BOOKED: “WOMANHOOD IS TOO TIGHTLY BOUND TO GIVE ME SCOPE”

By

MICHELLE ESTHER ALEXANDER FANKHAUSER

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of English

MAY 2010

© Copyright by MICHELLE ESTHER ALEXANDER FANKHAUSER, 2010
All Rights Reserved

© Copyright by MICHELLE ESTHER ALEXANDER FANKHAUSER, 2010
All Rights Reserved

To the Faculty of Washington State University:

The members of the committee appointed to examine the dissertation of MICHELLE ESTHER ALEXANDER FANKHAUSER find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

____
Augusta Rohrbach, Ph.D., Chair

____
Victor Villanueva, Ph.D.

____
Donna Campbell, Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to especially acknowledge the help of my mentor and friend, Augusta Rohrbach. She read parts of this dissertation more times that I can count and was always happy and enthusiastic to do so. I don't know what I would have done without her comments and guidance. I would also like to thank Victor Villanueva and Donna Campbell for serving on my committee and offering their valuable comments on my work. Finally, my friends both inside and outside academia who supported me through the process of writing this dissertation: Julie Meloni, Debbie Riebe, and Mike Riebe.

BOOKED: "WOMANHOOD IS TOO TIGHTLY BOUND TO GIVE ME SCOPE"

Abstract

by Michelle Esther Alexander Fankhauser, Ph.D.
Washington State University
May 2010

Chair: Augusta Rohrbach

This dissertation illuminates and examines the formal or paratextual elements employed by four 19th Century American female authors: Margaret Fuller, Lydia Maria Child, Jane Johnston Schoolcraft, and María Amparo Ruiz de Burton. It demonstrates the ways in which formal elements are as useful a tool to the literary critic as a traditional rhetorical analysis.

Gerard Genette, in *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation,* argues for the importance of paratextual elements, or "what enables a text to become a book and be offered as such to its readers and, more generally, to the public" (1). Paratexts exist at the place where authorship and the literary marketplace intersect, and offer literary critics a way to use the formal features of a book as a point of entry for analysis. Paratextual studies are foundational, in that they reveal the formal features that lay the groundwork for content.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT…..…………………………………………... iii

ABSTRACT…………………………………………………………… iv

INTRODUCTION……………………………………………………….. 1

CHAPTER

1. "A MEANS OF MUTUAL INTERPRETATION": REVOLUTIONARY RHETORIC IN MARGARET FULLER'S *WOMAN IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY*……………………………………………………... 8

2. "THE HONEST AGENT OF MY CONSCIENCE AND MY HEART": LYDIA MARIA CHILD'S *LETTERS FROM NEW-YORK*..……..28

APPENDIX A……………………………………………..50

3. "LANGUAGE DIVINE!": THE JANE JOHNSTON SCHOOLCRAFT ARCHIVE AND PARATEXTS…………………………………. 51

APPENDIX A……………………………………………..76

APPENDIX B……………………………………………..77

4. "I SLANDER NO ONE BUT SHALL SPEAK THE TRUTH": PARATEXTS IN *THE SQUATTER AND THE DON*…………………………….80

EPILOGUE……………………………………………………………..103

BIBLIOGRAPHY………………………………………………………108

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated with love and gratitude to my husband Jeff and my children, Nicholas, Jacob, Emma, and Quincy. Without their support and sacrifice of both time and sanity, this dissertation would not be possible.

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary literary criticism, the work of 19th Century American female authors is the focus of scholars who are concerned with re-reading and recovery. Early feminist scholars like Ann Douglas, Jane Thompson, and Nina Baym laid the groundwork for more recent feminist work. Cathy Davidson has written on female authors and the rise of the novel, Amy Kaplan on the domestic genre that many female authors wrote within, and Melissa Homestead on female authors and literary copyright law, to name only three. All of these studies on genre and rhetoric tell us much about female authors and their cultural and historical place in 19th Century America. There is, however, an important textual layer besides the content that so many critics focus on: paratextual elements employed by several 19th Century American female authors. This dissertation will explore the ways in which paratexts are as useful a tool to the literary critic as a traditional rhetorical analysis.

Paratexts offer literary critics a way to use the formal features of a book as a point of entry for analysis. Paratexts can tell us who an author's intended audience was, how the author wished for their book to be read, and how the author chose to represent him or herself in the literary marketplace. Paratextual studies are foundational, in that they reveal the formal features that lay the groundwork for content. Gerard Genette, in *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation,* argues for the importance of paratextual elements, or "what enables a text to become a book and be offered as such to its readers and, more generally, to the public" (1). In other words, paratexts are everything that makes a text a book, except for the text itself. In this way paratexts serve as a bridge between the idea of a book as a concept, and the book as a material object. This does not

mean that paratexts cannot be embedded within the text; several of the authors in this study do just that. Typically, though, paratexts are formal features of the book such as epigraphs, prefaces, and chapter titles that exist apart from the text itself. Genette also makes clear that paratexts go hand-in-hand with authorial intent, in so far as "something is not a paratext unless the author or one of his associates accepts responsibility for it" (9).[1] Paratexts, then, exist at the place where authorship and the literary marketplace intersect, in the space where the book emerges as a material object.

In this dissertation I focus on the paratextual space that exists at the intersection of authorship and marketplace in order to reveal the formal choices of Margaret Fuller, Lydia Maria Child, Jane Johnston Schoolcraft, and María Amparo Ruiz de Burton. The four 19th Century American female authors under consideration here all made deliberate paratextual choices based on their entry into a literary marketplace of some kind, whether it was the public marketplace or a more private gift exchange.[2] Once Nathanial Hawthorne famously complained that the marketplace was being overrun by a "damned mob of scribbling women," responding to the popularity of women's writing during the 19th Century. Hawthorne's statement only helps to illustrate the need for the continued scrutiny of female authors and how they moved from the realm of the private sphere into the public literary marketplace. When transitioning from private to public, paratextual choices can help to facilitate that move in a positive way.

Because a paratextual study naturally focuses on authorial choices, this dissertation is informed not only by Genette's theories, but also current work on female

[1] There are, of course, many paratextual elements that are not under the control of the author, but it is the authorial choices that I choose to focus on.
[2] In *The Business of Letters* Leon Jackson makes a convincing case for the expansion of our definition of "literary marketplace" to include transactions such as gift exchange.

authorship in 19th Century America. Anne Boyd's recently published *Wielding the Pen: Writings on Authorship by American Women of the Nineteenth Century*, makes it clear that female authors thought just as much about their authorial roles as men like Herman Melville or Nathaniel Hawthorne did. A compilation of over four hundred pages of quotations from female authors on writing itself, Boyd's book includes quotations from Fuller and Child, including one that demonstrates Fuller's struggle to balance the public authorial side of her life with the private:

> What shall I do, dear friend? I want force to be either a genius or a character. One should be either private or public. I love best to be a woman; but womanhood is at present too straitly-bounded to give me scope. At hours, I live truly as a woman; at others, I should stifle; as, on the other had, I should palsy, when I would play the artist. [90]

The difference between the wording in this quotation and the one I use for the title of this dissertation demonstrates Fuller's preoccupation with and revisiting of the concept of womanhood. The conflict Fuller expresses between her life as a woman and her desire for a public identity was partly a result of cultural expectations for women in the nineteenth century that dictated a life lead almost entirely in the private sphere. These were expectations that all the women in this study were aware of and had to overcome in some way; paratexts were one tool that the authors studied here employed in order to do that.

Of particular importance to this study is Susan Williams' *Reclaiming Authorship*. Williams offers a new perspective through which to view female authorship in the nineteenth century. She notes especially the "unstable taxonomy" (21) of terms

used to describe female authors. Williams demonstrates that the term "writer" is a modern critical term, as evidenced by the name of the main research organization in the field, The Society for the Study of American Women Writers (SSAWW) and Rutgers' American Women Writers series of publications. Accepting Williams' charge that we "need to synchronize practice and terminology, particularly given the fact that so many nineteenth-century women worked hard to claim themselves as 'authors'," all the figures under consideration here will simply be referred to as authors. (8) Thus the focus here will not be the authorial status of the figures I study, but rather the formal choices they made as authors.[3]

Each of these figures has something to offer the paratextual critic. Margaret Fuller actively worked to challenge the publishing norms and conventions of 19th Century America. By omitting paratextual markers like chapters, headings, or titles of any sort Fuller purposefully chose to subvert traditional book format by employing a new and experimental way of organizing her text. Chapter One of this dissertation, "'A Means of Mutual Interpretation': Revolutionary Rhetoric in Margaret Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*," examines Fuller's interventions in conventional publication format and the ways in which her choices regarding structure and format reflect and expand her larger argument about the place of women in the 19th Century. For Fuller, as for the other authors in this study, formal choices were tied to content and can demonstrate that though Gerard positions paratexts as something separate and distinct from content, the two most often work in tandem.

---

[3] Jane Johnston Schoolcraft in particular is a figure whose legitimacy as an author is sometimes questioned, something I will address further in Chapter three.

Negotiating market success is of primary importance in understanding Lydia Maria Child's paratextual choices. Child, like Fuller, experienced literary failure, but her significantly longer career demonstrates the results of more successful paratextual choices. Chapter Two, "'The honest agent of my conscience and my heart': Lydia Maria Child's *Letters from New-York*," analyzes the paratextual choices Child made in *Letters*, from her choice to call them letters when they were not, to her choice of epigraph on the title page. Juxtaposed with Child's earlier failed work, *An Appeal in Favor of the Class of Americans called Africans*, a paratextual analysis identifies the formal decisions Child made as author and editor of her volume as the reason *Letters* became so successful.

Chapter Three, "'Language Divine!': The Jane Johnston Schoolcraft Archive and Paratexts," takes up both poetry and the traditional Ojibwe stories that Schoolcraft wrote. The variety of her work and the context in which it was written lends itself to paratextual analysis. Schoolcraft's work was rarely published except in letters to her husband Henry or in his own hand-made newspaper, *The Muzzieniegun*. This chapter examines Schoolcraft's work and the formal elements at play in her stories and poetry. My work on Schoolcraft focuses on several areas of her work: her use of traditional European genres of poetry, her focus on revision, and her role in writing down traditionally oral Ojibwe stories. In each case, Schoolcraft retains elements of her oral heritage through her formal choices. By asserting that the written word itself becomes a paratext when used to record an oral tale, I show that Schoolcraft's contribution to paratextual studies is unique and offers a perspective on paratexts that even Genette did not address or anticipate.

María Amparo Ruiz de Burton wrote *The Squatter and the Don* later in the nineteenth century than the other authors in this study. As a Mexican who became an American citizen, Ruiz de Burton's impetus for writing was her desire to make clear and change the laws regulating land rights that unfairly discriminated against Mexican-Americans in nineteenth century California. Chapter Four, "'I slander no one but shall speak the truth': Historicity and Paratexts in *The Squatter and the Don*," shows how Ruiz de Burton used paratexts to anchor her narrative in contemporary events and make it more concrete to her readers. She included real life figures and quotations from their letters, excerpts from legislation regarding land rights and the Texas Pacific Railroad, an intrusive and outspoken narrator, and employed a pen name to shield herself from the negative reaction she anticipated from her novel's publication. Ruiz de Burton combined fiction and reality through paratexts, and used formal elements as a tool toward her larger goal of a change in legislation regarding the land rights of Mexican-Americans in California.

My goal in this dissertation is not to re-write the many fine cultural and historical studies that have so clearly established the difficulties that female authors experienced as members of the public sphere, but to build upon them and take their work one step further. By moving away from a cultural study and instead establishing a methodology for close formal analysis, my focus is not on the societal constraints that female authors faced, but on the paratextual markers that those constraints left behind in their work. As Cathy Davidson and Jessamyn Hatcher note in their introduction to *No More Separate Spheres!*, the bifurcation of the nineteenth century into distinct spheres of public and private is informative foundational and cultural work, but is more useful to us

now for our ability to dismantle and move beyond those rigid categories. It is with the strict use of these categories, for example, that Jane Johnston Schoolcraft is denied the status of author due to her lack of presence in the public literary marketplace.

Davidson and Hatcher write that in their collection they "seek to find ways to describe American literature and life that acknowledge the complex factors contributing to gender roles, everyday life, political forms, and creative expression" (8). I believe that paratextual studies are one way we can discover and acknowledge those complex factors, and the resulting analysis reveals the myriad ways that nineteenth century female authors negotiated those same complex factors.

CHAPTER ONE

"A Means of Mutual Interpretation": Revolutionary Rhetoric in Margaret Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*

Margaret Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* has engendered discomfort in its readers since its publication in 1845. Originally published in 1843 as an essay in the transcendental journal the *Dial* under the title "The Great Lawsuit. Man versus Men: Woman versus Women," Fuller expanded her essay to twice its length and changed the title for publication by Greeley and McElrath in 1845. Reviewers of Fuller's own time noted the structure of *Woman* especially, criticizing its seeming lack of organization. Orestes Brownson famously wrote in his review that *Woman* had "neither beginning, middle, nor end, and may be read backwards as well as forwards, and from the centre outwards each way, without affecting the continuity of the thought or the succession of ideas" (qtd. in Myerson, 19). Even Lydia Maria Child, a friendlier reviewer than most, noted that *Woman* was "sometimes rough in construction, and its meaning is not always sufficiently clear" (qtd. in Myerson, 7).

The consensus of modern critics is that Fuller employed careful rhetorical techniques and far from being a jumbled mess, *Woman* is actually a cleverly constructed treatise far ahead of its time. Scholars examine its conversational conventions and the way Fuller uses sentimental literary forms to convey her message as evidence of her rhetorical strategies.[4] While modern critics analyze the content of *Woman* to search for

---

[4] There are several excellent treatments of Fuller's rhetorical work in *Woman*. In "Conversation as Rhetoric in Margaret Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*," Judith Mattson Bean points out the conversational aspects of *Woman*, especially her use of self-disclosure and topical cohesion. Sandra Gustafson, in "Choosing a Medium: Margaret Fuller and the Forms of Sentiment," argues that Fuller used popular sentimental rhetorical forms such as sermons in *Woman* but used them subversively, in the process introducing a new genre in women's writing. Finally, in "Inventing a Feminist Discourse: Rhetoric and Resistance in Margaret Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century,"* Annette Kolodny reviews the rhetoric

Fuller's meaning, contemporary critics criticized not only its content but its formal features. Brownson's focus on the order of ideas and Child's mention of "rough" construction hint that their issues with *Woman* had just as much to do with formal choices as with content. In fact, *Woman* does not conform to the conventions of the book, including the lack of chapters, headers, or titles of any sort, while, at the same time, entering the world as a book. In traveling the distance from essay to book, the difficulty of the text stems partially from these omissions, and signals Fuller's desire to make sure her reader is an active and engaged one; without the expected textual markers the text cannot be easily read, and diligent attention is required for significant comprehension to take place. This chapter examines Fuller's interventions in conventional publication format and the ways in which her formal choices regarding structure and format reflect and expand her larger argument about the place of women in the 19th Century.

Woman is Fuller's best known, and most studied, work. Its structure is unexpected and its language can sometimes be obscure. In spite of these qualities, it is undeniably a foundational text of the women's rights movement, and even those who profess to difficulties with the text agree on its importance.[5] In it, Fuller writes of the importance of educating girls, and the importance of equality for women in both their professional and personal lives. Most importantly, Fuller makes it clear that her text is not solely for the benefit of women, but that men as well will benefit from women being granted more rights. As she writes in her Preface to *Woman*, "my highest wish is that this

---

textbook by Richard Whately Fuller used while teaching at the Greene Street School in Providence, and demonstrates that many of her rhetorical techniques in *Woman* are drawn from Whately's book.

[5] For more on how *Woman* influenced the women's rights movement, see Phyllis Cole's "Stanton, Fuller, and the Grammar of Romanticism." In it, Cole demonstrates that Elizabeth Cady Stanton attended at least one of Fuller's Conversation series and was greatly influenced by Fuller's ideas. She also notes that had Fuller not been in Italy, she would have spoken at the 1848 Seneca Falls Convention at Stanton's behest.

truth should be distinctly and rationally apprehended, and conditions of life and freedom recognized as the same for the daughters and the sons of time; twin exponents of a divine thought" (5). With each point she makes in the text, Fuller continues to emphasize the benefits to both genders.

