the initial darkness of the house that would give Hawthorne creative fecundity—so many shadows for nuanced perception and writing—but Twain's focus on stark realism puts that corpse into the sunlight, revealing Pap Finn in a kind of gothic horror as defined by Jim:

“It’s a dead man. Yes, indeed; naked, too. He’s been shot in de back. I reck’n he’s been dead two er three days. Come in, Huck, but doan’ look at his face—it’s too gashly.”

I didn’t look at him at all. Jim threw some old rags over him, but he needn’t done it; I didn’t want to see him. (60)

His refusal to look at the body—appropriate for a boy like Huck, running away from his father, even when he is dead—stems from a discomfort enhanced when the son defines his father as no longer a human being but as “something laying on the floor”—a thing, an object like any other in the household, limited to a status absent of any humanity, let alone personification. Narrating this story after the events have taken place, hence already knowing his father is dead, Huck describes his father amidst all the other furnishings of the house, just another piece of furniture, another part of the description of the setting, not a human but a prop not worthy of dialogue or mourning. Pap exists as first seemingly human but described second as inanimate, appropriate based on Huck and Jim’s initial thought that the man was alive only to realize he is dead.

Much as authors such as Hawthorne would locate the romance in the household, as would Edgar Allan Poe locate the gothic in these same domestic spaces, Twain engages with the same trope in locating Pap’s death site as a household. But it is a stranger’s house, a place unfamiliar to Pap or his son, again producing that uncanny and romantic combination of the familiar and the unfamiliar, in this case a location that is as seemingly prim and proper as the Widow’s house but as poorly arranged as Pap’s run-down shanty—a shanty created through thievery, the same thievery that has occurred in this floating house and which led to Pap’s anticipated demise. While Huck’s later appreciation for the households of the Grangerfords and the Wilkes suggests his attraction to domestic spaces, he receives an eerie impression from the combination of the Widow’s strict household with the terror of his father’s shanty, now combined into this house that does what it should not—remove itself from its property and float away. The fear produced

by encountering such an unexpected, overwhelming form of domesticity unsurprisingly produces no direct written reaction from Huck. Because of this lacking reaction, the horror is denied to us: Twain is not Poe, not Stowe, not even Hawthorne.

Emotional Huck

In his account of his father's death inside the floating house, Huck expresses little emotion over Pap's demise. In the last page of the book, Huck merely quotes Jim's testimony without offering an account of his reaction—whether he cried, screamed, or even laughed, or as his silent narration implies indeed remained silent. Upon hearing Jim's news, Huck continues his narration where he left off, with earlier discussion of future travels with Tom in the Indian Territory and away from the “siviliz[ing]” influence of Aunt Sally (307). Writing his autobiography in retrospect, after all events narrated have taken place, Huck's earliest remarks about his father do not foreshadow the man's death. Because Huck does not hint to his reader that the story will end with his father's demise, there are no direct statements by Huck to reveal any sadness concerning this death. In Huck's narration, even those persons who will die receive some sympathy from our narrator upon their first introduction, whereas Pap Finn is irredeemable throughout the book.

Scholars of nineteenth-century American culture typically look at the era as a contradictory period in defining masculine emotions. Oftentimes these critics resist considering how emotions operate within men, preferring instead to locate such emotions, as Haralson argues, as repressed or, as William Hecker does, written upon only the most womanly of Twain's men and the most manly of his women. Hecker sees such emotionality as natural for the author's more “androgynous” characters, not only for the cross-dressing Huck but also the militaristic

Joan of Arc and the anatomically effeminate cadet from *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*, whose gender portrayals complicate strict male-female anatomical binaries (37-38). When turning attention away from these characters' professions, clothing, and bodies and towards emotions, such scholars persist with what they think to be the gendered separation between being emotional and being emotionless. Granted, Twain naturalizes emotions as belonging to the female sphere of influence—"a young girl's heart" having within it "the pity and the tenderness that are natural to it" (*Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc* 239). Gillian Brown reads Huck's decision to leave for the Indian Territory as only an attempt to flee the "sentimental values" that define a feminine, emotional, and conforming American culture (5).

Refusal to distinguish hardness from an absolute lack of emotional expression clarifies why some scholars are so adamant to see Huck become just like his father—a smoking and stealing wanderer, poor and refusing the rules of society. The "transgressive content of the sentimental" should not be ignored simply because Twain mocks sentimental conventions. The father and his son are the same person, in particular because of Huck's ethical if ironically unintentional view of Jim as a human being in contrast to Pap's indictment against "free nigger" college professor (Clark 7-8, 36). Yet Huck's subdued reaction to the abuse he and Tom inflict on Jim, as well as his silence upon his father's death, leaves a troubling view of this boy's emotions, hard at best, antisocial and sociopathic at worst. In their close attention to Huck's itinerancy as the link between him and his father, scholars are willing to define the two men as similar because father and son run away from the supposedly civilized culture of domestic settings, and to recognize Huck on a dark road following the path of his father and ultimately leading him to become just as cruel.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ See Scott Donaldson, "Pap Finn's Boy" (1971); Harold Beaver, "Run, Nigger, Run" (1974); and Alex Pitofsky, "Pap Finn's Overture" (2006).

Defining “innocence and spirit” as “feminine” (Hecker 41) ignores the very masculinity of a character such as Huck—his own emotions, sentiment, innocence, and spirit located squarely in his identity as an emerging man. His tears actually emphasize not femininity but masculinity, in that there is nothing uniquely feminine to crying. While it is accurate to refer to Huck’s silence upon his father’s death as hardness, philosopher Sara Ahmed points out that “hardness is not the absence of emotion, but a different emotional orientation towards others” (4; emphasis in original). Twain’s decision to present Huck as crying inside a text that mocks the tropes of sentimentalism actually employs one goal of late-eighteenth and early nineteenth-century sentimentalism: these texts are designed to show men that it is manly to cry. Although the Cult of Domesticity is well known today as claiming the domestic sphere as belonging to women, works such as *Huckleberry Finn* show that men resist not the *actual* but the *imaginary* feminization of households, as likely to be represented as emasculating in some books as it is to be represented as masculinizing in others. Some men are comfortable describing pleasures they find in such domestic spaces. After all, Huck has as much to write about the joys of the Grangerford household as he does of the idyllic Mississippi River.

Yet Twain remains a satirist throughout these texts. Huck’s account of the Grangerford household serves to ridicule ante-bellum low-middle-class domesticity—the inclusion of well-known texts such as *Pilgrim’s Progress* more for show than for reading, comparable to the wax fruit for presentation rather than consumption, all appropriate for the Gilded Age as named by Twain. He guides the reader to look upon this domestic setting with mockery, through the eyes of a picaresque narrator whose opinion we should not trust—an uneducated, young rogue who lacks the common sense and adult experience to recognize how silly his remarks are. Scholars label Huck’s portrayal of the Mississippi merely as a celebration of the picaresque scene and

Twain's nostalgia for home, rather than as an allusion to the same romanticized passages that Twain would mock from Walter Scott or Ralph Waldo Emerson. Why should readers only take Twain's portrayals of domestic scenes as satirical rather than as serious? While Huck's occupation in household spaces can be unpleasant—his stopovers on his river ride consist of feuds, thievery, and murders—scholars emphasize the joyful freedom Huck feels during his adventures on the Mississippi but ignore the comfort he feels with the Grangerfords, the Wilkses, and the Phelps. Pap's death clarifies why Huck is silent over his father's demise but so pleased with his time at the households of so many persons no longer alive or no longer seen in the novel.