When she published *Woman*, she had already spent years thinking and talking about gender, in her series of Conversations. She led her Conversations in Boston between the years 1839 and 1842, and with one notable exception, they were attended only by women. In *The Memoirs of Margaret Fuller Ossoli*, Emerson provides transcriptions of several of Fuller's Conversations, and notes:

> Margaret should undertake an evening class, of four or five lessons, to which gentlemen should also be admitted. This was put in effect, in the course of the winter, and I had myself the pleasure of assisting at one—the second—of these soirées. [*Memoirs*]

This was in the winter of 1841, and Emerson adds that the presence of men created a difficulty for Fuller because the men felt they must "assert and dogmatize." It is impossible to know whether Fuller felt the difficulty Emerson describes, as she does not mention it in her letters. What is clear, however, is that the introduction of men added an element that Fuller felt was unwelcome, as this was the only Conversation to which men were admitted.

The topics covered in her Conversations ranged from the political to the literary, and many of her ideas on gender found their way into *Woman*. It was because of her known skill for speaking that many of her early reviewers, most often male (Emerson included), wrote that perhaps she should put the pen down permanently and stick to her

Conversations. He wrote in her *Memoirs* that "in book or journal she found a very imperfect expression of herself, and it was the more vexatious, because she was accustomed to the clearest and fullest." For this reason, Emerson and others urged her to begin her Conversation series as a way to earn an income, believing her written abilities to be poor and disorganized.

What we recognize now, though, is that Fuller crafted *Woman* carefully and to think otherwise is to deny the intellectual powers that she clearly possessed. As Annette Kolodny astutely notes in "Inventing a Feminist Discourse," when discussing the trend of scholars to subscribe to the theory that *Woman* is a disorganized mess of a text:

> The problem with this cumulative critical consensus is that it commits us to believing that the only woman invited as an intellectual equal into the Transcendental Club of Emerson, Frederic Henry Hedge, George Ripley, Bronson Alcott, and other reform-minded Harvard-trained intellectuals of the day – and urged by those same men to take up editorship of the *Dial* – was somehow incompetent. […] That an individual trained in both classical and contemporary rhetoric, who had taken the initiative to form a rhetoric class for senior girls at the Greene Street School in Providence, Rhode Island, could not compose a 'logical treatise.' [209]

Kolodny's argument is well taken, and it is with this attitude and perspective that I proceed in my own work. It is clear that Fuller was working with rhetorical and structural ideas that were uniquely her own.

Perhaps the best place to turn for understanding of Fuller's rhetorical strategies is to Fuller's own theory of reading. In 1845, while working at the *New-York Tribune*

under Horace Greeley, Fuller wrote in a letter that she had "never regarded literature merely as a collection of exquisite products, but rather as a means of mutual interpretation" (IV.39). Her view on literature was dialogic, in that author and reader communicated through the written word. Far from being static entities, Fuller saw texts as dynamic and open to interpretation by readers. In a letter written while revising *Woman*, she wrote that she would only agree to one edition of *Woman* initially because she "hope[d] to make it constantly better while I live and should wish to retain full command of it, in case of subsequent editions" (III.242). For Fuller, the revision process was ongoing and fluid, texts could be continuously improved and added to, and the meaning of the text itself was partially constructed by the reader.[6] Her belief in the crucial role of the reader in the interpretation of a text helps to explain why the formal and rhetorical choices she made in *Woman* can be seen as a way to encourage the reader to become more involved in the text.

In light of Fuller's theory of reading, it becomes easier to see cues regarding her formal and rhetorical choices in the text of *Woman* itself. Her radical view of the mercurial nature of women offers a theory behind the structure and organization of *Woman*:

> The especial genius of women I believe to be electrical in movement, intuitive in function, spiritual in tendency. She excels not so easily in classification, or re-creation, as in an instinctive seizure of causes, and a simple breathing out of what she receives that has the singleness of life, rather than the selecting and energizing of art. [68]

[6] Though we do not have the evidence of repeated revision that we have with someone like Walt Whitman, she clearly shared his commitment to writing as a process.

Taken in this light, *Woman* the book becomes a rhetorical and literal translation of the very nature of woman the being, with its fluid and dynamic organization, its seemingly random topic shifts, and its resistance to easy categorization or classification. To her way of thinking, the structure and content of *Woman* mirrors the intellectual and spiritual tendencies of Fuller's primary subject. In a sense, Fuller's theory of active reading requires her readers to apply that same theory to women themselves. In asking us to read *Woman* more carefully and actively, Fuller is asking us to understand the innate qualities of women, to read their lives as carefully as we read her book.

Fuller's active theory of reading was almost certainly influenced by her friend and mentor, Ralph Waldo Emerson.[7] In "The American Scholar," Emerson makes it clear that he believes in a significant level of engagement on the part of readers: "There is then creative reading as well as creative writing. When the mind is braced by labor and invention, the page of whatever book we read becomes luminous with manifold allusion. Every sentence is doubly significant, and the sense of our author is as broad as the world" (48). Fuller clearly hoped for her readers to hold this same belief and to immerse themselves in her work. It may also help explain the significant structural and content changes made to *Woman*. When she wrote "The Great Lawsuit," it was for publication in the *Dial*, and she could count on most of her small transcendental audience to be at least familiar with Emerson's theory of reading and perhaps practice it themselves. When she expanded the essay for a much broader audience she had no such assurance. The

[7] In *Feminist Conversations: Fuller, Emerson, and the Play of Reading*, Christina Zwarg shows the close relationship Fuller and Emerson had for many years, and the reciprocal influence they had on each other, arguing that "the exquisite entanglement of these two powerful and distinctive voices produced 'conversations' spanning a broader cultural register than previously understood by those determined to keep certain intellectual and cultural projects worlds apart"(2). Zwarg focuses mainly on Emerson and Fuller's developing sense of feminism, an area particularly relevant to any discussion of *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*.

increased difficulty, length, and complicated structure can be seen as Fuller's way of forcing her audience to become more involved readers; by creating a more difficult text, she created a more difficult reading experience, one that required full engagement on her readers' part.

The topic of *Woman* was certainly revolutionary and political in nature, but its structure is perhaps even more radical. Though infrequently addressed, one need only look at some of the changes Fuller made in the manuscript when expanding it to twice its original length to know that her choices were deliberate, not random or unintentional. More importantly, an analysis of the structural elements confirms what rhetorical analysis tells us: that Fuller's theory of reading was specific and drove the way she wrote *Woman.*

Fuller realized the difficulties the text presented when she told William Channing in a letter written after publishing the essay and while transforming it into a book that "the writing, though I have tried to make my meaning full and clear, requires, shall I say? too much culture in the reader to be quickly or extensively diffused" (III.242). This statement illustrates the main criticism of *Woman*: that it was too difficult, too convoluted, and required too much effort from the reader. Fuller, anticipating this complaint, demonstrates that she is aware of the issue and that she has chosen to leave *Woman* the way she wrote it, unwilling to change her paratextual or rhetorical strategies to better situate herself with her audience and the larger literary marketplace.

It is easy to find moments in *Woman* where Fuller's writing is not "full and clear," just as she asserts in her letter to Channing. Only a few pages into the text, a long and convoluted single sentence demonstrates this feature well:

> The numerous party, whose opinions are already labeled and adjusted too much to their mind to admit any of new light, strive, by lectures on some model-woman of bride-like beauty and gentleness, by writing and lending little treatises, intended to mark out with precision the limits of woman's sphere, and woman's mission, to prevent other than the rightful shepherd from climbing the wall, or the flock from using the chance to go astray. [17]

At seventy three words, and containing eight commas, this is surely the kind of writing that Fuller referred to in her letter to Channing, she understood the difficulty inherent in such a complicated sentence. Complicated and long, however, does not mean that Fuller wrote haphazardly or in an unfocused way. With its commas and purposeful extension of sentence boundaries beyond traditional norms, Fuller literally enacts on the page the very thing the sentence mocks in content.[8] The concrete and constant barriers to progression in the text mirror the barriers to women's progression described in the sentence. So while Fuller may have understood that her message was difficult, she was also aware that a lack of clarity and ease in interpreting a sentence would force her reader to slow down and take in her message. Though contemporary reviewers may have complained about sentences just like this one, it is in fact just the kind of sentence that Fuller no doubt hoped would encourage readers to begin their work of "mutual interpretation."

Fuller's level of control over her text and her professed belief in the importance of revision both demonstrate that the formal features of "The Great Lawsuit" and *Woman* are a useful and relevant point of entry for analysis. When comparing "The Great Lawsuit" to *Woman*, it is important to note the significant number of changes to paratextual elements that happened during the revision process. It seems that Fuller

[8] I am grateful to Dr. Gary Williams for providing me with this critical insight regarding the sentence.

considered her new audience and her expectations for them, and adjusted her text accordingly in order to mediate their reading experience as much as she possibly could.

A significant number of changes to paratextual elements occurred when Fuller expanded and revised "The Great Lawsuit" into *Woman* that seem designed to promote Fuller's theory of reading and her argument about the place of women in 19th Century society. Fuller turned to formal features of the book as an intellectual construction to signal its departure from the essay. She changed the title, added a new Preface, nearly doubled the number of pages, and added several appendices. In addition, she removed the running headers that were printed in the original essay. With the new title, Preface, introduction, conclusion, and appendices, the entire frame of the text itself is different. By reading the text as any of Fuller's readers would have, from beginning to end, and by focusing on the paratextual features and formal choices Fuller made, this chapter complements rhetorical analyses already written by Fuller scholars and offers a new way to read Fuller's book.

The title is the initial indication that the two editions of the work are to be considered separate entities and also marks the first of many significant paratextual revisions. Genette writes of the importance and complexity of titles, and notes especially the need to be as aware as possible of a title's "genetic prehistory, or prenatal life" (66). In *Woman* we have at least part of that "genetic prehistory" in the Preface. Fuller in fact writes about the title change and the reasons behind it precisely because she wants us to understand the history of the title and what went into its change. She explains that she preferred the original title because "it requires some thought to see what it means, and might thus prepare the reader to meet me on my own ground" (5). This statement

amplifies Fuller's comments to Channing about her meaning being sometimes too difficult to grasp easily. Her expectation of "mutual interpretation" requires that her readers grapple with the text and work to discern its meaning. Her ideal reader is not passive, but actively works to create an interpretation of their own that uses Fuller's work as its inspiration and foundation. The reader is asked to take part in a dialogue with Fuller, with her text as mediator. Every element was important to Fuller in achieving this effect, even the title, and though she changes the title according to her publisher's wishes, she still makes clear her preference and the reasoning behind it.

The Preface accomplishes something else and that is to signal Fuller's overall formal strategy in *Woman* and her belief in the fluidity of her text. Besides indicating that the old title was preferred by her in order to more readily engage her readers, Fuller wrote that part of the reason she changed the title was the complaint that it was too difficult to understand. In changing the title, Fuller hoped to address this objection. It is interesting, though, that in making the title easier to understand she chose a title that, as is often noted, does not match the content of the book. The original title, while more difficult to comprehend, was a good indicator of the text's subject content. In choosing her new title Fuller knowingly rejects the conventional purpose of the title – to provide readers with a snapshot of the work's theme.

While *Woman* does include an extended discussion of the place of women in the nineteenth century, the title gives no indication as to what specifically about women will be discussed. The title gives no clue that the following text advocates expanded rights and education for women. A book entitled *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* could just as easily delineate the place of women in nineteenth century society without promoting a

political view. Nor does the title mention men, the other main subject of Fuller's book. With the title change, Fuller indicates clear roles for both author and reader: the author challenges the reader and the reader responds with an engaged and interactive style of reading, beginning the work of "mutual interpretation."

Fuller's decision to include a Preface at all is also telling. Though the elements of the Preface combine to form a request from Fuller to her readers for active engagement, the existence of the Preface at all accomplishes the same thing. The Preface, after all, is traditionally a place in a text where an author can address readers directly.

Fuller turned to formal features of the book as an intellectual construction to signal its departure from the essay. While the new title and Preface are the initial points of contact for readers and Fuller's formal strategy, she continues to radicalize the text of *Woman*. For example, besides including a Preface, a common feature of a book, where there was none before, Fuller changed the first few pages of *Woman* significantly from "The Great Lawsuit," and added a new last page and several appendices, also common features of a book. With the new title, Preface, introduction, conclusion, and appendices, the entire frame of the text itself is different. Important to note are the two introductory quotations in *Woman* which appear nowhere in "The Great Lawsuit": "'Frailty, thy name is Woman.' 'The Earth waits for her Queen'" (7). She uses these quotations as a demonstration of the inequality between men and women by repeating them in the next line, substituting the word 'man' for 'woman,' and arguing that no one would accept the quotations if they were about men, and so should not be accepted about women either. She also uses the quotations to introduce a moral slant to her argument, asserting that man is indeed frail: "how frail! how impure!" (7). Within the first paragraph, then, she

indicates her view on the majority of people who believed that the state of women in society needed no adjustment or improvements; for Fuller, 'man' denoted both sexes, something she asserts numerous times in *Woman*.

"The Great Lawsuit" begins much differently, introducing a legal tone that becomes less prominent when surrounded by new material in *Woman*. In keeping with its title and legalistic language, "The Great Lawsuit" begins: "This great suit has now been carried on through many ages, with various results. The decisions have been numerous, but always followed by appeals to still higher courts. How can it be otherwise, when the law itself is the subject of frequent elucidation, constant revision?" (1). Characterizing the law as a living thing, a process, Fuller's belief in the importance of revision and fluidity shows itself in her introductory words. She argues that the very standards that allow women to be repressed can be revised like any other text. Though much of the legal aspect of the argument will give way to a more philosophical tone, the spirit of "process" guides Fuller through the transformation of "The Great Lawsuit" to *Woman*.

In addition to adding paratexts like the two introductory quotations, Fuller also removed paratexts during the revision process if it suited her theory of reading. In "The Great Lawsuit" there are running headers on the right-hand page throughout, signaling topic shifts and providing easy visual cues to the reader as to their place in the essay. In *Woman* there are no such markers and the entire text is presented in one continuous block. As Genette notes, running headers, or intertitles, are provided expressly for the use of the reader as no one else would be expected to see them. He, however, writes only about those cases when intertitles are present, noting that "absence, here as elsewhere,

may be as meaningful as presence" (297). The absence of running headers in *Woman* is indeed meaningful and complements Fuller's already demonstrated theory of reading. In keeping with her formal strategy, Fuller made a conscious decision to resist shaping the reader's experience by deliberately removing those textual elements which might be considered markers or signposts for her readers; in doing so she empowered and even demanded her readers to generate conclusions and synthesize the material on their own, and to find their own way through the text.

One way Fuller expanded *Woman* was in her abundant inclusion of quotations and examples from outside sources. Fuller employed this technique in "The Great Lawsuit," but to a much lesser degree; perhaps in revising the text for a more general audience Fuller felt it necessary to bolster her own authority by including so many outside sources. Fuller chooses not to cite most of what she includes in her work, leaving the onus instead on her reader. For example, Fuller inserts a quotation from Ben Jonson early in *Woman* and introduces it by writing only, "so in the noble passage of Ben Jonson" (23). There is no indication given of the title of the work from which it was taken as one would expect. In terms of content this quotation is important because it illustrates a trope in literature that Fuller objects to, that of the "manly woman." In terms of form, though, the Jonson quotation also demonstrates a specific paratextual strategy that Fuller uses over and over again: the use of outside quotations, most of them unattributed. In one modern critical edition of *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* there are no fewer than one hundred and seventy-nine endnotes used to cite and explain the excerpts Fuller includes; all of these notes were added by the modern editor.[9] For Fuller, including a critical citation would

[9] I refer to Jeffrey's Steele's edited collection of Fuller's work, *The Essential Margaret Fuller* (1995). It is part of Rutgers' American Women Writers Series.

mean giving her readers a tool she wants to deny them. By asking her readers to discover the quotation's source for themselves, she asks them to take an active role in her text and read carefully, navigating the text themselves and discovering their own meaning.

Fuller's theory of active reading is supported partly by her paratextual choice to use unattributed quotations. There are many quotations in *Woman* that have even less context then the Ben Jonson example, excerpts that have no clue as to their origin. If a reader was required to read and research carefully to discover which work of Jonson's his quotation came from, unattributed passages presented an even greater challenge and greater commitment to discovery on the part of the reader. During a discussion of the French author Eugene Sue, for example, Fuller inserts a short quotation, offering no clue as to its origin in her introduction of it:

> These French writers need ever to be confronted by the clear perception of the English and German mind, that the only good man, consequently the only good reformer, is he
>
> "Who bases good on good alone, and owes
> To virtue every triumph that he knows" [88]

The excerpt is presented in quotation marks and is clearly from an outside source, but it is completely unidentified and is not attributed to Sue. A footnote in Jeffrey Steele's edition lists the quotation as unidentified still. We are left to wonder where this passage comes from, while other quotations or lines of poetry she inserts anonymously were written by Fuller herself, a common practice at the time of her friends and fellow transcendentalists Emerson and Thoreau. This practice shows her awareness of

contemporary publishing conventions and her choice to employ them when it suited her own goals.

Why make it a quotation, though? While she may not have given her readers all the information regarding a quotation, she still used them profusely, and they are clearly set aside from the rest of the text. This is a quick visual and formal indication that those words are not hers, and that she wants them to stand out somehow. The quotations, no matter the subject or content, all perform the basic function one would expect from a quotation: they comment on the text around them. They are relevant to Fuller's larger thesis regarding women's rights and none seem out of place in terms of content alone. What Fuller accomplishes by setting them apart is a kind of strengthening of her own argument, and she makes it clear that the conversation she is attempting to initiate with her readers is not new. The sheer number of quotations indicates to any reader that Fuller is not the only person concerned with this topic, that she is in some ways continuing an already existing conversation, and that she wants her readers to take it up. This gives Fuller strong ground to stand on, and she associates herself with all of the people who have come before her and have written something relevant to her argument.

In addition to the quotations that were not cited, Fuller occasionally took another route when including an outside citation: she sometimes began to introduce an outside source, only to drop it for a few pages, bringing it back in unexpectedly later in the book. Even in that rare instance when she breaks her own pattern of leaving passages unnamed, she still makes her readers work for the knowledge. At the beginning of *Woman* she refers to a reply made by John Quincy Adams to questions posed to him by some women. This is all Fuller mentions, then she tells us she will "again advert in another place" (17).

Sixty-seven pages later the response of Adams is quoted, though with no warning whatsoever and no reference back to its initial appearance in the text. It is confusing even in modern editions that contain notes to direct the reader back to its initial reference, and Fuller must have realized this; this is one of only two places in the text of *Woman* that lists a title for a quotation. This is entitled simply "Reply of Mr. Adams," a clue to be sure but still not a very clear one. A reader must be very astute to remember so carefully a quotation from sixty-seven pages prior, especially considering the difficulty of the intervening material. In keeping with Fuller's theory of active reading, she makes the formal choice to split an outside quotation in two and demand that her readers follow along.

Fuller did include some traditional textual items in *Woman* but utilized them in non-traditional ways. One example of this is the line break. A line break is usually used to denote a shift in topic or a break in a thought. Fuller used line breaks sparingly in *Woman* and never in the way her readers would have been used to seeing them. When Fuller tells the story of Panthea and Abradatus, she places a line break in the middle of the story instead of at the end as would be conventional to delineate the boundaries of a story within another text. Even as she employs this device she subverts it by denying her readers' expectations and continuing with the same story. Every time she denies her readers and presents them with a new and revolutionary way of constructing a text through her paratextual choices, Fuller is signaling her desire to engage them, to make them think, to make them active participants in the reading process.

Once the main text is concluded, Fuller continues her thoughts with several appendices. While Genette is curiously silent on the characteristics of appendices as

paratextual elements, it is easy to anticipate that Fuller's readers would have expected an appendix to be linked in some way to the main text because that is what normative publishing conventions would have conditioned them to expect. Appendices normally contain secondary material that augments the text in some way, but is in some way different enough so as not to warrant inclusion in the body of the text itself. Fuller, staying true to her desire to subvert expectations and challenge normative publishing conventions through her formal choices, includes materials in the appendices that actually could be included in the main text and don't seem separate.

In the appendices Fuller includes fragments from outside works not included in *Woman*, but, interestingly, *all* of the quotations in the appendices are cited save the last poem, which has been attributed to Fuller herself, and the letter in appendix E. The appendices then become a kind of reversal of the main text. In this way the appendices, though they are paratextual elements, perform a function that the main text should, but does not, perform. It is true that appendices sometimes serve a bibliographical function and this may be as close to a bibliography as Fuller comes. The sections are organized alphabetically by letter, as a bibliography would be, and all of the quotations are identified. Because this is such a striking difference from the rest of the text, it is impossible not to notice that the appendices are full of citations and source information, much as a bibliography would be. This is the only place in her book where Fuller gives her readers what they might expect and desire by providing them with information regarding the quotations they are reading, almost as if to reward a hard-working reader who has made it through the rest of the text.

With the exception of the quotation attributions, all of the material in the appendices would be equally at home in the text itself. None of it seems secondary or separated in some way from the main text, which is what one normally expects from an appendix. Therefore the material in the appendices is the exact opposite of what one would expect to find in appendices if one were using the normative conventions of the book as a guide. As we have seen, though, Fuller was concerned only with subverting those conventions, not in conforming to them. Many of the appendices contain examples from different cultures of the "ideal" woman, something that Fuller also does in the main text of *Woman*. Appendix A, for example, contains a description of the goddess Isis, B contains an Italian poem describing the "perfect woman," C holds a Spanish example, and so on. In the text of *Woman*, Fuller uses several examples of the ideal woman. There is Ratchewaine, who was "chaste, mild, gentle in her disposition," (49) and Panthea, who was loyal to her husband Abradatus even after he died, sacrificing herself in her grief.

Though the material in the appendices matches the theme of the book to which it is attached, it is entirely new. It is not material that she once included in "The Great Lawsuit" and then extracted to the appendices of *Woman*. When an appendix is attached to a text it is normally referenced in the text with a note to see that particular appendix. The expectation then is that the material in the appendix relates in some way to the section in which it was referenced from the text. Fuller did include notes that reference her appendices, but not all of them. Fuller included notes that referred her readers to the following appendices in the following order: B, C, D, E, F, H, and F. Appendix F is referenced twice, and A and G have no notes whatsoever. So while Fuller included this

common feature of the book, once again she twists the convention and uses it in a way that makes sense for her and her particular reader-dependent theory of reading, leaving two of appendices to be discovered by her readers and asking them to make the connections between the appendices and the text.

The way that Fuller labeled her appendices, with letters rather than numbers, works with the unique way that she referenced the appendices in the main text. Numbers have a certain hierarchy and, more importantly, imply a particular order of reading in a way that letters do not. Fuller makes the formal choice, instead of employing numbers, to stay closer to text itself and use letters. Letters can be moved around and out of order without changing the importance of the entries; no one letter is more important than any other, while an Appendix labeled 1 might be interpreted as being more important than Appendix 5. Because of this, Fuller can reference F, H, and then go back to F without confusion.

While A and G are unreferenced in the body of *Woman,* they are just as connected to the main text as the other appendices. Appendix A, for example, contains a story of the goddess Isis, mirroring stories Fuller tells throughout *Women* that reference Roman writers and mythological stories. Appendix G consists of an extract from the papers of Miranda, a character that appears in *Woman* and whom many critics assume is a lightly veiled version of Fuller herself. Though Fuller doesn't make the connections for her readers, it is in line with her theory of reading that she expects her readers to read carefully and make the connection themselves.

The form and structure of *Woman* is a rhetorical technique Fuller used only once. Her earlier published book, *Summer on the Lakes,* is clearly divided into chapters and

Autobiographical Romance, though not published in Fuller's lifetime, has sections that are labeled. When *Woman* was published Fuller was already working at her new post at the *New-York Tribune* and wrote only short article length pieces and dispatches for the rest of her career. Though she told friends she was working on a long historical manuscript in Italy, it was lost in the shipwreck that claimed Fuller's life and we will never be able to compare its construction with *Woman's*.

What is clear from reading Fuller's work and her personal correspondence is that she was very interested in creating an interactive experience for her readers and resisted the normative publishing conventions that might have constricted the reading experience for her audience. Instead, taking her beliefs on the nature of women themselves and the power of a reader's interpretation of a text, she deliberately constructed a book that denies normative expectations and actively generates space for many different interpretations and translations. Fuller evokes Emerson's idea of "man thinking" in the construction and execution of *Woman*, and joins her contemporaries as a stylist as much as a thinker.

CHAPTER TWO

"The honest agent of my conscience and my heart": Lydia Maria Child's *Letters from New-York*

In a letter to Francis Shaw in January of 1843, Lydia Maria Child wrote that "if God spares my life in the coming year, I intend to start afresh in the race and rebuild my literary reputation" (*SL* 185). In late August the first edition of *Letters from New-York* was published, and its success prompted her to write again to Shaw in July of 1844 that she "meant to devote the remainder of my life to the attainment of literary excellence. […] Formed as my character now is, I cannot do otherwise than make literature the honest agent of my conscience and my heart; and if I do this, the more glowingly and gracefully I can write, the better" (*SL* 209). Clearly *Letters from New-York* had significant literary ramifications for Child. She depended on both volumes, the second published in 1845, to reinvigorate her literary reputation and provide her with the financial stability she desperately needed. Even more importantly, though, Child saw her work as an author as inextricably tied to her personal conscience and philosophy as an abolitionist and social reformer.

Child's *Letters*, though popular in their own time, are rarely addressed by contemporary scholars. The critical focus instead is often her earlier work of fiction *Hobomok* or her abolitionist text, *An Appeal in Favor of that Class of Americans called African*. A critical difference between Child's earlier works and *Letters* is the fact that *Letters* does not fit snugly in any particular genre. The form of *Letters* is a point of contention among scholars since they are not actually letters, even though Child chose to

call them letters.[10] Their content is contested as well, with scholars like Heather Roberts focusing on Child's use of sympathy, and Bruce Mills labeling Child's epistles "transcendental." Though Child's letters contain moments that can be called transcendental, Child herself resisted the label and sometimes wrote harshly of Emerson and his theories.[11] Nor does Child conform to the commonly held idea of a nineteenth-century female periodical editor as a woman who edits a journal by and for women and has nominal control over content.[12] Child, during her two-year tenure as editor of the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, insisted on complete control and received it, even though William Lloyd Garrison was the publisher. Perhaps the difficulty inherent in defining Child and her letters clearly are partly to blame for the lack of critical attention.

When writing about Child and *Appeal*, Carolyn Karcher posits that she reinvented herself several times as an author and that she came before the public in yet another "vastly different guise" (196). Because *Appeal* is so different from anything else Child wrote it can seem as if it wasn't written by her, and does at first appear a "different guise" for Child. The fact is, though, that Child wrote about reform during her entire career, and

---

[10] In "Thumping Against the Glittering Wall of Limitations," Stephanie Tingley calls Child's *Letters* "familiar essays" and writes that they "resist easy categorization by genre" (44). She resists calling them letters, in spite of Child's own reference in her title.

[11] Child writes in Letter III: "Perchance, you will even call me 'transcendental;' that being a word of most elastic signification, used to denote every thing that has no name in particular, and that does not especially relate to pigs and poultry" (17).

[12] I am thinking here especially of Steven Fink's "Antebellum Lady Editors and the Language of Authority," in which he explains the way that "lady" editors often experienced a "split identity" as a result of their occupation of both the public and private spheres. Fink notes that very often female editors did not actually have complete control over their journals and had to abide by the decisions of their male publishers.

Patricia Okker, in *Our Sister Editors*, writes about nineteenth-century American women editors in general, and Sarah Josepha Hale in particular. She writes that even though Hale held great power in the literary marketplace as the editor of *Godey's Lady's Book*, even she did not maintain complete editorial control over the content of *Godey's*; Godey instructed his readers to "address material to the fashion editor in care of him" and managed the fashion features himself (51). In comparing Hale to Child, though, we must remember that Hale insisted on the necessity of separate spheres for men and women, and Child made no such assertion. While Child demanded and received complete control over her newspaper, Hale did not demand the same from Godey.

though the tone may have been different and more aggressive in *Appeal*, a close examination of Child's texts shows that they have much in common. Rather than seeing *Letters* as something completely separate from *Appeal*, we should see the myriad connections between the two. Child was affected greatly by the financial failure of *Appeal* and the negative reaction she received from the literary marketplace, and *Letters* is her effort to correct her mistakes and publish a work of reform without being shunned.

It is precisely because of their complexity and genre crossing tendencies that I am most interested in them. Child's concurrent roles as editor of the *Standard* and author of the weekly columns that would become *Letters* are my primary focus. It is for this reason that this chapter will focus on the first volume of *Letters*, which were all written during her editorship at the *Standard*.[13] I am interested especially in the paratextual and formal elements of *Letters* and the ways in which they demonstrate her editorial control and conscious decision to make it a volume that not only contained her message of reform, but also appealed to readers of her day and became extremely popular, in stark contrast to *Appeal*.[14]

Child, an author who deftly adapted as circumstances called for it, no doubt learned how to do this in part by working for William Lloyd Garrison. Garrison's *The Liberator*, an even more prominent abolitionist journal than the *Standard*, was in print

[13] The second volume consisted of letters written after Child stepped down as editor of the *Standard* and were published originally in the *Boston Courier*.

[14] After the publication of the first volume of *Letters,* her weekly columns that were then published in the *Boston Courier* became even more popular. Tingley includes an account from Carolyn Healey Dall about the weekly publication of Child's letters: "The counting-room of the *Courier* was filled by an eager crowd, half an hour before the proper time, on the days when they were expected. The paper came damp from the press, and many a delicate glove bore traces of the fervor with which the owner had grasped the sheet. Men read it as they walked slowly up School Street. Young women ran into Munro and Francis' bookstore for their first glimpse. These letters were read aloud at the tea-table, and the next day everybody passed their bright sayings along." (43)

longer than any other abolitionist paper, and Garrison's focus was on both spreading his message and making sure his ventures were financially self-sustaining.[15] This kind of "evangelical consumerism" of the day was an example to Child, who wanted her *Letters* to not only spread her message but provide her with a much needed source of income.

Child's editorial standards and her level of control over the final product were high. She definitively stated her editorial philosophy in a letter to Ellis Loring, a lawyer and fellow abolitionist, in November of 1841. She wrote about negotiations to unite the *Pennsylvania Freeman* with the *Standard* and the desire of the *Freeman's* staff to insert three columns every week in the *Standard* without having to be approved by her as editor. She vehemently disagreed with this proposal:

> While I have the entire responsibility of the paper, I must have the entire control. The *Freeman* is filled with twaddling articles, without intellectual life and spirit, generally; and moreover, it is always betwixt & between on points of principle. […] If *such* communications are to be admitted into the *Standard*, I cease to be its editor the next day. [*SL* 153]

Child clearly held strict principles as editor, and one of them was not only to approve the content of the *Standard* but also to shape it and the style of writing that was published. This is a significant shift from her time as an author only, when she had to negotiate with potential editors and the tastes of the literary marketplace in order to publish her work. As editor she was also free to follow her own conviction and her success in the job served as ample defense should anyone have cared to question her choices. This strength of

[15] Augusta Rohrbach writes that Garrison "turned to the marketplace as both a source of revenue and a medium for the cause" (25).

conviction and self-confidence would serve her well as she edited *Letters* and made the choices that would insure her financial success and literary popularity.

The success of Child's *Letters* when compared to her earlier reformist work is striking, especially considering that they were originally published in the abolitionist *Standard.* The tone of Child's letters was significantly gentler than the other work published alongside it and was sometimes seen as not radical enough for the *Standard.* The *Standard* was normally filled with accounts of lynchings and reprints of antislavery speeches, and "Child's intimate, digressive, and meditative letters certainly may have seemed out of place" (Roberts 750). Nonetheless, they are reformist in nature; the fact that they became so popular and were not recognized as works of reform seems to be in line with Child's intent and a rhetorical triumph for her. The reviewer from the February 1883 *Harper's* praised her first collection of letters precisely because they held "no narrowness of the fanatical reformer" and did not force the reader to think "that there may be greater things elsewhere." This reviewer indicates that the "fanatical reformer," as one might have characterized Child's voice in *Appeal,* was outside of the comfort zone of the average reader. In Child's *Letters*, however, that reformer was not obvious and readers were allowed to take in her message without feeling undue pressure to agree or think about "greater things."

Before examining the text itself to look for evidence of Child's non-reformist persona and her editorial and authorial choices, we might first examine her editorial choices regarding what was *not* included. This is critical because Child made every decision about what to include in her collection, which included decisions about which letters to omit.