Childish Men

Huck understates the shock of seeing his father's body, not only because Jim covers the corpse but also because our narrator is Twain's ironic voice. Huck consistently abbreviates any reactions he has to the very scenes that in any other text would command more attention. This boy can spend more time writing about the equivocation of stealing chickens but not crabapples than the few pages he devotes to the death of his own father—even when writing after knowing of his father's demise, upon narrating the discovery of his corpse he writes of no emotional shock. But then again, what should we expect from just a child? William Dean Howells already refers to Twain's humor as “always good-humored humor, too, that he lavishes on his reader, and even its impudence is charming; we do not remember where . . . it is insolent, with all its sauciness and irreverence” (Rev. of *The Innocents Abroad* 765). In his reading of *The Innocents Abroad*, Fiedler has a field day with Howells's description: “[T]hese are terms suitable not so much to a man as to a boy, one of those naughty boys who is not in the final analysis downright

‘bad,’” yet from Fiedler’s tone, this is hardly a quality of boyishness to celebrate without complication. Instead, Fiedler politely criticizes Twain’s refusal to take responsibility as an adult, “to trade on that ‘boyishness’ which he never willingly surrendered, in order to get away with what would have been counted sacrilege in a full-fledged man” (Afterword 485).

Fiedler goes on to argue that Twain designs himself as immature in order to produce ironic results—“to embody his most mature definition of the American character would necessarily be a juvenile, just one more boy in a cast of boys” (485). Such ironic results strike Fiedler as a failure to grow up, ignoring Twain’s very words that celebrate childhood as a perfected state of humanity without belying maturation, in particular moving from boyhood into manhood. Aside from his heroicizing of children such as Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn—the former for his romantic thinking, the latter for his realist vision undermining the former’s thinking—Twain praised that boyish quality he found in even the most militant of men. As he wrote of Ulysses S. Grant and William Tecumseh Sherman, the duo’s “child-like naivety” struck the simultaneous idealistic and cynical Twain as “enchanting—and stupefying,” what he would refer to as the immature quality in Grant that paradoxically led to his military successes (*Mark Twain’s Letters* 459; Leon 111). Fiedler’s tone implies a flaw in American immaturity, one that Fiedler actually should be celebrating rather than condemning for a presumed failure that American literature struggles to satisfy European expectations. Having chastised Twain’s *Innocents Abroad* for its mixture of the author’s simplistic awe at European culture and American bitterness amid such surroundings, Fiedler fails to recognize the success by which Twain’s petulant tone defines an emotional orientation that indeed is immature but for the sake of accomplishing what his romantic forebears had not: revealing emotions through indirect

methods. The fact that Huck presents no writing to represent directly his shock at Pap's death does not make the character affectless.

Twain may mock so-called feminine effusions of emotions, but as any good satirist, his subjects for ridicule can be multiple, leaving it vague whether the author has only one intended subject of ridicule or many. In fact, by choosing to have Huck serve as the picaresque protagonist, Twain mocks the other, more affectless male protagonists found in similar books of adventures in the wilderness and encounters through many cities. Protagonists in rural romantic texts by Twain's predecessors like Sir Walter Scott and James Fenimore Cooper and contemporaries like Owen Wister constrain their emotions rather than cry, as does the wayward picaresque anti-hero. Whereas one goal of sentimentalism is to remind male readers that it is acceptable to cry, to argue that Twain only mocks sentimentalist conventions is to ignore his accomplishment in allowing a young boy on the verge of manhood to cry and thus engage in the same (though subdued) sentimentalist conventions being mocked elsewhere in the book. Rather than appearing as stoic and silent, or inauthentic but poetic, Huck emerges as a character capable of actually expressing his emotions and in a more authentic fashion. In each case, Huck mourns for the loss of someone's life, whether from feud, poverty, or punishment. Despite the lad's claim early in his autobiographical text that he "don't take no stock in dead people" (10), these examples reveal a deep concern for the lives of fellow human beings. A different emotional orientation is necessary in order to clarify Twain's approach to represent human life realistically through his characters, in particular his understated approach to revealing emotions. Surprisingly Twain comes upon this insight through a small boy—not Huck, but a child from Samuel Clemens's past.

Sandy's Silence

Twain was well known for his meticulous attention to the function of silence in drawing humor from spoken-word performance. Silence has its traumatic element as well, as can be evident when considering how speech, for example dialect, influences his texts. In her book *Was Huck Black?* Shelley Fisher Fishkin defines the inspiration that a black child had on Twain's creation of Huck's dialect. In a character sketch, he wrote for the *New York Times*, "Sociable Jimmy," Twain finds in the eponymous boy an entertaining distraction during his long lecture circuit in the Midwest. Despite Fiedler's resistance to immaturity as a preoccupation of American literature, Fishkin embraces the boy Jimmy as the inspiration behind Huck Finn, Twain's best narrator. Based on Fishkin's example, I argue that another black child, in this case a slave from Samuel Clemens's childhood, clarifies the reason why a narrator such as Huck is so unattached emotionally in his writing, yet so revealing when we read the silences of his text.

In an extract from his autobiography, in the midst of writing about his childhood at the family's household in Hannibal, Missouri, Twain remembers a young slave boy named Sandy, a child whose constant singing would frustrate him until he appealed to his mother to make the noise stop. Upon hearing young Samuel Clemens describe Sandy's singing, "[t]he tears came into her eyes, and her lip trembled," provoking his mother to reply "something like this—": "Poor thing, when he sings, it shows that he is not remembering, and that comforts me; but when he is still, I am afraid he is thinking, and I cannot bear it. He will never see his mother again; if he can sing, I must not hinder it, but be thankful for it. If you were older, you would understand me; then that friendless child's noise would make you glad" (qtd in *Autobiography* 212). The passage engenders emotion as an expression manifested by women through more physical means—quivering lips and crying eyes—whereas for Twain it leads to a consideration we would

call subdued for its private rumination rather than public, embodied expression. The quotation adheres closely to Haralson's argument—women are obviously expressive, men stoic and subdued. In his autobiographical reflection, Twain only reacts to the rhetoric of her statement, that “[i]t was a simple speech, and made up of small words.” His own repressed reaction reflects the way Twain connects emotions to speechlessness. The passage shows us how it is the silence defined by Twain's mother that clarifies the problem for his autobiographical counterpart Huck. Sandy comes to feel the loss through his silence, and perhaps Twain remembered that comparable feeling when writing his autobiography after the publication of *Huck Finn*. Silence becomes not the moment of suppression but a moment of revelation that only the best reader can uncover or create through projection, he or she who is in on the joke—and as Lynda Walsh notes, such is appropriate for a jokester like Twain.

But like any good joke, the important point is who gets to be inside or outside the joke, or more broadly on the inside or on the outside—so appropriate when looking at Twain's descriptions of interiors and exteriors of households, or at the response Twain writes to his mother's speech. While Twain the narrator does not provide a direct, elaborate description of his reaction to his mother's words, he does determine whom to allow to be on the inside or the outside. In response to his mother, Twain writes a key phrase that ties together not only his emotional concerns and his relationship to race but, most importantly, silence itself to domestic concerns. Twain's only response to his mother's speech is that her message “went home, and Sandy's noise was not a trouble to me any more” (*Autobiography* 212). Twain returns to an association between silence and home, as with Huck's silence and the floating house, is significant for clarifying that Twain's argument about domesticity is not as simple as Fiedler and his acolytes have made it sound. It is not that Huck is running away from any household so

much as still on the search for the ideal home—one without feuds, thievery, and slavery—that his petulant author will not allow him. There is something key to that phrase “it went home” that clarifies a sense of domestic calm as peopled by Twain, his mother, Sandy, and the idealized household that even an adult, embittered Twain sees fondly, and which offers hope for Huck to find similar peace.

As Twain revised antebellum domestic ideology forward into the postbellum United States, he struggled to draw what was productive in such ideology towards a more complex understanding of masculinity and femininity, while not merely imitating its sentimentality at the expense of the authentic sentiment underlying such formal presentations. Twain’s understated narration, both in his autobiography and in Huck’s conversational tone with his readers, reveals how realist authors would come to incorporate the duality of romance through oblique methods. The rise of realism may have suggested that Americans may have lost the romantic hope that there is a place for men in the perfect home, and Twain’s silences provide no obvious spoken or written commentary on this issue. I read Twain’s silences differently, however, as implying that we must keep silent in order to feel anything—to contemplate in silence our shared emotions that Twain will not overstate but leave us to imagine. Twain’s narrators remain mute in order to hide their desire for such homes. Like Huck, the reader remains on a journey to find what will never be found, what can never be spoken, what will remain always silent.