During the process of compiling the collection, Child consulted with her friend Ellis Loring on which letters to publish and which to excise. "[…] she disregarded his advice to reprint the entire series, and instead dropped three of the most radical antislavery letters without involving him in the decision"[16] (Karcher 301). In a letter to Loring in November of 1843, Child requests his advice on the topic:

> I shall not print *all* the letters; only the best ones. Would you omit the last two about Women's Rights, or not? I think it best to omit them. Would you publish the one about the execution of Colt, and against Capital Punishment? I should like to have you give me a little advice about this; even if you have but time to say a few words. [188]

Child always thought as an editor and seems to also have been thinking about her readership and which pieces they might like better. Though she does not go into more detail about why she thinks omitting the two on Women's Rights is the correct choice, what is important is her constant attention to every element of her collection. Just as she asserted during her time at the *Standard* that she was to maintain complete control if she were the editor, so did she maintain complete control over *Letters*, going so far as to underwrite the cost of publishing the first volume herself when her potential publishers disagreed with her editorial choices and become concerned over her reputation as an abolitionist.[17]

---

[16] Carolyn Karcher notes that the letters Child excised were the following: "no. 12, which championed the *Amistad* captives and defended the slave's right to fight in self-defense; no. 14, an interview with a fugitive, which graphically exposed the cruel treatment to which slaves were subjected; and no. 33, which reminisced about mob violence targeting George Thompson." She also replaced occurrences of the word "abolitionist" with the more innocuous term "reformer." (687)

[17] In the collection of Child's personal letters, editors Milton Meltzer and Patricia Holland introduce the section on Child's letters from 1843 on with the following: "The Langley brothers, who at first wanted to publish her *Letters from New-York*, later backed out for fear the book would offend their Southern customers. Child decided to publish the book at her own expense" (200).

She was interested in catering her collection to her more general audience away from the *Standard* and realized that there were certainly people who were not interested in being a part of abolition or any other cause; she learned this after she published *Appeal*. Though her readers at the *Standard* were a self-selected group that held the same beliefs she did, Child could not make the same assumptions about an audience beyond the *Standard* readership.

The initial pages of Child's *Letters,* those pages that come before the text begins and are grouped with the Preface, are strewn with markers placed by Child to signal her new paratextual strategy. The prefatory pages have much to tell us about how her contemporary readers first came to view them, and reading the pages as any contemporary reader would have gives us critical insight into Child's purpose. Elements like the title of the collection, the inscription, and the epigraph all work together to establish Child's persona before the reader delves into the letters themselves. In Child's case, because of her dual role as author and editor, her belief in editorial control, and her desire to correct the mistakes she made with *Appeal*, these paratextual elements are particularly telling and important.

Child was aware that the title would be the first point of interaction between a potential reader and her text. Even though her pieces are not technically letters, the title is *Letters from New-York* despite this because the word "letters" would have signaled certain thoughts in her readers' minds. Letters were domestic, intimate, non-threatening, and private communication from one person to another. Child took advantage of the fact that her title is what Genette calls a "genre indication" (77). Her readers would have

certainly been expecting letters from Child to be personal and somewhat private, as Child's glimpses into her walks with Hopper were.

At least one contemporary reviewer in the January 1845 issue of *The American Whig Review* criticized her for her choice. After sarcastically noting that if he wanted to guarantee the sale of a book he would surely put the word "letters" in the title as well, the reviewer notes that "all letters are not *letters.*" He goes on to write, while going into more detail about the text: "Letter I.—which we have half a mind to call, from sheer vexation, Chapter I.—" In truth, Child's letters are more like chapters than letters in form, with their lack of salutation or other epistolary elements, but in tone they are intimate and personal. This perceptive reviewer notes that he too would call his volume "letters" if he wanted to insure their sale, indicating the popularity of the epistolary form during this period. With the rise of epistolary novel and the popularity of letters in general in the early nineteenth-century, Child exploited a popular genre for her own purposes.[18]

As Janet Altman notes, letters are often used as a "bridge" or "connector" between sender and receiver and are a form of dialogue (13). Letters are traditionally addressed to a specific person and assume an intimate audience. Child adopts this intimacy through her use of the second person and uses it as a rhetorical bridge between herself and her readers. Yet, rather than a single recipient, her letters are intended for a group of readers, those originally united by their shared commitment to abolition. When she published her edited volume, Child had to move beyond the realm of abolition in

[18] The popularity of epistolary novels began in American during the 18th Century with authors like Samuel Richardson and Hannah Webster Foster. In *Special Delivery: Epistolary Modes in Modern Fiction*, Linda S. Kauffman begins by summarizing the history of the epistolary mode, noting its popularity and abundance in the nineteenth century.

order to garner a larger audience and her intimate epistolary strategy worked with this broader audience as well. A reviewer from the June 1845 issue of *The United States Democratic Review* wrote that Child's letters had "the color of a friendly communication to us individually." Above all, the letters were "friendly" in tone and not aggressive or reformist in nature. They also felt individual, as if each reader were the sole intended recipient. This quality creates a feeling of intimacy between the writer and reader, and encourages the dialogue that Child desired.

The reviewer's commentary on the lack of a reformist tone in Child's *Letters* was clearly by her own design. She wrote in a letter to Loring from February 1843, that "if the devil ever draws me into reform, of any kind, again, he is a smarter fellow than I take him to be" (189). This statement comes on the heels of her disappointing and stressful term as the editor of the *Standard* and she clarifies in another letter to Loring that March that "when I said I would have nothing to do with reforms, I merely meant with the organized machinery. I will work in my own way, according to the light that is in me" (194). When she wrote *Appeal* she was clearly connected to the "organized machinery" of the abolitionist movement, going so far as to note in her dedication the "unpopular but most righteous cause" that she worked for. This identification with a cause and a larger reform movement is non-existent in *Letters*, even though they were originally published in a paper sponsored by the abolitionist movement. This marks her desire to distance herself from organizations of reform.

The title of *Appeal* can be interpreted as a call to action or a request of some kind. *Appeal* was published as part of a tradition that includes David Walker's 1839 *Appeal to the Coloured Citizens of the World*. This kind of text is polemical and strongly worded,

and the title of Child's book alone would have implied a strong political message to her readers. The word "letters" implies a different kind of personal connection than the word "appeal" does. Child's readers would have been used to writing and receiving letters from loved ones, and even sharing those letters with a small circle of friends. An "appeal" though is plaintive and advertises a pronounced agenda and purpose beyond mere communication. "Letters" signals something else entirely to readers: a personal communication meant to be read by a small number of people, and a correspondent that is likely a personal acquaintance in some way.

Using her editorial skills in an authorial capacity, Child took great care to craft the title page as carefully as any of her letters.[19] Under Child's name as author can be found a list of some of her other works, none of which identify her connection to a reformist organization or make an overt political statement. The titles given are "*Philothea, The Mother's Book, The Girl's Book, Flowers for Children, etc..".* *Philothea* is a work on transcendental mysticism, and the others are books directed at mothers and children. The references to her earlier domestic work establish the sentimental tone Child will use in *Letters*. Nowhere is *Appeal* listed, nor is she acknowledged as the editor of the *Standard*. In a volume of letters originally published in a reformist newspaper, the absence of reference to any of her other reformist works or to their original context is significant. It signals that Child did not want to be seen by her reader as a reformer, or as the author who wrote *Appeal*, but instead as the domestic woman who wrote books about and for mothers and children. This list of accomplishments also excludes her role as editor of the *Standard*. It is important that her role as editor of the *Standard* is never mentioned, not just because the abolitionist context would turn away many readers, but also because her

---

[19] Please see the facsimile of the title page of *Letters* on page 51 of this chapter.

role as editor was well outside the accepted sphere of domestic influence women were supposed to occupy during the time period. When she takes on a sentimental tone in *Letters,* she took care to construct her identity as one that was non-threatening and non-political.

Child used a common rhetorical technique and adopted a tone of humility regarding her collection by calling it in the Preface to *Letters* "an unpretending volume" that is "simple, sincere, and earnest," a message that correlates well with her sentimental persona and also mimics the rhetorical technique of apologizing for their texts used by most, if not all, female authors of the time. In reality this is an example of Child soft-pedaling her own work, again avoiding the forceful tone and confidence found in *Appeal*. It was a statement that her readers would have expected and Child delivered. Her text, of course, is anything but simple, but Child's rhetorical skill was to make it seem so. Just as she had clear beliefs about the role of an editor, she possessed strong opinions about the ways in which the general reading public could be introduced to the message of reform.

Child's vision for success as a reformer is revealed in a letter written to Margaret Fuller, in which she offered an informal review of *Summer on the Lakes*:

> In a word then, you always seem to me to write with too much *effort*. It may now be the mere *habit* of elaborateness; but it has the appearance of effort. The stream is abundant and beautiful; but it always seems to be *pumped*, rather than to *flow*. In other words I might say, your house is too full; there is too much furniture for your rooms. This is the result of a higher education that popular writers usually have; but it stands much in the way of extensive popularity. [*SL* 211/12]

Hearkening back to the language used in Poe's "Philosophy of Furniture," Child eschews the well furnished room as clearly as Poe did, and advocates for narrative economy. Regarding texts much as one would a room full of furniture, Child tells Fuller that there is too much in the way of her words, that there are obstructions between her message and her readers.

Child also indicates a level of separation between Fuller and her readers based on her apparent education and intellectual status. Child's assertion that this stands in Fuller's way attests to her belief that an author must be relatable to a large audience in order to become popular. *Appeal*, with its focus on abolition, would have only attracted those readers who were already a part of the abolitionist movement and not a larger audience beyond that. Child's *Letters* needed to be removed from their connection to the *Standard* and the abolitionist movement in order for Child to put her belief into action for herself. This explains the lack of attribution on the title page to Child's role as editor or her authorship of *Appeal.*

Contrast Child's statement to Fuller with her own assertion that her volume is "simple" and "unpretending" and her strategy becomes clear. As author and editor, it was Child's job to reach her readers and promote her views and she recognized that Fuller no doubt desired the same outcome from her writing. It is interesting to note that Child points out the difference between what Fuller likely intends to do, and what actually appears on the page, illuminating her awareness that every step of the writing and editing process must be deliberate and carefully considered. While Fuller may have developed a "habit" of elaborateness through much practice, the outcome is the appearance of "effort," something Child believes alienates readers. Child's assertion is

that Fuller can and should be more aware of how her writing seems to her readers and adjust her style in order to garner a larger audience. She communicates that an author can purposefully control the way they appear and connect to readers. Child's belief in evangelical consumerism is evidenced in her advice to a fellow female author.

Though there is no mention of *Appeal* on the title page of *Letters,* Child did include a poem by Samuel Taylor Coleridge, as she did in many of her texts, including *Appeal*. Serving as an epigraph, the poem sets the tone for the text readers are about to begin. Child's use of Coleridge is in keeping with Genette's notion that a major function of the epigraph is "one of commenting – sometimes authoritatively – and thus of elucidating and thereby justifying not the text but the *title*" (156). Indeed its close proximity to the title itself suggests that the epigraph comments directly on it. This is especially true of epigraphs that are found on the title page, as Child's is, directly below the title and her name.

At work as well is Child's capitalization on Coleridge's popularity with 19th Century readers and perhaps a sense of tone in these two particular Coleridge poems that indicate the larger goal of Child's *Letters*: a conversation with her readers. A Coleridge scholar named G.M. Harper labeled both these Coleridge poems and six others his "conversation poems," a grouping that stands to this day. (Holstein 223) Though the labeling of these poems comes long after the publication of Child's books and her death, it emphasizes precisely the quality that Child was likely interested in and that led her to choose them as epigraphs for her books. After all, what are letters if not conversations between people?

The epigraph in *Appeal* is entitled "Fears in Solitude," and it was written in 1798. It is an emphatic extract, full of strong language and several exclamation points:

> We have offended, Oh! my countrymen!
> We have offended very grievously,
> And been most tyrannous. From east to west
> A groan of accusation pierces Heaven!
> The wretched plead against us; multitudes,
> Countless and vehement, the sons of God,
> Our brethren!

Words like "tyrannous," "wretched," and "vehement" punctuate the lines where exclamation points do not, accentuating and amplifying the strong message already initiated in the title. The poem justifies Child's titular appeal, and she successfully extracted those parts that would most indicate to readers her point of view. The content of the poem also clearly matches Child's message to her readers in *Appeal* and her belief that slavery is a great shame and should be rectified immediately. The fanatical reformer one reviewer wrote of is present here, and there is also a kind of plea here. Like the *Appeal* of the volume's title, Child indicates by demonstrating the severity of the situation that something must change. There is a silent call to action here, and if the reader chooses to ignore that call then their offenses and tyranny will continue. There is an onus placed on the reader that is absent in *Letters.*

The Coleridge poem on the title page of *Letters* is "Dejection: An Ode," written in 1802. A small extract of a much longer poem, Child deftly chooses those lines from the poem that most clearly relate to her text:

We receive but what we give, […]

Ah, from the soul itself must issue forth

A light, a glory, a fair luminous cloud,

Enveloping the Earth:

And from the soul itself must there be sent

A sweet and potent voice of its own birth,

Of all sweet sounds the life and element!

Instead of end stops with exclamation points, this excerpt's lines are enjambed and flow from one line to the next. Instead of choppy, vehement language and rhetorical urgency, Child employs rhyme and there is no urgency in this extract, no demand for immediate action. In this case we can see how Child's attention to formal details can influence the reader and connect with the content of her volume at the same time, even before the process of reading her text begins.

In content the Coleridge extract closely matches the major themes found in *Letters*. Child's point in most of her letters is that any change must come from within, and places great importance on a person's soul. She also emphasizes the importance of looking beyond appearances. In her first letter, for example, Child writes about her inability to see only what is on the surface in any situation. She writes that everything "seems to come to me from the Infinite, to be filled with the Infinite, to be tending toward the Infinite" (14). Child constantly draws her focus back to the soul and the internal, and it is certainly no accident that the word "soul" appears twice in this short passage. There is also an element of optimism and hope in Child's *Letters*, feelings mirrored in this epigraph. The hope in the extract comes from the soul, the internal and private that

eventually envelops the public space of the Earth. The hope in Child's collection comes from the private literary form of letters, communications from inside a private domestic space that emerge into the larger public sphere. Child's careful eye cleverly chose a Coleridge poem that mirrored her text's message, and because she edited her own volume we know that the Coleridge poem was her own choice.

After the title page comes an inscription to John Hopper, son of the abolitionist Isaac T. Hopper. This is the only prefatorial indication, subtle though it is, that Child has ties to the abolitionist movement and the fact that it's an inscription rather than a dedication is in keeping with Child's rhetorical intent and her formal strategy to structure her collection as a conversation with her readers and a personal missive from her to them. An inscription, after all, is usually written by hand in an individual copy and is unique. This implies a personal relationship between author and inscribee, much as letters connote a personal relationship between writer and recipient. A dedication, in contrast, is printed by the publisher in all the copies. Child's inscription, though, is printed by the publisher in each copy, but her labeling it an "inscription" gives it a more personal and intimate tone.

In most of her letters, Child describes scenes she witnesses as she walks the streets of New York. Averting her readers' fears or reservations about a woman walking the streets of New York alone, again concerned with propriety in a way she was not with *Appeal*, she makes it clear in her dedication that Hopper was along for most of it:

> […] in a city of strangers you have been to me as a brother; most of the scenes mentioned in these Letters we have visited together; and I know that the young lawyer, busily making his way in a crowded world, has not driven from his mind

> a love for nature and poetry, or closed his heart against a most genial sympathy for the whole family of man.

This inscription does more than thank Hopper for his company. Genette notes, after all, that a dedication or inscription "could accommodate other messages besides praise for the dedicatee" (123). In this inscription Hopper becomes the stand-in for Child's audience as he is along for the strolls that Child takes her readers on rhetorically. To emphasize Hopper's role as proxy for her readership, Child signs the inscription simply from "The Author" rather than a more personal term. She is the author writing to her audience, even though she couches it in a personal inscription to Hopper.

Child included an inscription in *Appeal* as well, though its tone and content are much different. The inscription in *Appeal* is to the Reverend S. J. May, who was an abolitionist and delivered public lectures on the topic, often reading passages from *The Liberator* and praising Garrison. She inscribes *Appeal* to him "as a mark of gratitude" for his work to further the cause. In *Appeal*, Child's formal strategy was to identify as clearly as possible with abolition and broadcast her message of reform in whatever way possible. By the time she compiled *Letters*, she believed that more restraint was necessary for popularity, and so her focus on evangelical consumerism dictated that she be more subtle about her message.

In addition to the inscription, there is also a preface in *Letters.* The preface is directed to Child's readers and thanks them for reading her book. After calling her message "simple, sincere, and earnest," she ends by describing the mission of her book as "helping human souls to be truthful and free." The Preface is signed "L. Maria Child," a contrast to the generic signature of the inscription, and a more personal way to sign a

passage of thanks. The use of her first initial implies a familiarity and an assumption that her reader will know her first name.

The preface of *Letters* stands in stark contrast to the preface of *Appeal,* extending Child's efforts to distance herself from her earlier text. There is no signature to the preface of *Appeal*, removing the level of familiarity that Child achieves in *Letters'* preface. Her preface in *Appeal* does not serve as a thank you to her readers, but instead assumes the worst: "Reader, I beseech you not to throw down this volume as soon as you have glanced at the title. Read it, if your prejudices will allow, for the very truth's sake." While both prefaces demonstrate a commitment to the truth, the preface of *Appeal* is an entire page of Child attempting to convince her readers of the truth of abolition, rather than the short paragraph of thanks in *Letters.*

Appeal's preface smacks of the "fanatic reformer" by asserting that though its subject is unpopular, it is most needed, and so the views of the public are unimportant. This seeming disregard for her readers' feelings is not apparent in *Letters*, where her desire to appeal to as many readers as possible rules out such blatant disregard of their opinions. As in the preface of *Letters*, Child uses the word "mission" when describing the content of her book and references its "mission of humanity." These small similarities only serve to further underline the stark differences between the two prefaces. Both set the tone for their respective volumes, and while *Appeal's* preface is immediately political and strident, *Letters'* preface is unassuming and non-political. It is clear in both cases, however, that Child had specific goals in mind and she employed two very different approaches and sets of formal choices to achieve those goals.

Child includes a table of contents in *Letters* that lists each "letter" by roman numeral, and then includes a few terms under each one that indicate the main ideas contained within. Letter I, for example, contains three sub-topics: "The Battery in the Morning," "Streets of Modern Babylon," and "Street Musicians." This kind of listing makes it possible for her readers to pick and choose which letters they read. The sub-topics also demonstrate that each letter is a separate entity and not dependent on any other letter for meaning as chapters would likely be. The table of contents serves as a kind of index, pointing her readers to particular topics they might be interested in and allowing them to bypass others if they chose.

Child's use of an index in *Letters* was not the first time she employed the formal element. In *Appeal*, instead of a table of contents, the pages after the inscription and before the text begins contain an index that lists topics and names and the pages on which they can be found. Just as in *Letters,* Child gives her readers the ability to pick and choose which pages they read based on which topics they are most interested in. It's not necessary in either volume for a reader to read the entire work to find passages they are particularly interested in. The appearance of the index at the front of the book in *Appeal* is jarring and unexpected; a reader expects to see an index at the end of a book, not the beginning. There is an expectation that the material would have already been read before the index is encountered. In this case, though, Child was clearly worried about how much of her book her audience would actually read. In keeping with her plea in the preface that people read it in spite of their personal feelings, Child includes an index to ensure that they could read only those sections most compelling to them.

After all of the work Child undertakes to present *Letters* as a collection of personal correspondences, the letters themselves lack several characteristics that are usually found in an epistle. There is no salutation, for example, and no signature. They are dated chronologically and many of them employ second person to give the feeling of direct address, but a visual scan shows that they are not letters. Why go to all the work of presenting them as letters? Why establish a personal connection and dialogue with readers that mimicked letter writing if the final product wasn't going to be structured as such?

The answer may be partly answered by content. Even though most of the letters are on general subjects concerning the city of New York and Child's walks in it, the reformer is always present if even in a more subdued form. In between letters that discuss art museums, flowers, and spiritual awareness, Letter XXIII contains the sub-topics "The Florida Slave-Trader and the Patriarch," "Boswell's Remarks on the Slave-Trade," and "The Fixed Point of View." In the letter Child transcribes a long conversation she had with a slave owner who nonetheless thought highly of black people and had married an African woman, resulting in several children. Despite this, the man refused to free his slaves because he believed that the important work he did in other parts of the world would suffer if his slaves were freed and his source of income was lost. He tells Child that "to do good in the world, we *must* have money. That's the way I reasoned when I carried on the slave trade. It was very profitable then" (158). This man is presented admirably and his good character traits are described. All the while she describes his apparent hypocrisy and her disappointment in him. The letter ends with Child's assertion that people could change if only they knew where to look: "Feeble

wanderers they are, following a flickering jack-o-lantern, when there is a calm, bright pole-star for ever above the horizon, to guide their steps, if they would but look to it" (162). This letter clearly contains a reformist message and a condemnation of slavery, but the tone is gentle. Child presents the slave owner as a good man who simply follows bad logic, but if he only knew where to look he would recognize the error of his ways.

Though Child did not market or present *Letters* as an abolitionist text, it still is. Passages like the one described above exist throughout the collection. She has, however, introduced herself as an author who focuses on issues of the home, who wants to have a dialogue with her readers, and who makes no demands of her readers. She is simply writing a personal letter and sharing an anecdote of her life in New York. The slave owner could be anyone and the point is that ordinary and good people succumb to bad ideas all of the time.

Child's approach in *Letters* with regard to the content could not be more different than her approach in *Appeal*. In *Appeal* there are no chapters about art museums or flowers interspersed with the abolitionist material to dull the impact or give her readers a break from the extreme material. Every word in *Appeal* is tightly focused on abolition and the examples Child employs are not gentle, like the slave owner of *Letters*, but graphic and often disturbing. She writes of "husbands [being] torn from their wives, children from their parents, while the air is filled with the shrieks and lamentations of the bereaved" (12). She writes in no uncertain terms about the morality of the slave trade:

> From the moment the slave is kidnapped, to the last hour he draws his miserable breath, the white man's influence directly cherishes ignorance, fraud, treachery,

> theft, licentiousness, revenge, hatred, and murder. […] And thus do we dare to treat beings, who, like ourselves, are heirs of immortality! [16]

When compared with the passage in *Letters* about the slave owner, it is hard to tell that she is discussing the same topic, so different is the delivery of material. The slave owner of *Letters* is a kind old Christian man who tries to do some good with the money he earns, but the slave owner of *Appeal* is a vicious murderer who kidnaps women and children, denying their status as children of God and profiting from it the whole time.

Child's care to match content and form in both volumes indicates her concern to make her books cohesive. None of the formal elements in either book can be separated from the content and the paratexts are clearly designed to complement the text they surround. While both volumes are concerned with the same message of reform, Child realized that the method of delivery was as important as the message itself. After the failure of *Appeal*, Child set out to construct a collection that would appeal to as broad an audience as possible while still conveying her reformist message. While the text contained within *Letters* is vastly different from the text of *Appeal*, Child also deploys formal elements in a different way.

The popularity of *Letters* attests to the success of Child's paratextual approach. By divorcing her letters from their original abolitionist context, by labeling them letters, and by creating a personal dialogue with her readers, Child succeeds in creating a volume that was both reformist and appealed to a broad audience. In combining her new gentler tone with one of the most popular genres of her day, Child created her own "letter of introduction" to the literary world.

LETTERS

FROM

NEW YORK.

BY L. MARIA CHILD,

AUTHOR OF PHILOTHEA, THE MOTHER'S BOOK, THE GIRL'S BOOK, FLOWERS FOR CHILDREN, etc.

We receive but what we give,
And in our life alone does Nature live:
Ours is her wedding-garment, ours her shroud!
    And would we aught behold of higher worth
Than that inanimate cold world, allowed
To the poor loveless ever-anxious crowd,
    Ah, from the soul itself must issue forth
A light, a glory, a fair luminous cloud,
    Enveloping the Earth:
And from the soul itself must there be sent
    A sweet and potent voice of its own birth,
Of all sweet sounds the life and element!

COLERIDGE.

THIRD EDITION.

NEW-YORK:
C. S. FRANCIS & CO., 252 BROADWAY.
BOSTON:
J. H. FRANCIS, 128 WASHINGTON STREET.
1845.

1072742

CHAPTER THREE

"Language Divine!": The Jane Johnston Schoolcraft Archive and Paratexts

While the other figures in this dissertation had to make deliberate paratextual decisions based on their entry into and interaction with the literary marketplace, Jane Johnston Schoolcraft offers a different and valuable perspective. As a mixed race woman living in the Ojibwe settlement in Saulte St. Marie, Michigan, Schoolcraft rarely published her work in the traditional sense. As Robert Dale Parker notes, however, Schoolcraft was "nevertheless among the first American Indian authors. She was also the first known American Indian literary writer, the first known Indian woman writer, by some measures the first known Indian poet, the first known poet to write poems in a Native American language, and the first known American Indian to write out traditional Indian stories" (2). Yet, her identity as an author is of less importance to this discussion than are the formal choices she made in her work. As Leon Jackson notes, traditional definitions of authorship in the antebellum period are increasingly "too ahistorical and too simplistic to be useful" (2).[20] This is especially true of Schoolcraft who has not traditionally been considered an important figure of study due in part to her lack of publication. Schoolcraft's example is one that demonstrates how normative and pervasive paratextual considerations are, and that there are paratexts yet to be explained that go beyond the categories theorized by Genette.

[20] Jackson, while asserting that authorship and its economies needs to be re-imagined, does not employ Schoolcraft as an example in his book. Augusta Rohrbach does, however, and addresses Schoolcraft specifically in a chapter of her *Thinking Outside the Book*. Rohrbach uses Schoolcraft and her work as a way to "interrogate literacy and authorship as a stable cultural form and index" (2). Her conclusion that current scholarship on the history of the book and the categories we use demands a more nuanced and less rigid set of criteria is well taken, and this line of thinking informs my dissertation.

The literary magazine was *The Muzzeniegun or Literary Voyager*, a hand-written collection put together and distributed by Henry Rowe Schoolcraft. In it can be found numerous examples of Schoolcraft's work that were never published anywhere else. However, the archive of her work, recently collected in a single edition by Robert Dale Parker, is much more extensive than simply the texts published in *The Muzzeniegun*. The Schoolcraft archive, in addition to the pieces Henry published, also contains poetry and American Indian tales. Schoolcraft's work transcends genre boundaries and includes pieces both in English and Ojibwe. Given the current critical climate for re-examining literary figures from antebellum America,[21] and given that we now consider figures like Emily Dickinson[22] to have self-published in her fascicles, Schoolcraft's archive deserves the consideration that Parker advocates.

A paratextual reading of the archive illustrates her loyalty to her oral heritage, even as she took part in a literate one. Her earliest and most published works were the Ojibwe oral stories she wrote down, as Augusta Rohrbach observes, in order to preserve them. They were published by Henry in the *Literary Voyager* and were read by more people than most of her poetry was. For these previously oral stories, the written language itself becomes the paratext and one of her main concerns was to preserve her oral culture as much as possible. Her poetry, though less often published than the Ojibwe tales, can tell us much about who she envisioned as her audience and how she desired her work to be received. Schoolcraft's choice of poetry as a genre meant to be

[21] The current critical movement toward recovering previously ignored literary figures focuses especially on female authors and authors of color. Parker's collection of Schoolcraft's work is an excellent example of this trend.

[22] It is interesting to note that though less of Dickinson's work was published during her lifetime than Schoolcraft's was during hers, the title of "author" or "poet" regarding Dickinson is never questioned in the way that it is for Schoolcraft. This is reflective of many other differences between the two women, not the least of which was Schoolcraft's work in an oral tradition and the different values that are still placed on different kinds of literacies.

read and heard out loud is an indicator that even when working within a literate tradition, her upbringing in an oral one was never far from her mind. Just as oral tales necessarily changed each time they were told, she clearly believed in the usefulness of revision and her ability to continue shaping a poem for a desired effect. Much of her work exists in several versions, sometimes with drastic shifts of meaning from one to the next. Throughout all of her work runs a thread of bilingualism, and she often uses both English and Ojibwe in the same piece. Put together, all of the paratextual elements listed above combine and overlap to form a portrait of an author who exerted great control over her work, was pre-occupied with how her work would be received, and was intent on populating her written work with the markers, or paratexts, of an oral tradition.[23]

****

Schoolcraft, in an effort to preserve tales told orally, wrote down several of the Ojibwe stories that she knew well. This was also a goal of Henry's as an ethnographer, who wrote down several other stories and published Schoolcraft's in the *Literary Voyager* in an effort to concretize and preserve them. After all, as Walter Ong notes, "there is no way directly to refute a text. After absolutely total and devastating refutation, it says exactly the same thing as before" (78).[24] Schoolcraft, as a member of a community that was slowly disappearing, would have understood that writing those stories down would make them concrete and irrefutable to whites who valued literacy over orality. Henry's job was to preserve artifacts from Native societies, and

[23] This point may seem obvious or self-explanatory but is especially important to make with Schoolcraft. Traditional scholarship often positions her as an amateur little interested in the distribution or reception of her own work, or purely a transcriptionist with a lack of originality. Scholars like Parker, Rohrbach, and Bethany Schneider are working to counteract that erroneous assumption.

[24] This is true, but I believe there is more room for reader input than Ong posits here. Fuller and Child, for example, demonstrate that readers can and do participate in a text and help determine its meaning to some degree. This is different, though, from a live audience influencing an unfolding and unwritten story, and it is in that sense that I use Ong's quotation here.

transcription of the tales would have accomplished just that. It is difficult to know whether Schoolcraft would have undertaken this project had she not been married to a man eager to publish this material. Nevertheless, Schoolcraft's oral tales offer a particularly interesting and unique perspective to the paratextual scholar. In particular, I will address "The Three Cranberries," "Corn story (the origin of corn)," and "The Little Spirit, or Boy-Man."

Before an examination of particular tales can begin, their existence as an aggregate demands an important distinction between Schoolcraft and the other figures in this dissertation. While the other authors under study were raised in and worked from a purely literate standpoint, Schoolcraft was educated in both an oral and a literate tradition. The oral tradition dictated a fluidity in story-telling, with each storyteller making their own individual choices or changes to the tales. The audience participates in the story, perhaps taking part in flyting or adding a response when the story demands one. The oral story is a communal experience instead of the solitary one that reading a text can be.[25] A fundamental change is made in the tales when they are committed to paper and the fluidity is removed. Ong's notion about the irrevocable nature of a text outlines the inability of an audience or a reader to truly participate in a written story and influence its outcome; the outcome is already written down. For these reasons, I assert that writing itself becomes a paratext for these oral stories.

My position that paratexts are integral and underexamined elements of any text is especially important here. Genette's definition of paratexts, that they are anything that allows a book to be presented as such to readers, dictates that the written word itself must

[25] Of course books were often read out loud to several people at a time and not all reading experiences were solitary, but most reading is done by individuals silently, a drastic difference from the communal story-telling experience.

be considered a paratext in this case. There is, of course, nothing in Genette's book that addresses orality, so focused is he on a literate context, but my conclusion is drawn from his theory nonetheless.[26] Writing the stories down is what enabled them to be presented as a written work to Schoolcraft's readers and so print itself becomes a paratext. This does not mean, however, that Schoolcraft divorced the stories from all oral storytelling elements; a closer examination demonstrates that the devices that oral storytellers would have used to tell the tales are still present in written form.

The oral tradition necessitates its own set of rules and criteria. There are formal devices used by oral storytellers in order to more easily remember their material. One of these is repetition, a mnemonic technique that would have helped storytellers remember their words. In "The Three Cranberries," for example, three cranberry sisters wonder how to escape a wolf should he appear at their lodge. The story repeats as each cranberry states her intended escape:

> "I," said the green one, "will climb up a shingoup tree." "I," said the white one, "will hide myself in the kettle of boiled hominy." And "I," said the red one, "will conceal myself under the snow." [189]

The structure of each cranberry's statement is the same, repeating in a device designed to prompt a storyteller's memory. This mnemonic technique means that a storyteller would not have to remember each sentence or section of a story exactly, but could instead recall an entire section like this one based on repetition.

Repetition appears in nearly every Ojibwe oral story that Schoolcraft writes down. "Corn story (the origin of corn)" was published in Henry's 1839 *Algic Researches* and is credited with being used by Longfellow as "the basis for part V of *The Song of*

[26] Genette mentions "oral confidences" very briefly, but has no section dedicated to oral storytelling.

Hiawatha" (Parker 187).[27] In the tale an Indian boy spends time alone in a lodge to seek his spirit guide. His spirit comes to him for three days in a row, wrestling with him each time and leaving the boy with the warning that he would be back the next day. The repetition is not confined to the spirit's visits, but also appears when the two discuss the boy's stay in the lodge. He is there for seven days and the spirit returns on the fourth day to visit the boy for the last time. All of the numbers and repetition help not only the storyteller, but also the listener in an oral context. Remembering the story elements would have been important for listeners and the repetition would have helped them to do so and to follow the story. Repetition, then, was as directed at the audience and their ability to follow a story and make meaning as it was designed to help the teller. So too does the repetition help Schoolcraft's reader retain the story and gain a sense of Ojibwe storytelling.