Bibliography

- Achilles, Jochen. "Purgers and Montaged Men: Masculinity in Hawthorne's and Poe's Short Stories." *Amerikastudien / American Studies* 43.4 (1998): 577-592.
- Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Allston, Washington. "The Gentle Boy—with an Original Illustration." *Christian Register and Boston Observer* 18.3 (19 Jan 1939): 1. Rpt. in *Nathaniel Hawthorne: The Contemporary Reviews*. 41.
- Ammons, Elizabeth. "Preface." *Uncle Tom's Cabin* by Harriet Beecher Stowe. Ed. Ammons. vii-ix.
- Andrews, William L. *To Tell a Free Story: The First Century of Afro-American Autobiography, 1760-1865*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- Arnold, David L. "The Type of Shame: Hester Prynne as Jeremiad." *Pacific Coast Philology* 27.1-2 (1992): 44-53.
- Ashwill, Gary. "Savagism and Its Discontents: James Fenimore Cooper and His Native American Contemporaries." *American Transcendental Quarterly* 8.3 (1994): 211-227.
- Austen, Jane. *Northanger Abbey*. Boston: Little, Brown, & Company, 1903.
- Barlowe, Jamie. *The Scarlet Mob of Scribblers: Rereading Hester Prynne*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2000.
- Barry, Elaine. "Beyond the Veil: A Reading of Hawthorne's 'The Minister's Black Veil.'" *Studies in Short Fiction* 17 (1980): 15-20.
- Bauermeister, Erica R. "The Lamplighter, The Wide, Wide World, and Hope Leslie: Reconsidering the Recipes for Nineteenth-Century American Women's Novels." *Legacy* 8 (Spring 1991): 17-28.
- Baym, Nina. "Again and Again, the Scribbling Women." *Hawthorne and Women: Engendering and Expanding the Hawthorne Tradition*. Ed. John L. Idol and Melinda M. Ponder. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999. 20-35.
- . "Concepts of the Romance in Hawthorne's America." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 38.4 (1984): 426-443.
- . "Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Mother: A Biographical Speculation." *American Literature: A Journal of Literary History, Criticism, and Bibliography* 54.1 (1982): 1-27.

- , et al. *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. 6th ed. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 2003.
- . “Thwarted Nature: Hawthorne as Feminist.” *Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Study of the Short Fiction*. Ed. Nancy L. Bunge. New York: Twayne, 1993. 58-77.
- Beaver, Harold. “Run, Nigger, Run: *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* as a Fugitive Slave Narrative.” *Journal of American Studies* 8 (1974): 339–361.
- Beecher, Catharine Esther. *A Treatise on Domestic Economy: For the Use of Young Ladies at Home and at School*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1849.
- , and Harriet Beecher Stowe. *The American Woman’s Home: Or, Principles of Domestic Science: Being a Guide to the Formation and Maintenance of Economical, Healthful, Beautiful, and Christian Homes*. New York: J.B. Ford and Company, 1869.
- Bell, Michael Davitt. *Culture, Genre, and Literary Vocation: Selected Essays on American Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Benjamin, Park. “*The Gentle Boy*.” *The New-Yorker* 6.19 (26 Jan 1839): 301. Rpt. in *Nathaniel Hawthorne: The Contemporary Reviews*. Ed. Idol and Jones. 42.
- Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The Office of The Scarlet Letter*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Bergman, David. “F. O. Matthiessen: The Critic as Homosexual.” *Raritan: A Quarterly Review* 9.4 (1990): 62–82.
- Berman, Jacob. “Domestic Terror and Poe’s Arabesque Interior.” *ESC: English Studies in Canada* 1.1 (2005): 128–150.
- Berry, Stephen W. *All That Makes a Man: Love and Ambition in the Civil War South*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Blunt, Alison. “Imperial Geographies of Home: British Domesticity in India, 1886-1925.” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 24.4 (1999): 421–440.
- Boone, Joseph Allan. *Tradition Counter Tradition: Love and the Form of Fiction*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. “Nathaniel Hawthorne.” Rpt. in *Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Tales*. 1st ed. Ed. James McIntosh. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1987. 405–415.
- Bosco, Ronald A., and Jillmarie Murphy. *Hawthorne in His Own Time*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2007.

- Boston Daily Journal* 15 Oct 1858. "Boston Daily Journal Extracts of Minnesota Interest, 1842-1859." St. Paul: The Minnesota Historical Society. Transcript.
- Brodhead, Richard H. *The School of Hawthorne*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Broek, Michael. "Hawthorne, Madonna, and Lady Gaga: *The Marble Faun*'s Transgressive Miriam." *Journal of American Studies* 46.3 (Aug 2012): 625-640.
- Brooks, Nancy Growald. *Arlington House: A Guide to Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial, Virginia*. Washington, DC: National Park Services, 1986.
- Brown, Gillian. *Domestic Individualism: Imagining Self in Nineteenth-Century America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Browning, Elizabeth Barrett. *Lady Geraldine's Courtship*. New York: C. Scribner, 1870.
- Browning, Preston M. "Hester Prynne as a Secular Saint." *Midwest Quarterly* 13 (1972): 351-362.
- Brownlie, Robin Jarvis. "First Nations Perspectives and Historical Thinking in Canada." *First Nations, First Thoughts: The Impact of Indigenous Thought in Canada*. Ed. Annis May Timpson. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009. 21-50.
- Buchanan, Lindal. *Regendering Delivery: The Fifth Canon and Antebellum Women Rhetors*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005.
- Burgett, Bruce. *Sentimental Bodies: Sex, Gender, and Citizenship in the Early Republic*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Butler, Mary G. *Sojourner Truth: From Slave to Activist for Freedom*. New York: Rosen Publishing, 2003.
- Caldwell, Patricia. "Why Our First Poet Was a Woman: Bradstreet and the Birth of an American Poetic Voice." *Prospects: An Annual Journal of American Cultural Studies* 13 (1988): 1-35.
- Carlson, David J. *Sovereign Selves: American Indian Autobiography and the Law*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006.
- Carolina, Katherine Adams. *Owning Up: Privacy, Property, and Belonging in U.S. Women's Life Writing: Privacy, Property, and Belonging in U.S. Women's Life Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Carpenter, Frederic I. "Hester the Heretic." *College English* 13.8 (1952): 457-458.

- Carter, Catherine. "'Not a Woman': The Murdered Muse in 'Ligeia.'" *Poe Studies/Dark Romanticism* 36.1-2 (2003): 45–57.
- Chapman, Mary, and Glenn Hendler, eds. *Sentimental Men: Masculinity and the Politics of Affect in American Culture*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999.
- Cheever, Susan. *American Bloomsbury: Louisa May Alcott, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Margaret Fuller, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Henry David Thoreau: Their Lives, Their Loves, Their Work*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2007.
- Child, Lydia Maria Francis. *The American Frugal Housewife: Dedicated to Those Who Are Not Ashamed of Economy*. New York: S.S. & W. Wood, 1841.
- . *Hobomok: A Tale of Early Times*. Boston: Cummings, Hilliard & Company, 1824.
- Church, Joseph. "'To Make Venus Vanish': Misogyny as Motive in Poe's 'Murders in the Rue Morgue.'" *American Transcendental Quarterly* 20.2 (2006): 407–418.
- Clark, C. E. Frazer, Jr. "Origins of the American Renaissance: A Front-Page Story." *Studies in the American Renaissance* (1977): 155–164.
- Clark, Suzanne. *Sentimental Modernism: Women Writers and the Revolution of the World*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indian University Press, 1991.
- Colacurcio, Michael J. "'The Woman's Own Choice': Sex, Metaphor, and the Puritan 'Sources' of *The Scarlet Letter*." *New Essays on The Scarlet Letter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. 101-135.
- Coleman, Arthur. "Hawthorne's Pragmatic Fantasies." *College Language Association Journal* 31.3 (Mar 1988): 360-371.
- Copway, George. "Address Before the Legislature of Pennsylvania." *The Life, Letters and Speeches of Kah-Ge-Ga-Gah-Bowh*. New York: S. W. Benedict, 1850. 171-191.
- . "The American Indians." *The American Whig Review* 18 (1849): 631–637.
- . *The Life, History and Travels of Kah-Ge-Ga-Gah-Bowh (George Copway): A Young Indian Chief of the Ojebwa Nation...* Albany: Weed and Parsons, 1847.
- . "Organization of a New Indian Territory." New York: S. W. Benedict, 1850.
- . *Running Sketches of Men and Places in England, France, Germany, Belgium, and Scotland*. New York: Riker, 1851.
- . *The Traditional History and Characteristic Sketches of the Ojibwey*. London: Gilpin, 1850.

- Coulling, Mary P. *The Lee Girls*. Winston-Salem: John F. Blair, 1987.
- Couzelis, Mary J. "What Can 'The Tell-Tale Heart' Tell About Gender?" *Adapting Poe: Re-Imaginings in Popular Culture*. Ed. Dennis R. Perry and Carl H. Sederholm. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 217–229.
- Crowley, Joseph Donald. *Hawthorne: The Critical Heritage*. New York: Routledge, 1970.
- Cummins, Maria Susanna. *The Lamplighter*. Boston: J.P. Jewett, 1854.
- Dahl, Curtis. "The Architecture of Society and the Architecture of the Soul: Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables* and Melville's *Pierre*." *University of Mississippi Studies in English* 5 (1984): 1–22.
- . "Arrowhead and the 'Razeed' Roof: An Architectural Speculation." *Melville Society Extracts* 55 (1983): 5–7.
- D'Amore, Maura. "'Country Life within City Reach': Masculine Domesticity in Suburban America, 1819-1871." Diss. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2009.
- . "Thoreau's Unreal Estate: Playing House at Walden Pond." *New England Quarterly* 82.1 (2009): 56–79.
- Davidson, Cathy N, and Jessamyn Hatcher, eds. *No More Separate Spheres!* Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Dayan, Joan. "Poe's Women: A Feminist Poe?" *Poe Studies/Dark Romanticism* 24.1-2 (1991): 1–12.
- . "Romance and Race." *The Columbia History of the American Novel*. Ed. Emory Elliott et al. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991. 89-109.
- DeLano, Sterling F. *The Harbinger and New England Transcendentalism: A Portrait of Associationism in America*. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1983.
- Dolis, John. "Thoreau's Walden: Intimate Space and the Economy of Being." *Consumable Goods*. Ed. David K. Vaughan. Orono: University of Maine, 1987. 185–193.
- "Domestic Life Among the Indians." *Godey's Magazine and Lady's Book* 30 (June 1845): 252.
- "Domestic Life Among the Indians." *The Poughkeepsie Casket* 2.6 (30 June 1838): 42-43
- Donaldson, Scott. "Pap Finn's Boy." *South Atlantic Bulletin* 36.3 (1971): 32–37.

- Donovan, Josephine. *Uncle Tom's Cabin: Evil, Affliction, and Redemptive Love*. Boston: Tawyne, 1977.
- Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture*. New York: Anchor-Doubleday, 1988.
- Dumas, George. "Home." *New Declamations: Modern Short Speeches on Current Subjects*. Ed. Lester Boone. New York: Noble and Noble, 1943. 136-137.
- Dunbar, Eve. "The Terror of Poe: Slavery, the Southern Gentleman, and the Status Quo." *Memory and Myth: The Civil War in Fiction and Film from Uncle Tom's Cabin to Cold Mountain*. Ed. David B Sachsman et al. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2007. 39-47.
- Egan, Jim. *Oriental Shadows: The Presence of the East in Early American Literature*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2011.
- Elbert, Monika. "Hester and the New Feminine Vision." *Hester Prynne*. Broomall: Chelsea House, 2004. 181-202.
- . "No (Wo)man's Land: Hawthorne's 'Neutral Territory' and Hester's 'Magic Circle' as Home." *Mid-Hudson Language Studies* 12.2 (1989): 27-39.
- . "Poe and Hawthorne as Women's Amanuenses." *Poe Studies/Dark Romanticism* 37.1-2 (2004): 21-27.
- . *Separate Spheres No More: Gender Convergence in American Literature, 1830-1930*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2000.
- Elliott. "Remarks on the Bunker Hill Monument." *Advocate of Peace* (Dec 1840): 227-232.
- Elmer, Jonathan. *Reading at the Social Limit: Affect, Mass Culture, and Edgar Allan Poe*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.
- . "Terminate or Liquidate? Poe, Sensationalism, and the Sentimental Tradition." *The American Face of Edgar Allan Poe*. Ed. Shawn Rosenheim and Stephen Rachman. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995. 91-120.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "Self-Reliance." 1841. *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Ed. Nina Baym et al. 6th ed. Vol. B. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 2003. 1160-1176.
- English, Thomas Dunn. "Reminiscences of Poe.: IV." *The Independent* (5 Nov. 1896): 4-5.
- Erlich, Gloria C. "Hawthorne and the Mannings." *Studies in the American Renaissance* (1980): 97-117.

- Faflik, David. "South of the 'Border,' or Poe's Pym: A Case Study in Region, Race, and American Literary History." *Mississippi Quarterly* 57.2 (2004): 265–288.
- Fay, Susan Barrera. "Identifying the Female Author: Anonymity and Pseudonymity in Early American Publishing." *Publishing History* 34 (1993): 92-93.
- Feidelson, Charles. *Symbolism and American Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Fiedler, Leslie. Afterword. *The Innocents Abroad, or The New Pilgrims Progress* by Mark Twain. New York and Toronto: Signet, 1966. 477-492.
- . "Come Back to the Raft Ag'in Huck Honey!" *Partisan Review* 25 (1948): 664-671.
- . *Love and Death in the American Novel*. New York: Criterion, 1960.
- Fisher, Benjamin F, ed. *Poe in His Own Time: A Biographical Chronicle of His Life, Drawn from Recollections, Interviews, and Memoirs by Family, Friends, and Associates*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2010.
- Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. *Was Huck Black? Mark Twain and African-American Voices*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- "Fourth Peace Congress." *Advocate of Peace* 10 (Nov-Dec 1850): 286-311.
- Frederick, John T. "Cooper's Eloquent Indians." *PMLA* 71.5 (1956): 1004–1017.
- Fulford, Tim. *Romantic Indians: Native Americans, British Literature, and Transatlantic Culture 1756-1830*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Fuller, Margaret. "The Great Lawsuit: MAN versus MEN. WOMAN versus WOMEN." 1843. *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Ed. Nina Baym, et al. 6th ed. Vol. B. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 2003. 1620-1654.
- Gage, Frances Dana. "Ar'n't I a Woman." *History of Woman Suffrage*. Ed. Elizabeth C. Stanton et al. Vol 1. Rochester: Charles Mann, 1887. 116.
- Gallagher, Susan Van Zanten. "A Domestic Reading of *The House of the Seven Gables*." *Studies in the Novel* 21.1 (Spring 1989): 1-13.
- Gaul, Theresa Strouth. "Romance and the 'Genuine Indian': Cooper's Politics of Genre." *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 48.3 (2002): 159-186.
- Gilmore, Michael T. "Uncle Tom's Cabin and the American Renaissance." *The Cambridge Companion to Harriet Beecher Stowe*. Ed. Cindy Weinstein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 58-76.