In *Orality and Literacy*, Walter Ong lists several other specific characteristics of oral works in addition to repetition. He notes, for example, that oral tales are usually "aggregative rather than analytic," "close to the human lifeworld," and "empathetic and participatory rather than objectively distanced" (43-45). In other words, oral tales were meant to tell specific stories that meant something to their readers and established a sense of community. Besides the repetition inherent in an oral tale for the storyteller's benefit, there are often particular epithets or "formulary baggage" that are not normally present in written stories. Those formulaic elements are considered too redundant to be written down several times and because they accumulate too much "aggregative weight" (Ong

[27] The full title of Henry's book was *Algic Researches, Comprising Inquiries Respecting the Mental Characteristics of the North American Indians. First Series. Indian Tales and Legends.* The stories in this volume were published several more times under different titles, so this particular tale had a relatively large circulation.

38). The reader tires of seeing the same phrase over and over, but the listener and the oral teller both benefit from such redundancies.

In “Corn Story,” Schoolcraft includes not only elements of repetition, but also formal epithets and the origin of an important communal staple in order to convey as much of the oral storytelling experience as possible. The boy’s lodge encounters with his spirit guide eventually lead to an explanation of the origin of corn. The boy defeats his guide in a wrestling contest, and upon his defeat buries him in the spot he requested, carefully tending and weeding the ground. In the spring a corn plant sprouts in the spot, prompting the boy to tell his father that their days of depending on the hunt for all their needs are over. Anyone listening to the story would likely have depended on corn to be a large part of their diet and this shared sense of dependence reinforces the community they already share. “Corn Story” has a direct relationship to the world of the Ojibwe and contains no objective distance, a prominent feature of oral storytelling. The communal experience involved in oral storytelling enforces the larger communal connections of the listeners. Neither are there any abstract terms or words. Even the corn husk is referred to as a “blanket” in order to quickly provide a common and clear visual picture of the husk to all listening.

“Corn Story” contains formulaic elements that indicate its oral origins. The spirit who comes to the boy is referred to as the “beautiful stranger” several times and the boy’s father is repeatedly described as “poor.” Ong notes that “oral folk prefer, especially in formal discourse, not the soldier, but the brave soldier; not the princess, but the beautiful princess” (38). The accumulation of these terms throughout a story creates an aggregative effect that is usually edited out of written work. In an oral setting they work

to reinforce a particular idea, and to make sure that neither the storyteller nor the listener forgets the descriptions used. Schoolcraft retained the epithets in written form in order to more closely mimic the storytelling experience.

The elements included in "The Little Spirit, or Boy-Man" indicates that Schoolcraft was concerned with maintaining as much of the original storytelling experience as possible when she wrote the tales down. The story is about a boy who was smaller than everyone else but uses his size to his advantage. He manages to steal a fish from larger hunters by concealing himself next to the fish, and he lets himself be swallowed by a large fish in order to catch it. The repeated elements in this story describe the boy's continued trips to the lake and his encounters with the larger hunters.

In "The Little Spirit" Schoolcraft includes some dialogue in Ojibwe which she then only partially translates for her reader:

> "Masmis-quan-ge-gun-a, be-nau-wa-con-zhe-shin," that is "*You*, of the *red fins* come and swallow me." Immediately that monstrous fish came and swallowed him; and seeing his sister standing on the shore in despair he hallooed out to her, "Me-zush-ke-zin-ance." She wondered what he meant, but on reflection thought it must be an old mockisin. [192]

It is telling that she includes hyphens to indicate syllable boundaries. This gives a sense of how the Ojibwe words would be pronounced if they were spoken out loud and emphasizes the oral roots of the story. It also allows her readers to hear what this passage would have sounded like in an oral storytelling experience. She translates the first line, a nod to her readers who would not understand what the little boy said to the fish, in order to aid their understanding of the tale. The lack of translation for the second word mirrors

the sister’s lack of understanding, forcing the reader and the sister to share for a moment in the experience of the story. The experience shared between sister and reader replicates to some degree the shared experience an audience would have had at an oral telling of the story.

Parker’s notes on the original manuscript of “The Little Spirit” illuminate another formal strategy Schoolcraft employed to mimic the oral experience. Parker writes that in the manuscript version of the tale, it is “all one paragraph and roughly, lightly punctuated, noticeably not intended as a final draft.” Parker makes the edits he sees necessary, adding punctuation. He notes that “the manuscript pays little attention to marking where sentences end, which is typical of JJS’s prose.” He attempts, in his edits, to “retain a semblance of the manuscript’s lightly punctuated, swift pace” (193). It is certainly true that this technique likely indicates Schoolcraft’s treatment of a rough draft, and that she or Henry would later add the missing punctuation.

I believe it is also likely, however, that the swift pace of the tale and the lack of attention to sentence boundaries indicates an attempt to transcribe as much of the oral experience as possible. The fact that this style typifies Schoolcraft’s approach to prose, not poetry or her other writing, indicates a decision that goes beyond the explanation of the rough draft. An oral delivery would not have needed to concern itself with punctuation, and some sentences might run together where they would be separated on paper. An oral storyteller would not be concerned with paragraph boundaries either, and as far as the listeners were concerned, each story would be one entity. It is only once stories are written down that they need elements such as paragraph separation. Though Parker’s reasoning for adding punctuation and conforming to the rules of print make

sense for his audience, his notes allow us to understand that Schoolcraft wished to retain for her audience as many of the characteristics of oral storytelling as she could.

Schoolcraft's strong identification with her Ojibwe heritage is never more evident than in her stories. The choice she makes to preserve the formal elements of the oral storytelling experience transition into much different choices when she writes poetry. This indicates her awareness of genre, and that what is appropriate for one form is not necessarily for another. She desires to present herself differently in her poetry, with the focus shifting away from creating cultural artifacts toward participating in a long and established literate tradition.

****

Schoolcraft, as a savvy and thoughtful author, appropriated popular forms as she saw fit. This is not a phenomenon unique to Schoolcraft and has been well documented with American Indian authors[28] and other poets of color such as Phillis Wheatley. This was a way for Schoolcraft to both conform to the dominant cultural tradition that surrounded her, and also to launch a subtle critique of that same form and the cultural force and tradition behind it.[29] This occurs most often in Schoolcraft's poetry, which often conforms to particular criteria long established in the European tradition. Her choice of poetry also indicates her allegiance to an oral tradition. After all, poetry is meant to be read aloud and many of its metrical and rhythmic characteristics are designed to be heard rather than read silently. She combines her fidelity to the oral form and her

[28] Simon J. Ortiz noted that this tendency demonstrates "the creative ability of Indian people to gather in many forms of the socio-political colonizing force which beset them and to make these forms meaningful in their own terms" (8)

[29] Joshua Bellin writes in *Medicine Bundle* of "the capacity (indeed necessity) for Indians to construct novel identities through imitation of the dominant culture" (82).

status as a mixed race woman, entering the most oral of literate traditions and appropriating popular poetic forms.

Take, for example, Schoolcraft's poem entitled "Lines Written at Castle Island, Lake Superior." Parker notes in his introduction to the poem that there are three different versions and they are labeled as translations of an original Ojibwe version that no longer exists, and that one of the versions differs significantly from the others. Parker includes an earlier version of the poem in the collection, on the grounds that according to poetic and historical evidence it is the one written "soon after the event and during JJS's lifetime." (92) The title is reminiscent of Wordsworth's "Lines Composed a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey," and like Wordsworth's piece it concerns a remembered place and begins with a strong personal identification with that place:

> Here in my native inland sea
>
> From pain and sickness would I flee
>
> And from its shores and island bright
>
> Gather a store of sweet delight. [92]

Schoolcraft's poem consists of rhyming couplets of iambic tetrameter, in contrast to Wordsworth's blank verse. Nonetheless, the structure of the title and imitation of the Romantic tradition of poetry would have been recognizable to Schoolcraft's audience. So too would have been the overall sentiment of nostalgia and a deep and personal connection to a specific place in the natural world.

Just as Tintern Abbey does in Wordsworth's poem, Castle Island provides a needed retreat from the stresses of everyday life. Wordsworth's escape from "the din of cities" is echoed by Schoolcraft's declaration that Castle Island is a place "far from the

haunts of men away." Schoolcraft's retreat, however, is informed by a political and cultural system that marginalized her own people and encroached upon their sacred spaces. When Schoolcraft ends her poem by noting that at Castle Island there are no "laws to treat my people ill," her poem is transformed from a piece filled with Romantic nostalgia to one of political protest and lament.

Schoolcraft's appropriation of the Romantic genre then becomes a critique of the very form her words inhabit. It is not enough for Schoolcraft to go to Castle Island and rejuvenate for a few hours as Wordsworth would have. Ultimately she must return to her life, and to her place as a member of a colonized group. This is a perspective that Wordsworth necessarily did not have, and this difference indicates the way that Schoolcraft takes the Romantic form and complicates it with her position as an occupant of two worlds.

In a poem entitled "To a Bird, Seen Under My Window in the Garden," Schoolcraft enters into a tradition in which poets identify themselves with birds or use the qualities of birds to convey their message. In the modern critical world, Emily Dickinson's bird poetry immediately comes to mind, but other examples include Shelley's "To a Skylark" and Keats' "Ode to a Nightingale." As a popular nineteenth-century genre, bird poetry is another form that Schoolcraft's audience would have been familiar with.[30] Schoolcraft's title instantly signals the genre to her readers; this poem was published in the larger literary marketplace as a part of Henry's *Oneota*.[31] Another genre that has clear ties to the natural world, bird poetry was a way for Schoolcraft to connect with a European poetic tradition.

[30] There is, in fact, a Penguin anthology of bird poetry, attesting to the abundance of material.
[31] *Oneota* (1844) was one of several ethnographic collections of American Indian material edited by Henry with contributions from Jane.

The poem itself is short, with only two stanzas consisting of quatrains in iambic tetrameter. The lines rhyme alternately:

Sweet little bird, thy notes prolong,

And ease my lonely pensive hours;

I love to list thy cheerful song,

And hear thee chirp beneath the flowers.

The time allowed for pleasures sweet,

To thee is short as it is bright,

Then sing! rejoice! before it fleet,

And cheer me ere you take your flight. [104]

The poem demonstrates a brief moment of connection between Schoolcraft and a bird outside her window. It also contains a typical Romantic moment of interaction between a person and the natural world, and the strong feelings that can come from such an encounter. It is telling that Schoolcraft is cheered by the sound the bird makes, whose song has the power to cheer Schoolcraft's mood. While this motif is present in bird poetry from other authors during this time period, in Schoolcraft's hands it adds a subtle connection to Schoolcraft's oral heritage and the power of the spoken word and sound in general.

Unlike "Lines Written at Castle Island," Schoolcraft's Romantic turn in "To a Bird" includes no particular Ojibwe political concern. Instead Schoolcraft situates herself firmly as a Romantic poet, with her focus on feelings of happiness and sadness simultaneously. There is the typical Romantic lament, this time for more hours like the one spent listening to the bird instead of partaking in "lonely pensive hours." It also ends

with a moment of rejuvenation, in which the bird sings and cheers the poet before it departs. There is nothing in this poem that identifies Schoolcraft with the Ojibwe, and anyone reading it would detect no distinguishing characteristics between the writer and the tradition in which she chose to write. Her identity as Ojibwe is usually masked in her poetry, and she only occasionally chooses to include elements that signal her Ojibwe affiliation.

In certain examples of Schoolcraft's poetry, like "Castle Island" and "To a Bird," the titles are reminiscent of other poetry in the genres Schoolcraft employs. Other poems clearly identify their form with their titles, and "Acrostic" is one such piece. Acrostic is a poetic genre in which the first letters of each line spell a word that usually has something to do with the topic of the poem itself. Schoolcraft's "Acrostic" is only five lines long:

> A thing of glitter, gleam, and gold,
>
> Loose thoughts, loose verse, unmeaning, old,
>
> Big words that sound a thousand fold;
>
> Unfinished scraps, conceit and cant,
>
> Mad stanzas, and a world of rant. [157]

The first letters of each line spell the word "album," and Parker notes that "albums were popular books that collected a diverse array of writing and pictures, combining the roles of magazine, anthology, and coffee-table book, and often elaborately printed, bound, and decorated in gold" (157).

In "Acrostic," Schoolcraft seems especially interested in noting the difference between the appearance of an album, with its "glitter, gleam, and gold," and the content, with its "conceit" and "mad stanzas." There is a significant contrast between the

presentation of the album and the material within, indicating an awareness on Schoolcraft's part of paratextual elements and how well they coordinate with rhetorical ones. To her, the glittering exterior holds nothing more than a disorganized and arrogant bunch of words. They lack the cohesion that Schoolcraft seems to expect from such a book.

The words she describes are written ones, seemingly stagnant and disconnected on the page. They are complicated words that "sound" impressive but are really not. The written in this case lacks a connection to the oral, with a stark contrast between how the words look and how they sound. Schoolcraft's focus on combining the oral and the literate comes through in her critique of other authors' inability to do the same.

Schoolcraft herself published in what might be called an album on a smaller scale, the *Literary Voyager*, though without the intricate binding and appearance. Perhaps her involvement in the publishing of the *Literary Voyager* taught her that connecting the pieces in a collection like this was vital in order to create a positive reading experience. Wherever her interest in albums came from, these five lines indicate Schoolcraft's concern for a reader and the responsibility of an author or editor to make the reading experience, both oral and literate, cohesive and pleasant. The author or authors of the pieces in the "Acrostic" album are only concerned with being published in an extravagant way, not with the reading experience their volume creates.

Like "Acrostic," "Elegy" is a Schoolcraft poem that identifies its form with its title. Schoolcraft wrote several poems about the death of her two year old son William Henry in 1827, including "Elegy." The elegy was a poetic lament dealing with a significant loss or death, and though elegies classically employed a particular meter,

poets in the nineteenth century moved away from elegiac meter to explore the form more freely. Like many poets of her time, Schoolcraft did not write her elegy in traditional elegiac couplets.

Though she moved away from the classical form, Schoolcraft's "Elegy" is still a poem with consistent meter and rhyme. The poem consists of nine numbered quatrains that rhyme in an A,B,A,B pattern. The poem's highly structured form is immediately visible on the page, but also lends itself to a reading experience that is marked by the use and sound of rhyme and a regular rhythm.

In stanza 6 of "Elegy," Schoolcraft connects orality and her mourning:

> And my sighs shall increase,
>
> The soft murmurs of spring,
>
> As in thy requiem low,
>
> I so pensively sing [132]

In order to completely express her grief, Schoolcraft must do something other than just write the poem in her son's memory. While partaking in a poetic tradition that positions the poem itself as monument and remembrance enough, Schoolcraft must also vocalize her despair, again connecting the oral and literate.[32]

The focus on vocalization as an important element of mourning continues in other poems Schoolcraft wrote to commemorate Willy's death. In "To my ever beloved and lamented Son William Henry," there are several lines that include quotation marks to indicate speech. More importantly, her remembrances of Willy often reference things she said to him while he was alive:

---

[32] The idea that a poem itself will last forever and serve as a monument to the dead is a common motif in the poetic tradition. One poet particularly well known for this is William Shakespeare, who populated his Sonnets with references to their ability to concretize and preserve the dead for all eternity.

Where is that voice attuned to love,

That bid me say "my darling dove"?

But oh! that soul has flown above,

Sweet Willy. [135]

Schoolcraft mourns especially Willy's voice in this stanza, and misses both hearing him and being able to respond with a term of endearment. She positions orality as an important part of their relationship, the loss of which she grieves along with him. She memorializes parts of their conversation, putting them into quotation marks, in order to indicate that they were just as important as his appearance or presence in her life.

While she misses his voice and her responses to him, she also uses orality as a way to express her grief. In "Sweet Willy," a third poem about her lost son, Schoolcraft describes the visit that she and Henry make every year to Willy's gravesite. While sitting under the tree next to his grave, they "often, with remembrance/Of our darling little boy/Repeated—"they that sow in tears/"Shall reap again in joy" (138). The need to say the words out loud as a way to reinforce them, and the use of quotation marks emphasizes Schoolcraft's use of orality as a way to mourn her child.

As a poet who possessed both oral and literate heritage, Schoolcraft found a way to combine both traditions in her poetry. By simultaneously employing traditional European poetic forms and adding formal elements tying her poetry to an oral tradition, Schoolcraft employed paratexts as a way to demonstrate her dual allegiance. The consideration she used when choosing her formal elements continued as she worked to revise and refine her pieces.