- Glaspell, Susan. *Trifles*. New York: F. Shay-The Washington Square Players, 1916.
- “A Glimpse of Hawthorne’s Boyhood.” *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 83 (1947): 178-184.
- Gorman, Herbert. “Hawthorne’s Notebooks Are Rescued from Distortion: The Manuscript as It Was Before Mrs. Hawthorne Edited It to Conform to ‘Genteel Standards.’” *New York Times* 25 Dec. 1932: BR3.
- Gould, Philip. “Revisiting the ‘Feminization’ of American Culture.” *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 11.3 (1999): i–xii.
- Greysen, Naomi. “Affective Geographies: Sojourner Truth’s Narrative, Feminism, and the Ethical Bind of Sentimentalism.” *American Literature* 79.2 (2007): 275–305.
- Hale, Sarah Josepha. “The Bunker Hill Monument.” *Ladies’ Magazine and Literary Gazette* (1 Feb 1830). 88-89.
- . *Northwood: A Tale of New England*. 2 vols. Boston: Bowles & Dearborn, 1827.
- . “Why Women Were Made Lovely.” *Lady’s Book* (Feb 1838): 92-93.
- . “The Worth of Money.” *Ladies’ Magazine and Literary Gazette* (1 Feb. 1830): 49-55.
- Haralson, Eric. “Manly Tears: Men’s Elegies for Children in Nineteenth-Century America.” *Boys Don’t Cry? Rethinking Narratives of Masculinity and Emotion in the U. S.* Ed. Milette Shamir and Jennifer Travis. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002. 88-105.
- . “Mars in Petticoats: Longfellow and Sentimental Masculinity.” *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 51.3 (1996): 327-356.
- . “Why Women Were Made Lovely.” *The Lady’s Book* 16-17 (Jan-Feb 1838): 92-93.
- Harlowe, Marie. “Sojourner Truth, the First Sit-In.” *Negro History Bulletin* 29 (1966): 173-174.
- Hawthorne, Julian. *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife: A Biography*. Boston: James R. Osgood, 1885.
- Hawthorne, Manning. “Hawthorne’s Early Years.” *Essex Institute Historical Collections* (1938): 1-21.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *The Blithedale Romance*. 1852. New York: Penguin, 1986.

- *Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Ed. William Charvat, et al. 20 vols. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1962-1988.
- “Drowne’s Wooden Image.” 1844. *Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Tales*. Ed. McIntosh. 2nd ed. 218-228.
- “Ethan Brand.” *Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Tales*. Ed. McIntosh. 2nd ed. 254-267.
- “The Gentle Boy.” 1831. *Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Tales*. Ed. McIntosh. 2nd ed. 36-61.
- *The House of the Seven Gables*. 1851. Ed. Seymour L. Gross. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1967.
- *The Letters of Hawthorne to William Ticknor, 1851-1869*. 1910. Ed. C. E. Frazer Clark, Jr. 2 vols. Newark: Carteret Book Club, 1972.
- “Main-Street.” *Aesthetic Papers*. Ed. Elizabeth Peabody. 1849. Rpt. in *Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Tales*. 1st ed. Ed. McIntosh. 209-230.
- *The Marble Faun*. Ed. Richard Brodhead. New York: Penguin, 1990.
- “Mrs. Hutchinson.” *Salem Gazette* (7 Dec 1830). *Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Tales*. Ed. McIntosh. 2nd ed. 67-73.
- *Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Tales: Authoritative Texts, Backgrounds, Criticism*. 1st ed. Ed. James McIntosh. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1987.
- *Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Tales: Authoritative Texts, Backgrounds, Criticism*. 2nd ed. Ed. James McIntosh. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 2013.
- “The New Adam and Eve.” *United States Democratic Review* 12 (Feb 1843): 146-155.
- Preface to *Twice-Told Tales*. 1851. 317-320.
- “The Prophetic Pictures.” *Twice-Told Tales*. Rpt. in *Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Tales*. Ed. McIntosh. 2nd ed. 200-219.
- *The Scarlet Letter*. 1850. *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Ed. Baym. Vol B. 1333-1474.
- *The Snow-Image, and Other Twice-Told Tales*. 1852. Rpt. in *Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Tales*. Ed. McIntosh. 2nd ed. 321-323.
- *Twice-Told Tales*. 2 vols. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1866.
- “The Witches—A Scene from Main Street.” *Godey’s Lady’s Book* 47 (Mar 1851): 192.

- Hayward, William. "Pro-Slavery in Indiana." *Liberator* (15 Oct. 1858).
- Hecker, William. "The Androgynous Warrior: An Examination of Gender Blending in Twain's Military Heroes." *Mark Twain Annual* 1 (2003): 37-43.
- Hedrick, J. D. "Parlor Literature: Harriet Beecher Stowe and the Question of 'Great Women Artists.'" *Signs* 17.2 (Winter 1992): 275-303.
- Hendler, Glenn. *Public Sentiments*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Herbert, T. Walter. *Dearest Beloved: The Hawthornes and the Making of the Middle-Class Family*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995.
- Hoffman, Daniel. "Ligeia—Not Me! Three Women Writers Respond to Poe." *Poe's Pervasive Influence*. Ed. Barbara Cantalupo. Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 2012. 117–125.
- . *Poe Poe Poe Poe Poe Poe Poe Poe*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998.
- Holland, Jesse J. *Black Men Built the Capitol: Discovering African-American History In and Around Washington*. Guilford: Globe Pequot, 2007.
- "Home." *The Advocate of Moral Reform* 12.15 (1 Aug 1846): 120.
- "Home." *The Christian Witness, and Church Member's Magazine* 3 (March 1846): 102.
- "Home." *The Fourth Reader, or, Exercises in Reading and Speaking: Designed for the Higher Classes in Our Public and Private Schools*. Boston: Sanborn, Carter and Bazin, 1847. 179-180.
- "Home." *The Mother's Magazine* 12 (May 1844): 140-141.
- "Home." *One Hundred Choice Selections in Poetry and Prose*. Ed. Phineas Garrett, et al. Philadelphia: P. Garrett & Co., 1889. 159-160.
- "Home." *The Rover* 4.2 (1845): 18.
- "Home." *Young American Speaker and Manual of Oratory*. Ed. Henry Davenport Northrop. Philadelphia: International Publishing, 1895. 150.
- "Home." *Young People's Speaker*. Philadelphia: National Publication Company, 1900. 150.
- Houston, Neal B. "Hester Prynne as Eternal Feminine." *Real: The Journal Of Liberal Arts* 21.1 (1996): 29-39.

- Howe, Daniel Walker. *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Howells, William Dean. *Literary Friends and Acquaintance*. New York: Harper, 1900.
- . Rev. of *The Innocents Abroad, or the New Pilgrim's Progress*. *The Atlantic Monthly* 24 (1869): 764-766.
- Hubbell, Jay B. "Poe and the Southern Literary Tradition." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 2 (1960): 151-171.
- Hutchings, Kevin. *Romantic Ecologies and Colonial Cultures in the British Atlantic World, 1770-1850*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2009.
- Idol, John L., and Buford Jones, eds. *Nathaniel Hawthorne: The Contemporary Reviews*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Jackson, Andrew. *Messages of Gen. Andrew Jackson: With a Short Sketch of His Life*. Concord: J. F. Brown and W. White, 1837.
- Jacobs, Harriet A. *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl: Written by Herself*. Ed. Lydia Maria Child and Jean Fagan Yellin. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Jacobs, Peter. *Journal of the Reverend Peter Jacobs*. Anson Green at the Conference Office, 1853.
- Jacobs, Robert D. "Rhetoric in Southern Writing: Poe." *Georgia Review* 12 (1958): 76-79.
- James, Henry. "The Art of Fiction." Rpt. in *The Art of Fiction* by Sir Walter Besant and Henry James. Boston: Cupples, Upham, 1885. 51-85.
- . *Hawthorne*. London and New York: Macmillan, 1895.
- Jenkins, Wilbert L. *Climbing Up to Glory: A Short History of African Americans During the Civil War and Reconstruction*. Wilmington: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.
- Kaiser, Johanna. "Boston Chooses Life-size Edgar Allan Poe Statue to Commemorate Writer's Ties to City." *The Boston Globe* 23 Apr. 2012.
- Kazanjian, David. *The Colonizing Trick: National Culture and Imperial Citizenship in Early America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Kelley, Mary. *Private Woman, Public Stage: Literary Domesticity in Nineteenth-Century America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

- Kelley, Wyn. "‘I’m Housewife Here’: Herman Melville and Domestic Economy." *Melville Society Extracts* 98 (1994): 7–10.
- . "Pierre’s Domestic Ambiguities." *The Cambridge Companion to Herman Melville*. Ed. Robert S. Levine and Andrew Delbanco. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 91–113.
- Kennedy, J. Gerald. *Romancing the Shadow: Poe and Race*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Kennedy, Roger. "Jefferson and the Indians." *Winterthur Portfolio: A Journal of American Material Culture* 27.2-3 (1992): 105-121.
- Kerber, Linda K. "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman’s Place: The Rhetoric of Women’s History." *The Journal of American History* 75.1 (1988): 9–39.
- Kimmel, Michael. "The Birth of the Self-made Man." Rpt. in *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Ed. Rachel Adams and David Savran. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2002. 135-152.
- Knobel, Dale T. "Know-Nothings and Indians: Strange Bedfellows?" *Western Historical Quarterly* 15.2 (1984): 175–198.
- Konkle, Maureen. *Writing Indian Nations: Native Intellectuals and the Politics of Historiography, 1827-1863*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Kopacz, Paula. "‘Men Can Doe Best, and Women Know It Well’: Anne Bradstreet and Feminist Aesthetics." *Kentucky Philological Review* 2 (1987): 21–29.
- Kot, Paula. "Feminist ‘Re-Visioning’ of the Tales of Women." *A Companion to Poe Studies*. Ed. Eric W. Carlson. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996.
- Kummings, Donald D. "Hawthorne’s ‘The Custom House’ and the Conditions of Fiction in America." *CEA Critic: An Official Journal of the College English Association* 33.3 (1971): 15-18.
- Laird, Holly A. *Women Coauthors*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000.
- Lathrop, G. P. *A Study of Hawthorne*. Boston: 1876.
- Lee, Robert A. "‘Like a Dream Behind Me’: Hawthorne’s ‘The Custom-House’ and *The Scarlet Letter*." *Nathaniel Hawthorne: New Critical Essays*. London and Totowa: Vision and Barnes & Noble, 1982. 48-67.
- Leon, Philip W. *Mark Twain and West Point*. Toronto: ECW Press, 1996.

- Leverenz, David. *Manhood and the American Renaissance*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- . “Mrs. Hawthorne’s Headache: Reading *The Scarlet Letter*.” *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 37.4 (1983): 552–575.
- . “Poe and Gentry Virginia: Provincial Gentleman, Textual Aristocrat, Man of the Crowd.” *Haunted Bodies: Gender and Southern Texts*. Ed. Anne Goodwyn Jones and Susan V. Donaldson. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1997. 79-108.
- Levine, Robert S. “In and Out of Parlor.” *American Literary History* 7.4 (Winter 1995): 669-680.
- “Literary Notices.” *Ladies Magazine* 3.1 (Jan 1830): 47.
- Ljungquist, Kent P. “Poe’s ‘Al Aaraaf’ and the Boston Lyceum: Contributions to Primary and Secondary Bibliography.” *Victorian Periodicals Review* 28.3 (1995): 199–216.
- . “The Poet as Critic.” *The Cambridge Companion to Edgar Allan Poe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 7-20.
- Lopez, Drew. *Red Ink: Native Americans Picking Up the Pen in the Colonial Period*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2012.
- . “‘The Whole Wilderness Shall Blossom as the Rose’: Samson Occom, Joseph Johnson, and the Question of Native Settlement on Cooper’s Frontier.” *American Quarterly* 58.4 (2006): 1119–1145.
- “Love of Home and Country.” *A Book of Anecdotes, Religious, Interesting and Practical* by Matthew Denton. London: Ward and Co., 1850. 56-58.
- Lowell, James Russell. “Edgar A. Poe.” *Graham’s American Magazine* (Feb 1845). Rpt. in *Works* by Edgar Allan Poe. Vol. 1. New York: Widdleton, 1880. cii-cviii.
- . “Hawthorne.” *The Vision of Sir Launfal and Other Poems*. Ed. Ellen A. Vinton. Boston: Benjamin H. Sanborn, 1899. 42-43.
- Lyons, Paul. “Opening Accounts in the South Seas: Poe’s Pym and American Pacific Orientalism.” *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 42.4 (1996): 291-326.
- Mabee, Carleton. “Sojourner Truth and President Lincoln.” *The New England Quarterly* 61.4 (1988): 519-529.
- . *Sojourner Truth: Slave, Prophet, Legend*. New York and London: New York University Press, 1993.

- Mabbott, Thomas Ollive, ed. *Tales and Sketches*. Vol 1. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2000.
- Maier, John R. *Desert Songs: Western Images of Morocco and Moroccan Images of the West*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1996.
- “Maria Louise Hawthorne.” *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 75 (1939): 103-34.
- Marden, Orison Sweet. *The Secret of Achievement*. Boston and New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1898.
- Marshall, Megan. *The Peabody Sisters: Three Women Who Ignited American Romanticism*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2005.
- Masteller, Richard N., and Jean Carwile Masteller. “Rural Architecture in Andrew Jackson Downing and Henry David Thoreau: Pattern Book Parody in Walden.” *New England Quarterly* 57.4 (1984): 483–510.
- Matthiessen, F. O. *American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- May, Chad T. “The Romance of America: Trauma, National Identity, and the Leather-Stocking Tales.” *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 9.1 (2011): 167–186.
- MBS. “Incidents of Travel—George Copway, the Indian Lecturer.” *Ohio Farmer* 6.6 (7 Feb 1857): 22.
- McWilliams, John. “The Rationale for ‘The American Romance.’” *Boundary 2* 17 (Spring 1990): 71-82.
- McCarthy, Paul. “Houses in Walden: Thoreau as ‘Real-Estate Broker,’ Social Critic, Idealist.” *Midwest Quarterly: A Journal of Contemporary Thought* 28.3 (1987): 323–339.
- McFarland, Philip. *Hawthorne in Concord*. New York: Grove, 2004.
- McGill, Meredith. *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834-1853*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Mellow, James R. *Nathaniel Hawthorne in His Times*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.
- Meyers, Jeffrey. *Edgar Allan Poe: His Life and Legacy*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.
- Michael, Magali Cornier. *New Visions of Community in Contemporary American Fiction: Tan, Kingsolver, Castillo, Morrison*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2008.

- Milder, Robert. *Hawthorne's Habitations: A Literary Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Mitchell, Thomas G. *Antislavery Politics in Antebellum and Civil War America*. Westport: Praeger, 2007.
- Montgomery, Travis. "Poe's Oriental Gothic: 'Metzengerstein' (1832), 'The Visionary' (1834), 'Berenice' (1835), the Imagination and Authorship's Perils." *Gothic Studies* 12.2 (2010): 4–28.
- Moore, Thomas R. "'A Thick and Darksome Veil': The Rhetoric of Hawthorne's Sketches." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 48.3 (1993): 310–325.
- Morisi, Eve Célia. "The Female Figure of Poe's Poetry: A Rehabilitation." *Poe Studies/Dark Romanticism* 38 (2005): 17–28.
- Moss, Sidney Phil. *Poe's Literary Battles: The Critic in the Context of His Literary Milieu*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1963.
- "Mr. Poe's Poem." *Boston Courier* 18 Oct 1845: 2. Rpt. in *Poe in His Own Time*. Ed. Fisher. 57-58.
- Murphy, Larry G. *Sojourner Truth: A Biography*. Santa Barbara: Greenwood, 2011.
- Murtuza, Athar. "An Arabian Source for Poe's 'The Pit and the Pendulum.'" *Poe Studies* 5.2 (1972): 52.
- "Native Americans at Bunker Hill." Boston National Historical Park. Web. 7 Feb. 2013. <<http://www.nps.gov/bost/historyculture/nativeamerican.htm>>
- Nicolay, Theresa Freda. *Gender Roles, Literary Authority, and Three American Women Writers: Anne Dudley Bradstreet, Mercy Otis Warren, Margaret Fuller Ossoli*. New York: Peter Lang, 1995.
- Noble, Marianne. *The Masochistic Pleasures of Sentimental Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Oberholtzer, Ellis Paxson. *The Literary History of Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs, 1906.
- "Observations on the Tragedy of Tamerlane." *The Portfolio* (Feb 1816): 138-141.
- O'Connell, Catherine E. "'The Magic of the Real Presence of Distress': Sentimentality and Competing Rhetorics of Authority." *The Stowe Debate: Rhetorical Strategies in Uncle*