****

Schoolcraft's ties to her oral heritage are evident in her use of revision as a formal technique. Just as an oral storyteller would have likely changed the story slightly each time it was told, so does Schoolcraft make continuous changes to her work, resulting in multiple versions of almost everything she wrote. The oral emphasis on the fluidity of storytelling translated in the written context to a constant focus on revision. Of course the focus on revision does not come solely from an oral tradition, and other authors like Fuller and Whitman also placed an emphasis on revision, but I believe that Schoolcraft's clear desire to work with oral elements in her work adds another dimension to her revisions that do not exist in Fuller's.

"Lines Written at Castle Island, Lake Superior" exists in three versions and there is a fourth Ojibwe version that is as yet undiscovered. Parker does not reprint all the versions in his collection, but even the existence of more drafts of the poem implies an author who thought carefully about her final product. Her attention to formal details and each element of her work indicates that she carefully considered both her audience and her final product. It also implies a kind of care and ownership of her work that comes from a person who considers herself an author and storyteller. The poet who wrote "Acrostic" and thought about how all the elements of a work interacted would surely spend some time revising in order to achieve her desired effect with a poem.

While Parker made purposeful and logical decisions as to which poems to include in his collection and explains his reasoning for each one, most different versions of any particular poem are not included. One poem that is an exception is "Resignation," for which Parker includes two of the three main versions of the poem. Comparing them side

by side illuminates formal choices and changes Schoolcraft made during the revision process. The first included version printed in Parker's collection is eight lines long and is earlier than the second version Parker includes:

> How hard to teach the heart, oppress with grief,
> Amid gay, worldly scenes, to find relief;
> And the long cherish'd bliss we had in view,
> To banish from the mind—where first it grew!
> But Faith, in time, can sweetly soothe the soul,
> And Resignation hold a mild control;
> The mind may then resume a proper tone,
> And calmly think on hopes forever flown. [125]

The second and later version is expanded to twelve lines and several formal changes are made.[33] Even a simple visual scan of the two poems side by side shows a difference in line indentation, length, and punctuation.

The additional four lines that Schoolcraft adds in the later version of "Resignation" are all indented, while the original line spacing remains the same. The second included version omits much of the punctuation that functions as end stops to every line. Instead, most of the lines are enjambed and the thoughts flow from one line to the next without a pause or interruption due to a comma or exclamation point.

In coordination with the difference in formal elements, the meaning of the poem changes slightly as well. For example, line 4 in the first included version is relocated in the second, both preceded and followed by new lines: "And fix its torn affections and

[33] Please see Appendix A at the end of this chapter for a transcription of the second included version of "Resignation"

regard/And the long cherish'd bliss we had in view/To banish from the mind, where it first grew/And clung for succor! oh how hard!" The exclamation point is relocated and a hyphen becomes a comma. The moved exclamation point demonstrates the change in meaning Schoolcraft makes with her revision. By adding a line about "bliss" clinging for succor, she emphasizes and amplifies how difficult it is to overcome grief and to move on after a tragedy. She adds a line that states that torn affections can be "fixed," a sentiment missing in the earlier version. Schoolcraft counterbalances the intensity of the grief experienced with the notion that such grief can be fixed and relieved.

A second significant change in meaning comes toward the end of the poem, when Schoolcraft discusses the role of resignation. The focus and title of the poem, resignation is the conclusion that both poems come to. Eventually a person learns to resign themselves to their changed life after a tragedy, not necessarily to accept it. In the first included version, resignation is discussed on line 6. This placement shifts to line 9 in the second version and is followed by a new line: "Bid Resignation hold a mild controul/And calm the troubled passion's noisy din." In this version the mourner must ask for, or "bid," resignation to take control of their lives, becoming active as opposed to passive. There is more agency here, though, and the mourner has more control over their own fate. The end stop after line on resignation is gone, allowing the two lines to become one continuous thought. Resignation, in this poem, also has the power to calm the noisy din of troubling emotions, making it more capable of offering comfort. The change in agency for the mourner and the hope that such strong emotions can be fixed give the second version of this somber poem a slightly more hopeful and positive tone.

The changes in "Resignation" are small and affect the meaning of the poem only slightly. The changes and revisions Schoolcraft made in another poem, "The Contrast, a Splenetic Effusion," are much more significant.[34] Parker notes that there are four manuscript versions of this poem in existence. Three of the versions seem to have been written around the same time, and the fourth is later and significantly different. Parker prints one of the early versions and the later one in his collection.

The second, revised, version of "The Contrast" is longer by nearly twenty lines than the earlier included version. The extra length is taken up partly with moments of self-identification and political statements that do not exist in the first version. Both poems are nostalgic looks back at Schoolcraft's childhood and reflections on how much more difficult her life has become as an adult. The reasons behind the difficulty inherent in adulthood are drastically different in each poem, however, and the formal elements of each poem support their very different content.

The revisions to the later version of "The Contrast" are designed to identify Schoolcraft as an Ojibwe poet concerned with negative changes in her society. The poem shifts from a lament about the loss of childhood innocence to one lamenting the loss of a people and a way of life. In order to frame this political statement in a more measured way, the words "a splenetic effusion" are removed from the title of the poem. "Splenetic effusion" refers to an emotional outburst so powerful that it cannot be contained. Creating a political statement that was designed to be taken seriously, Schoolcraft removed the notion that her thoughts were an uncontrolled emotional outburst. She continued this process by also removing any exclamation points during the process of revision, erasing the formal markers of an emotional outburst. Instead, she presents her

[34] Please see Appendix B at the end of this chapter for transcriptions of both versions of "Contrast"

argument in a calm and measured way, perhaps concerned that an emotional plea would not be taken as seriously.

The two poems diverge almost immediately, when Schoolcraft refers to "St. Mary's woodland bowers" in line 8 of the revised version. At no point in the earlier version does she refer to a specific place or even a setting in general, rendering it void of any possibility for identification. The specific mention of place early in the revised version situates it in the specific context of the Ojibwe settlement of Saulte St. Marie. Schoolcraft continues to name places when she refers to "my father's simple hall," while at the same time setting the nostalgic tone she employs throughout the revised version. Her memories include times that were "calm," "tranquil," and "peaceful," and with the soothing adjectives Schoolcraft employs she provides another contrast to the emotionally charged earlier poem.

The changes in both the title and setting descriptions collaborate to produce a much different poem after revision. In the earlier poem Schoolcraft notes that her difficulties in adulthood began after she "in love's mazes rang'd" and entered into more complicated adult relationships. In the revised poem, Schoolcraft's adult concerns are caused by the loss of her people and their way of life:

> The world hath sent its votaries here.
>
> The tree cut down—the cot removed,
>
> The cot the simple Indian loved,
>
> The busy strife of young and old
>
> To gain one sordid bit of gold
>
> By trade's o'er done plethoric moil,

And lawsuits, meetings, courts and toil. [40-46, 118]

Schoolcraft continues the theme of simplicity in the description of her people. The contrast here, certainly the contrast of the title, is between a simpler way of life and an invading force with contradictory beliefs and actions.[35] The simple cots hung among trees in a forest give way to lawsuits and meetings, all in the pursuit of riches. In an ironic twist, she mentions the "plethoric moil" of white society, echoing the since removed "splenetic effusion" of the original title. Both phrases refer to bodily humors associated with particularly strong emotions, and both refer to an outburst of that emotion. The chaotic and emotional force Schoolcraft so carefully removed from her poem resurfaces in a different cultural context, as she shifts the emotionally unstable tone to white society and away from her people.

While the earlier version of the poem ends with emotional "bliss" turning to "gloom," the revised poem ends with a strongly worded political statement. Schoolcraft writes a goodbye to "days of homebred ease" and then focuses on the future: "And with the star flag, raised on high/Discover a new dominion nigh/And half in joy, half in fear/Welcome the proud Republic here" (118). The welcome Schoolcraft offers to white settlers and explorers is uneasy, tempered with trepidation and fear. The appearance of the Republic is a contrast to the "rural cares" that characterize the beginning of the stanza and Schoolcraft's focus on juxtaposing the rural and simple against the urban and chaotic.

[35] Henry, in "Dawn of Literary Composition by Educated Natives of the Aboriginal Tribes," describes the changes in St. Marie society that are reflected in Schoolcraft's revised poem, describing the earlier time much as she does: "The 'Happy Valley' of St. Mary's was, indeed, robbed of its seclusion and rural attractions, where the adventurous traveler and bold Indian trader, with his troubadour boatmen, had once been the only guests. But this seclusion was forever gone. […] The poetic age of St. Mary's was indeed now past, and that of reality xxxx began. A few years effected a complete revolution in the village, in its inhabitants and its business. The native poetess stood revealed to a new population" (Parker 250).

The final lines look ahead, turning away from simpler times once and for all, echoing the movement Schoolcraft has made in her own life.

****

A reading of the Schoolcraft archive makes it clear that she realized and understood the power of language, working to craft and revise her own words until she achieved her desired effect. The poem "Language Divine!," written in 1816, is an example of how Schoolcraft envisioned the power of language. She visited, with her mother, a family that had recently lost a young son to an incident of what Henry calls "cannabalism." Schoolcraft wrote "Language Divine!" in anticipation of their journey and expresses her hopes in the first four lines: "Language divine! Thy aid impart/To breathe the feelings of the heart/That burns with sympathetic woe/For those whose tears incessant flow" (145). She asks "language" to gift her with the power to help the family in their time of grief and help her be a sympathetic friend to them. She later asks "language" to "make my every word a balm," turning despair into calm and helping the family to understand that the boy was now in heaven.

This poem, perhaps more than any other piece of Schoolcraft's writing, illustrates her belief in the power that the spoken word can have. The words that offer comfort on "Language Divine!" are spoken, not written, and they come from a woman raised in an oral tradition. Though she spent a lifetime writing down her thoughts and taking part in a literate tradition, Schoolcraft always maintained ties to her oral heritage. Whether it was by writing down Ojibwe oral tales, making several revisions to each of her pieces much as an oral storyteller would during each story telling, or writing poetry, a genre designed

to be spoken out loud and heard, Schoolcraft used the literate tradition to preserve the oral one.

Schoolcraft's paratexts are not ones that Genette anticipated when he devised his theory. His focus on a literate tradition means that the formal markers I have pointed out in Schoolcraft's work are not markers Genette discusses. His paratextual theory, however, does apply to Schoolcraft, and her focus on the formal elements of her work is clear. Her belief in the power of "Language divine!" reveals itself as she connects the oral and literate traditions, creating writing that was, like her, an occupant of two different worlds.

APPENDIX A:

"Resignation" [2]

How hard to teach the heart, opprest with grief
Amid gay worldly scenes to find relief
    And fix its torn affections and regard
And the long cherish'd bliss we had in view
To banish from the mind, where first it grew
    And clung for succour! oh how hard!
But Faith and time, can sweetly soothe the soul
    Stilling the elements of grief within,
Bid Resignation hold a mild controul
    And calm the troubled passion's noisy din.   [10]
Then may the mind resume its proper tone,
And meditate on hopes and joys forever flown. [125]

APPENDIX B:

"The Contrast, a Splenetic Effusion. March, 1823"

With pen in hand I shall contrast,
What I have felt—what now has past!
Slights from my friends I never knew,
Serenely sweet my hours then flew—
Or if by chance one gave me pain,
The wish to grieve me not again;
Express'd in terms endearing, kind,
Infused a joy throughout my mind—
That to have been one moment pain'd,
Seem'd more like bliss but just attain'd. [10]
With gratitude my heart has mov'd,
In fault—by them to be reprov'd:
So mild and gentle were their words,
To me more sweet, than songs of birds:
For well I knew that each behest,
Was warm'd by love—convincing test!
Thus pass'd the morning of my days;
My only wish to gain the praise,
Of friends, deserving of my love—
By actions kind, I strove to prove, [20]
That *all I did,* was them to please,
The sweetest source of all my ease!
My efforts were kindly receiv'd—
My feelings *ever were* believ'd.
But ah! how soon the scene has chang'd,
Since I have in love's mazes rang'd.
Oft in tears I sigh and languish,
Forc'd to bear in silent anguish—
Looks strange—expressions oft unkind—
Without an intercourse of mind. [30]
Constrain'd to bear both heat and cold—
Now shun'd—now prized above all gold.
In converse now, we take delight,
Oft joining in fair fancy's flight.
Now elate—with pleasure smiling,
Kindness mutual—time beguiling.
But oh how transient! oh how soon,
Every bliss is turn'd to gloom! [38]

"The Contrast"

With pen in hand, I shall contrast,
The present moments with the past
And mark difference, not by grains,
But weighed by feelings, joys and pains.
Calm, tranquil—far from fashion's gaze,
Passed all my earliest, happy days
Sweetly flew the golden hours,
In St. Mary's woodland bowers
Or my father's simple hall,
Oped to whomsoe'er might call [10]
Pains or cares we seldom knew
All the hours so peaceful flew
Concerts sweet we oft enjoyed,
Books our leisure time employed
Friends on every side appeared
From whose minds no ill I feared
If by chance, one gave me pain
The wish to wound me not again
Quick expressed in accents kind
Cast a joy throughout my mind [20]
That, to have been a moment pained,
Seemed like bliss but just attained.
Whene'er in fault, to be reproved,
With gratitude my heart was moved,
So mild and gentle were their words
It seemed as soft as song of birds
For well I knew, that each behest,
Was warmed by love—convincing test.

Thus passed the morning of my days,
My only wish, to gain the praise [30]
Of friends I loved, and neighbors kind,
And keep a calm and heavenly mind.
My efforts, kindly were received,
Nor grieved, nor was myself aggrieved.
But ah! how changed is every scene,
Our little hamlet, and the green,
The long rich green, where warriors played,
And often, breezy elm-wood shade.
How changed, since full of strife and fear,
The world hath sent its votaries here. [40]
The tree cut down—the cot removed,
The cot the simple Indian loved,
The busy strife of young and old

To gain one sordid bit of gold
By trade's o'er done plethoric moil,
And lawsuits, meetings, courts and toil.

Adieu, to days of homebred ease,
When many a rural care could please,
We trim our sail anew, to steer
By shoals we never knew were here, [50]
And with the star flag, raised on high
Discover a new dominion nigh,
And half in joy, half in fear,
Welcome the proud Republic here.

CHAPTER FOUR

"I slander no one, but shall speak the truth": Historicity and Paratexts in *The Squatter and the Don*

Doña Josefa, widow of Don Mariano and a main character in *The Squatter and the Don*, ends the novel with a statement regarding the wrongs committed against her family during the course of the narrative: "I slander no one, but shall speak the truth" (364). This quotation is significant not simply because those are the last words of the novel, but also because they succinctly sum up María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's motivation for writing it. *The Squatter and the Don* concerns itself with two families and the repercussions of both the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and congressional legislation regarding the construction of the Texas Pacific Railroad.

Ruiz de Burton, like Margaret Fuller, undoubtedly possessed the goal of a large readership who would be exposed to the issues she raised in her writing. Her paratextual strategies for reaching and influencing those readers, however, were diametrically opposed to Fuller's. Instead of making her text difficult to read by removing textual markers, Ruiz de Burton populated *The Squatter and the Don* with formal elements that led her readers through the story and continuously reinforced her message about land rights and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. She connects her fictional narrative to historical events, using paratexts to give her text a sense of historicity.

The formal elements forecast the plot of the story itself, working in tandem with the content to create a cohesive whole. She constructed an active and sometimes independent narrator, who intrudes into the narrative whenever necessary to make a point, at times even taking several pages to make a particular position clear. Ruiz de

Burton also includes in her work of fiction excerpts from congressional legislation, the Huntington letters,[36] and various treaties to make her point clearly and connect the narrative to concrete contemporary and historical events.

The Squatter and the Don

Ruiz de Burton published two novels in her lifetime and it is her second and later novel *The Squatter and the Don* that I am concerned with here. What interests me is the way Ruiz de Burton violates the conventions of the fictional novel in the service of her political goals and how she emphasized the concrete nature of the issues she wrote about through her formal choices. Published in 1885, the novel tells the story of two families living in California during the late 19th century, each represented in the title of the novel by their patriarchs. The squatter is William Darrell, who moves at the beginning of the novel from Alameda to Southern California in order to claim land under the Homestead Act of 1862. It becomes clear that he has squatted before unsuccessfully, and his wife argues against the wisdom of repeating his mistake, asking him instead to stake a claim on land that is undisputed. He disagrees and travels to San Diego County, staking a claim for his family on the land of Don Mariano Alamar.