- Tom's Cabin. Ed. Mason I. Lowance Jr. et al. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994. 13-36.
- Okker, Patricia. *Our Sister Editors: Sarah J. Hale and the Tradition of Nineteenth-Century American Women Editors*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008.
- Onderdonk, Todd. "The Marble Mother: Hawthorne's Iconographies of the Feminine." *Studies in American Fiction* 31.1 (2003): 73-100.
- Osgerber, Bill. "The Bachelor Pad as Cultural Icon: Masculinity, Consumption and Interior Design in American Men's Magazines, 1930-65." *Journal of Design History* 18.1 (2005): 99-113.
- Paine, Albert Bigelow, ed. *Mark Twain: A Biography*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1912.
- Painter, Nell Irvin. *Sojourner Truth: A Life, a Symbol*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.
- "Parental and Family Influences on Hawthorne." *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 76 (1940): 1-13.
- Parker, Robert Dale, ed. *The Sound the Stars Make Rushing Through the Sky: The Writings of Jane Johnston Schoolcraft*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- "Patriots of Color at the Battle of Bunker Hill." Boston National Historical Park's Teacher Resource Center. Web. 15 Feb. 2013.
<<http://www.nps.gov/bost/forteachers/upload/P%20of%20C%20Biographiesmerge.doc>>
- Patterson, Cynthia Lee. *Art for the Middle Classes: America's Illustrated Magazines of the 1840s*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010.
- Pearson, Norman Holmes. "Elizabeth Peabody on Hawthorne." *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 94 (1958): 256-276.
- Pease, Donald E. "Hawthorne in the Custom-House: The Metapolitics, Postpolitics, and Politics of *The Scarlet Letter*." *Boundary 2: An International Journal of Literature and Culture* 32.1 (Spring 2005): 53-70.
- Pepper, George. "Themes of Happiness." North Carolina Legislature, Raleigh. Nov. 1868.
- Perry, Dennis R. "A Poe within a Poe: *Inception*'s Arabesque Play with 'Ligeia.'" *Adapting Poe: Re-Imaginations in Popular Culture*. Ed. Dennis R. Perry and Carl H. Sederholm. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 81-92.
- Person, Leland S. *The Cambridge Introduction to Nathaniel Hawthorne*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

- . “Hawthorne’s Early Tales: Male Authorship, Domestic Violence, and Female Readers.” *Hawthorne and the Real: Bicentennial Essays*. Ed. Millicent Bell. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2005. 125-143.
- . “Poe and Nineteenth-Century Gender Constructions.” *A Historical Guide to Edgar Allan Poe*. Ed. J. Gerald Kennedy. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. 129-166.
- Peyer, Bernd. *American Indian Nonfiction: An Anthology of Writings, 1760s-1930s*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007.
- , ed. *The Elders Wrote: An Anthology of Early Prose by North American Indians 1768-1931*. Berlin: Deitrich Reimer Verlag, 1982.
- . *The Tutor’d Mind: Indian Missionary-Writers in Antebellum America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997.
- Pitofsky, Alex. “Pap Finn’s Overture: Fatherhood, Identity, and Southwestern Culture in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*.” *Mark Twain Annual* 4 (2006): 55–70.
- Poe, Edgar Allan. “A Chapter on Autography [Part I].” *Graham’s Magazine* 19 (Nov 1841): 224-234.
- . “A Chapter on Autography [Part II].” *Graham’s Magazine* 19 (Dec 1841): 273-286.
- . “Landor’s Cottage: A Pendant to ‘The Domain of Arnheim.’” *Flag of Our Union* 4 (9 Jun 1849): 2. Rpt. in *Tales of Mystery and Imagination*. New York: Fall River Press, 2009. 405-415.
- . Letter to Louis A. Godey. 16 July 1846. *Edgar Allan Poe Society of Baltimore*. 6 Nov 2009. <<http://www.eapoe.org/works/letters/p4607160.htm>>. 29 Dec 2012.
- . “The Oblong Box.” *Godey’s Lady’s Book* 29 (Sept 1844): 132-136. Rpt. in *The Works of Edgar Allan Poe*. New York: W. J. Widdleton, 1876. 351-362.
- . *The Selected Writings of Edgar Allan Poe*. Ed. G. R. Thompson. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 2004.
- . “Tamerlane.” *The Raven and Other Poems*. New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1845. Rpt. in *Selected Writings*. Ed. Thompson. 8-15.
- . *Tamerlane and Other Poems*. 1827. London: George Redway, 1887.
- . *The Works of the Late Edgar Allan Poe*. Ed. Rufus Wilmot Griswold. 4 vols. New York: Redfield, 1857.

- Poirier, Richard. *A World Elsewhere: The Place of Style in American Literature*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.
- Pollin, Burton Ralph. "Poe as Author of the 'Outis' Letter and 'The Bird of the Dream.'" *Poe Studies / Dark Romanticism* 20.1 (1987): 10-15.
- Porter, Dorothy. "Sojourner Truth Calls Upon the President: An 1864 Letter." *Massachusetts Review* 13.1/2 (1972): 297-299.
- Quinn, Arthur Hobson. *Edgar Allan Poe: A Critical Biography*. 1941. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Quintal, George. *Patriots of Color: "A Peculiar Beauty and Merit": African Americans and Native Americans at Battle Road & Bunker Hill*. Boston: Boston National Historical Park, 2004.
- Ratner, Lorman A., et al. *Paradoxes of Prosperity: Wealth-Seeking Versus Christian Values in Pre-Civil War America*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009.
- Reid, Mayne. *Edgar Allan Poe*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1885.
- Reidy, Joseph P. "'Coming from the Shadow of the Past': The Transition from Slavery to Freedom at Freedmen's Village, 1863-1900." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 95.4 (Oct 1987): 403-428.
- Rev. of *The Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. *North American Review* 99 (Oct 1864): 539.
- Reynolds, David S. *Beneath the American Renaissance: The Subversive Imagination in the Age of Emerson and Melville*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Rex, Cathy. "Survivance and Fluidity: George Copway's *The Life, History, and Travels of Kah-Ge-Ga-Gah-Bowh*." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 18.2 (2006): 1-33.
- Rhoads, Bonita. "Poe's Genre Crossing: From Domesticity to Detection." *Poe Studies/Dark Romanticism* 42 (2009): 14-40.
- Richards, Eliza. *Gender and the Poetics of Reception in Poe's Circle*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "Poe, Women Poets, and Print Circulation." *Teaching Nineteenth-Century American Poetry*. Ed. Paula Bernat et al. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 2007. 203-219.
- . "'The Poetess' and Poe's Performance of the Feminine." *Arizona Quarterly* 55.2 (1999): 1-29.

- Roberts, Robert. *The House Servant's Directory, or A Monitor for Private Families: Comprising Hints on the Arrangement and Performance of Servants' Work*. Boston: Munroe and Francis, 1827.
- Rogin, Michael P. *Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian*. Piscataway: Transaction Publishers, 1991.
- Ruoff, A. LaVonne Brown. "George Copway." *Dictionary of Native American Literature*. Ed. Andrew Wiget. New York: Taylor & Francis, 1994. 217-222.
- . "George Copway: Nineteenth-Century American Indian Autobiographer." *Auto/Biography* 3 (Summer 1987): 6-17.
- . "The Literary and Methodist Contexts of George Copway's *Life, Letters and Speeches*." *Life, Letters and Speeches* by George Copway. Ed. Ruoff and Donald B. Smith. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006. 1-21.
- Ruthven, Kenneth. *Faking Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Ryan, Mary. *The Empire of the Mother*. 1982. New York: Harrington Park Press, 1985.
- Sayre, Gordon M. *The Indian Chief as Tragic Hero: Native Resistance and the Literatures of America, from Moctezuma to Tecumseh*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- . "Jefferson and Native Americans: Policy and Archive." *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Jefferson*. Ed. Frank Shuffelton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 61-72.
- Schacht, Miriam Helga. *Rootedness and Mobility in International Indigenous Literatures*. Diss. University of Texas at Austin, 2008.
- Scheckel, Susan. *The Insistence of the Indian: Race and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century American Culture*. Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Schenone, Laura. *A Thousand Years Over a Hot Stove: A History Of American Women Told Through Food, Recipes, And Remembrances*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2004.
- Schildt, Roberta. "Freedman's Village: Arlington, Virginia, 1863-1900." *Arlington Historical Magazine* 7.4 (1984): 11-21.
- Schoolcraft, Henry Rowe. "Domestic and Social Manners of the Indians While on Their Wintering Grounds." *Friends' Intelligencer* 10.34 (12 Nov 1853): 532-534.

- . *The Indian in His Wigwam, or, Characteristics of the Red Race of America: From Original Notes and Manuscripts*. Buffalo: Derby & Hewson, 1848.
- Shamir, Milete. *Inexpressible Privacy: The Interior Life of Antebellum American Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Silverman, Kenneth. *Edgar A. Poe: A Biography: Mournful and Never-Ending Remembrance*. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.
- Smith, Donald B. "George Copway." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000. Web. <<http://www.biographi.ca/009004-119.01-e.php>>. 22 Dec. 2012.
- . "Kahgegahbowh: Canada's First Literary Celebrity in the United States." *Life, Letters & Speeches* by George Copway. Ed. A. LaVonne Brown Ruoff and Donald B. Smith. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006. 23-60.
- Smith, Henry Nash, and William M. Gibson, ed. *Mark Twain-Howells Letters*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Belknap Press, 1960.
- Sova, Dawn B. *Critical Companion to Edgar Allan Poe: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2007.
- Spacks, Patricia Meyer. *Gossip*. New York: Knopf, 1985.
- Stashower, Daniel. *The Beautiful Cigar Girl: Mary Rogers, Edgar Allan Poe, and the Invention of Murder*. New York: Dutton, 2006.
- Stern, Madeleine B. *Louisa May Alcott: A Biography*. Lebanon: University Press of New England, 1999.
- Stewart, Randall. "Recollections of Hawthorne by His Sister Elizabeth." *American Literature* 16.4 (Jan 1945): 316-331.
- Stowe, Harriet Beecher. "Sojourner Truth, the Libyan Sibyl." *Atlantic Monthly* XI (April 1863): 473-481.
- . *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. 1852. Ed. Elizabeth Ammons. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1994.
- Sweet, Timothy. "George Copway." *American Travel Writers, 1776-1864*. Ed. James Schramer and Donald Ross. *Dictionary of Literary Biography*. Vol. 183. Detroit: Gale Research, 1997. 68-72.
- . "The Life of George Copway or Kah-Ge-Ga-Gah-Bowh (1818-1869)—and a Review of His Writings." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 23.3 (Autumn 1988): 5-38.

- Taketani, Etsuko. "Thoreau's Domestic Economy: Double Accounts in Walden." *The Concord Saunterer* 2.1 (1994): 65–76.
- Thompson, Gary Richard. *The Gothic Imagination: Essays in Dark Romanticism*. Pullman: Washington State University Press, 1974.
- Thoreau, Henry David. *Walden*. 1854. Rpt. in *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Ed. Baym. 6th ed. Vol. B. 1807-1982.
- . "Walking." 1862. Rpt. in *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Ed. Baym. 6th ed. Vol. B. 1993-2016.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. 2 vols. New York: J. & H. G. Langley, 1840.
- Tompkins, Jane. *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Works of American Fiction, 1790-1860*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Tosh, John. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Truth, Sojourner. *Sojourner Truth's Narrative and Book of Life*. Ed. Olive Gilbert and Frances W. Titus. Boston: 1875.
- Turco, Lewis. "The Matriarchy of American Poetry." *College English* 34.8 (1973): 1067–1074.
- Twain, Mark [Samuel Clemens]. *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. 1885. Ed. Guy - Cardwell. New York: Penguin, 1985.
- . *Autobiography of Mark Twain*. Ed. Harriet Elinor Smith, et al. Vol. 1. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2010.
- . *Mark Twain's Letters*. Ed. Albert B. Paine. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1917.
- . *Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc*. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1806.
- Ullén, Magnus. *The Half-Vanished Structure: Hawthorne's Allegorical Dialectics*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2004.
- Ultan, Lloyd, and Barbara Unger. *Bronx Accent: A Literary and Pictorial History of the Borough*. Piscataway: Rutgers University Press, 2000.
- Valenti, Patricia Dunlavy. *Sophia Peabody Hawthorne: A Life*. Vol. 1. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2004.

- Venet, Wendy Hamand. *Neither Ballots Nor Bullets: Women Abolitionist and the Civil War*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1991.
- Vogelius, Christa. “‘Folded Up in a Veil’: Sophia Hawthorne’s Familial Ekphrasis and the Antebellum Travelogue.” *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 59.1 (2013): 79–111.
- Wagenknecht, Edward. *Henry Wadsworth Longfellow: Portrait of an American Humanist*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Waggoner, Hyatt H. *Hawthorne: A Critical Study*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- . *The Presence of Hawthorne*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979.
- Walker, Cheryl. *Indian Nation: Native American Literature and Nineteenth-Century Nationalisms*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Walker, Ian Malcolm. *Edgar Allan Poe: The Critical Heritage*. New York: Routledge, 1986
- Waller, Jennifer R. “‘My Hand a Needle Better Fits’: Anne Bradstreet and Women Poets in the Renaissance.” *Dalhousie Review* 54 (1974): 436–450.
- Walsh, Lynda. *Sins Against Science: The Scientific Media Hoaxes of Poe, Twain, and Others*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.
- Walter, Cornelia Wells. “A Failure.” *Boston Evening Transcript* 17 Oct 1845: 2. Rpt. in *Poe In His Own Time*. Ed. Fisher. 52-53.
- Wang, Yamin. “A Representative of the New Female Image: Analyzing Hester Prynne’s Feminist Consciousness in *The Scarlet Letter*.” *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1.6 (2010): 893-897.
- Washington, Margaret. “Introduction.” *Narrative of Sojourner Truth*. Ed. Washington. New York: Vintage, 1993.
- . *Sojourner Truth’s America*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2009.
- Webster, Daniel. “The First Bunker Hill Monument Oration.” 1825. *The World’s Famous Orations*. Ed. William Jennings Bryan. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906. 24–37.
- Welter, Barbara. “The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860.” *American Quarterly* 18.2 (1966): 151–174.
- Whitman, Walt. *Prose Works 1892: Specimen Days*. New York: New York University Press, 2007.

- Williams, Susan S. “‘Promoting an Extensive Sale’: The Production and Reception of *The Lamplighter*.” *New England Quarterly* 69.2 (June 1996): 179-200.
- . *Reclaiming Authorship: Literary Women in America, 1850–1900*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Wilson, Susan. *Boston Sites & Insights: An Essential Guide to Historic Landmarks in and Around Boston*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.
- . *The Literary Trail of Greater Boston: A Tour of Sites in Boston, Cambridge, and Concord*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2005.
- Wineapple, Brenda. *Hawthorne: A Life*. New York: Random House, 2004.
- Winters, Yvor. “Maule’s Curse: Hawthorne and the Problem of Allegory.” *The American Review* (September 1937): 339-361.
- Wright, John W. “A Feathertop Kit.” *Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Tales*. 1st ed. Ed. James McIntosh. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1987. 439-454.
- Yellin, Jean Fagan, ed. *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl: Written by Herself* by Harriet Jacobs. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Young, Virginia Hudson. “Fuller and Hawthorne: The Androgyny of Genius.” *Publications of the Missouri Philological Association* 10 (1985): 64–70.
- Zboray, Ronald J., and Mary Saracino Zboray. *Literary Dollars and Social Sense: A People’s History of the Mass Market Book*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Žižek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London and New York: Verso, 1989.