The Don of the story, Alamar, has numerous squatters on his desirable land, including Darrell, and has filed an appeal in an attempt to solidify his ownership of the land and remove the squatters. Under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo he has been naturalized as an American citizen and granted land, but his land, like that of other new

[36] The Huntington letters were evidence in a lawsuit brought against the "Big Four" of the Central Pacific Railroad Company of California, one of who was Collis P. Huntington. Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita, who rediscovered Ruiz de Burton's text and published it in 1992, explain in their introduction to the novel: "The novel's indictment of fraud and bribery is based on 'evidence' that is historically specific: most notably, reference to the 600 letters from Huntington to an associate, Colton, made public in the famous *Colton suit* against the Big Four, a trial that lasted for eight years, ending in 1885, the year of *The Squatter and the Don's* publication, and during which the details of the illegal political maneuvers that allowed them to control state politics and the California delegation in Congress are exposed" (28).

Mexican American citizens, was under scrutiny by the government to determine who rightfully possessed it. Awaiting an official ruling the Don behaves graciously and legally toward the squatters on his land, believing that his appeal will be upheld and he will be able to reclaim his property for his family. The Darrell and Alamar families become intertwined throughout the course of the novel, living next to each other and observing a courtship carried on until the end of the novel between Darrell's son Clarence and the Don's daughter Mercedes.

Ruiz de Burton's personal history is important to a fuller understanding of both the fictional narrative she creates and her motivation for working to enact political change. Ruiz de Burton had an especial interest in Californian land claims, as she and her husband Henry Burton purchased the Jamul Ranch in California before travelling east for his work. After his death in 1869 Ruiz de Burton returned to their ranch with her children, only to find it overrun by squatters and her own land claim under question. She spent the rest of her life attempting unsuccessfully to solidify her ownership through legal channels, as well as a separate land claim in Ensenada, and died penniless in Chicago in 1895.

****

However, *The Squatter and the Don* is not simply about real estate. Rather, the subtle intertwining of racial prejudice, class distinctions, and contemporary legislative and economic occurrences is its subject. The racial prejudice is clear from the beginning of the novel, as some of the less honorable squatters refer to Alamar and Mexicans in general as "greasers." For many of the squatters, racial motivation is as much to blame for their deliberate efforts to sabotage the Don than are any profits they could make from

the land they claim. While the Don may be looked down upon by the squatters, Ruiz de Burton positions him as a kind of aristocrat who adheres to specific ideals regarding his business and social activities. The class difference between the Alamars and many of the squatters are striking, from the Don's focus on honesty and integrity, to the differences in their homes. The prejudices displayed by the characters in the novel are individual demonstrations of the legislature's prejudices, and the economic and legal wrongs done to Mexican Americans are played out through Don Mariano and his many squatters.

The most important historical event relevant to an understanding of the novel is the defeat of the Texas Pacific Railroad that would have brought people and money to San Diego.[37] The ensuing trail against the "Big Four" and their role in defeating the Texas Pacific, especially Collis P. Huntington, plays a major role in the novel.

Scholars have approached *The Squatter and the Don* in ways that engage it as an historical romance and an example of Chicana literature.[38] José F. Aranda Jr. takes issue with Sánchez and Pita's introductory comments, asserting that "the novel eluded the specificity of their analysis" (13) and arguing that Ruiz de Burton was not a subaltern figure, as Sánchez and Pita assert, but was more complicated than such a label gave her credit for. Jennifer S. Tuttle engages the "discourse of neurasthenia" (57) that is prominent in the novel, and Vincent Pérez notes that Ruiz de Burton's critique of the US government in *The Squatter and the Don* "parallels anti-Northern discourse in Southern

[37] Sánchez and Pita note: "Writing from the vantage point of an acculturated Californio herself, Ruiz de Burton dialogues with a number of contemporary discourses—political, juridicial, economic, commercial, and literary—both dominant and minority, all to voice the better resentment of the subaltern" (8).
[38] In scholarship, Ruiz de Burton is acknowledged by scholars as the first Mexican American to publish in English. Vincent Pérez calls *The Squatter and the Don* a "foundational Mexican American literary [text]" (27) and Sánchez and Pita assert that the novel requires a double reading, "constructed as it is both as romance and history" (6).

plantation and domestic fiction" (28).[39] Scholarship on Ruiz de Burton is relatively recent and ongoing, but has so far focused mainly on issues of genre and content, with little mention of formal choices.[40]

Paratexts in *The Squatter and the Don*

An awareness of paratexts both builds upon and augments an analysis of content, no matter the genre under discussion. In the case of *The Squatter and the Don*, formal elements tie the narrative to contemporary historical occurrences, imparting to the readers of this fictional narrative a more pressing and realistic tone. Ruiz de Burton employs paratexts as signposts for her readers, from the title of the novel to her pen name and the chapter titles, deploying them constantly so that no reader could lose their way or fail to understand her point.

Contemporary reviewers noted the ease with which a reader could access the novel, calling it "a very pleasant and readable tale"[41] and one filled with "sprightly, natural and well managed" dialogue.[42] A reader's ability to consume and enjoy a novel is based partly on choices of content. Surely the inclusion of several romantic storylines and the tension and suspense inherent in the second half of the novel helped to insure that it was read and appreciated by readers. Formal choices also have a role in making a novel more or less readable, though they may not be as apparent at first glance. I would argue, though, that all of Ruiz de Burton's formal choices were made to direct the reader,

---

[39] Ruiz de Burton and Schoolcraft have this critique of the government in common. Though Ruiz de Burton clearly worked for a change in policy, Schoolcraft's writing expresses nostalgia instead of the belief that any change in policy was possible.

[40] An exception to this is James Frazier, whose article, "*The Squatter and the Don*: Title Page as Paratextual Borderland," posits that the novel's title page reflects the border disputes that take place within the novel. Frazier's observations on the particular elements of the title page are astute and support his argument, though my analysis differs slightly.

[41] *The Daily Examiner*, February 2, 1885 (*Conflict of Interest*)

[42] *Daily Alta*, January 27, 1885 (*Conflict of Interest*)

helping to ensure that her message was not only received but embraced as natural and right.

The title of the novel itself, *The Squatter and the Don*, is the first paratextual element that most readers see. Genette notes that a title is usually an indicator of genre or subject, and this was definitely the case for Ruiz de Burton. The squatter and the don of the title are the two main characters of the novel, and the interactions between them and their families are the focus of the narrative. Perhaps more importantly, though, is the order of the title. Why does the squatter Darrell come before Don Mariano in the title, taking the first position even though it is he who is wrong in the story? Frazier believes the order of the title is relatively unimportant, arguing that though the squatters clearly had the law on their side, "the title's juxtaposition of near antonyms arguably hints that this deference is merely expedient and superficial" (32). I disagree with Frazier here, instead choosing to place more importance on the title order than mere expedience. After all, in a text which demonstrates a high degree of paratextual awareness, why would the title order be an anomaly? As is the case with many paratextual elements Ruiz de Burton uses, the answer can be found in its connection to the content of the story.

There is a great deal of legal language in *The Squatter and the Don*. The main dispute is one over land, and the characters discuss the law in great detail. In all matters, the law favors the squatter over the Californio landowner. Don Mariano makes this clear to us in one of his many statements on the matter concerning his land and the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo by Mexico:

> How could Mexico have foreseen then that when scarcely half a dozen years should have elapsed the trusted conquerors would, *'In Congress Assembled,'* pass

> laws which were to be retroactive upon the defenseless, helpless, conquered people, in order to despoil them? […] I think but few Americans know or believe to what extent we have been wronged by Congressional action. [67]

Just as the rightful Californio landowner always comes in behind the squatter, so does the don follow the squatter in the title and in the novel. Don Mariano's interests are slowly eroded and his fortune and life are lost. The squatter Darrell is the direct cause of much of the Don's misfortune and outlives Don Mariano in the narrative. It is Darrell's son Clarence who is the ultimate savior of both families in the novel. He becomes a millionaire many times over by investing in a productive mine, and when Don Mariano's family is forced to abandon their home it is Clarence who provides them a new home, marrying Mercedes at the end of the novel and cementing the two families' connections. By choosing this particular order, Ruiz de Burton signals the place of each man in society and the way each is regarded under the law.

Ruiz de Burton revisits the significance of the novel's title when she entitles Chapter XXV "The Squatter and the Don." This pivotal chapter in the narrative contains the scene in which other squatters come to William Darrell and tell him that the land he is squatting on has been secretly paid for. His son Clarence has obeyed his mother's wishes and circumvented Darrell's desire to pay for his land only after all legal matters were settled. It was Clarence who paid Don Mariano for the land and asked for his promise of secrecy. When Darrell discovers this he confronts Don Mariano, leading to a violent altercation and the postponement of the marriage between Clarence and Mercedes. Darrell's actions in this chapter directly or indirectly cause most of the misfortune that falls upon the Don's family for the rest of the novel. This includes the Don's eventual

death, which Darrell comes to believe is his fault entirely and bases his guilt on his actions during chapter XXV. Ruiz de Burton asks us to remember the title of the novel in this chapter by using it a second time, and also demonstrates which of the two men will be victorious, no matter the validity of his actions. The title's order, then, is not "expedient" or "superficial," but instead comments directly on the outcome of the narrative and of many real life land disputes. In this way Ruiz de Burton reinforces the content of her novel with a formal choice.

The subtitle of the novel is another paratextual element worthy of discussion. The subtitle, *A Novel Descriptive of Contemporary Occurrences in California*, clearly delineates that Ruiz de Burton's subject is current, that it is set in California, and has some basis in fact. In other words, Ruiz de Burton desires from the outset that her readers see her novel as composed at least partially of fact and rejects its placement in the category of pure fiction even as she employs the word "novel" in the subtitle. Frazier takes particular issue with the word "contemporary" in the subtitle, arguing that Ruiz de Burton uses it falsely to ascribe immediacy to a narrative that is set ten years earlier than its publication. Instead, Frazier argues that Ruiz de Burton chose the word "contemporary" to signal that it is a historical novel. This is true, and surely a popular genre that Ruiz de Burton desired to tap into. However, though the events of the novel begin in 1872, they take place over several years. By the time the novel ends, the events are much closer to its 1885 date of publication. More importantly, the novel ends with a line of dialogue and no narrative conclusion; the sense is that the story continues without us and could, in fact, be ongoing even as the novel is read in 1885. It is widely acknowledged in scholarship that *The Squatter and the Don* contains significant basis in

contemporary reality. Sánchez and Pita note in their introduction that "the Alamar family narrative given in *The Squatter and the Don* can be seen as a fictional account of the fortunes of many Californio families" (12).

A controversy contemporary to the novel's publication confirms that readers and reviewers of Ruiz de Burton's own time understood the novel's connection to reality. In fact, shortly after its publication *The Squatter and the Don* was included in the collection of the recently opened San Diego public library. The *San Diego Sun* reported in April of 1885 on a censorship controversy at the library concerning Ruiz de Burton's book, owing partly to the fact that the novel "caricatured some of the best citizens, as well as some that were not so good" (559). Copies of the book were vandalized and pages were torn out. It seems that Ruiz de Burton's efforts to ground her text in contemporary reality and make it relevant to her readers succeeded only too well.

The provocative nature of the book was undoubtedly anticipated to some degree by Ruiz de Burton and her efforts to shield herself from part of it may explain her choice of the pen name "C. Loyal." A letter written in June of 1884 to her friend George Davidson shows Ruiz de Burton thought carefully about the decision to publish under a pseudonym:

> I have been writing a book, so I hope you won't scold me for being indolent. I don't know whether I shall publish it under my own name, so *I want to keep the matter quiet*. Only two or three friends know I am writing it. [*Conflicts of Interest* 505]

Ruiz de Burton acknowledges the need for secrecy and her reluctance to tell many people about her narrative. Certainly she was concerned over the reaction to her novel, critical as it was toward many figures still active in government when it was published.

The pen name “C. Loyal” is interesting in another way, however. As a formal decision, her choice to use this particular name adds a level of complexity to any paratextual analysis and makes it clear that Ruiz de Burton put significant thought into every detail of her novel. Sánchez and Pita explain the meaning behind the pen name:

> The “C.” stood for *Ciudadano* or “Citizen,” and “Loyal” for *Leal,* i.e. *Ciudadano Leal,* a “Loyal Citizen,” a common letter-closing practice used in official government correspondence in Mexico during the nineteenth century. […] the designation of the author as a ‘loyal citizen’ provides an ironic twist, considering that the work is severely critical of the political structures of American society [11]

Casting herself in the role of government official, Ruiz de Burton chose to employ a pen name with ties to Mexico. Interestingly, the pseudonym, by being indeterminate in gender, obliterates her identity as a woman.[43] Her nom de plume signals her loyalty and ethnic identity, even as she wrote a novel critical of her adopted country. Less “ironic,” as Sánchez and Pita believe, her use of the pen name does not question Ruiz de Burton’s allegiance to America, but rather reflects her attitude toward a select few government officials. Even the primary squatter in the story is portrayed in a sympathetic light, following misguided laws that other people put into effect. Frazier, somewhat oddly, calls Ruiz de Burton’s pen name “bilingual shenanigans,” and notes that it indicates that

[43] The reviewer from the February 1885 *Daily Examiner* writes that “the author is very much in earnest, and also that, he or she, whichever “C. Loyal” may be, has a grievance, that is very deep and very sore” (565).

she has “figuratively and grammatically speaking, one foot on each side of the border” (34). This is true, but I would take this analysis one step further and examine the content of the novel for more clues as to the purpose of Ruiz de Burton’s pseudonym.

My assertion that Ruiz de Burton’s pen name is not ironic is supported in the novel itself by Don Mariano when he asserts that most Americans are unaware of the injustices caused by Congress. He goes on to add that “truly, I believe that Congress itself did not anticipate the effect of its laws upon us, and how we would be despoiled, we, the conquered people” (67). Ruiz de Burton carefully maintains this stance throughout the novel, making it clear that her criticism is leveled at a few government officials and no one else, not even most squatters. She signals her loyalty with her pseudonym, letting her readers know that she is loyal to her country even as she criticizes its leaders. It is unlikely that many contemporary readers would have understood her pen name’s ties to Mexico, but she silently advertises this allegiance as well. Her readers certainly would have understood the word “loyal,” however, and the message of allegiance that Ruiz de Burton was trying to send to them.

In keeping with her strategy toward readability, Ruiz de Burton employs clear and strong chapter titles throughout the novel designed to give the reader an idea of content even before any of the text is read. There are thirty seven chapters that are both numbered and named in the novel, serving as formal markers that carefully guide the reader through the story. The thirty eighth chapter does not have a number, but is labeled the Conclusion and also given a title. This chapter comes after the events of the narrative and is made up by the narrator’s comments entirely.

The chapter titles in *The Squatter and the Don* all situate the narrative in terms of time, place, or chapter content. Modeled on the newspaper headline, chapters such as "The Sins of our Legislators!" and "Spanish Land Grants Viewed Retrospectively" clearly telegraph the content of the chapter to a reader.[44] Ruiz de Burton, in her desire to ensure the delivery of her message, uses chapter titles as formal markers in her narrative, letting her readers know what to expect. The clarity of the chapter titles likely also contributed to the many mentions of "readability" in contemporary reviews.

There are several characters in the novel and this creates the potential for confusion, especially when characters travel away from California and the narrative switches back and forth between locations. Ruiz de Burton mitigates this with chapter titles, including "In New York," "At the Capitol," and "From Alameda to San Diego." These chapter titles let the reader know the setting of the narrative and absolve them from having to figure it out themselves. Ruiz de Burton's goal is to educate her readers politically rather than challenge them as readers. By guiding and directing her readers through paratextual cues like chapter titles, she advances her message. Ruiz de Burton, then, privileges practicality in message delivery, rather than, for example, Fuller's focus on idealism to the detriment of the reading experience.

Besides providing narrative cues, the chapter titles also serve the purpose of summarizing the story for the reader at a single glance, and keeping her readers oriented toward the political stakes involved. Tapping into reader sentiment, the titles of the initial chapters are more hopeful and optimistic: "Efforts to Right the Wrong" (Chapter 4) and "Clarence is the Bearer of Joyful News" (Chapter 9) are titles that imply that there is

[44] This is not unlike Child's chapter organization, with her use of words and phrases to communicate the content of each chapter to her readers.

still a chance that the land dispute will be settled and Don Mariano's family will be able to proceed with their lives. This optimism is quickly countered, however, both in terms of the action of the narrative itself and the chapter titles. The "joyful news" referred to in the title of Chapter 9 is the arrival of Tom Scott to discuss the possibility of the Texas Pacific Railroad coming to San Diego. Colonel Tom Scott was a key player in the real life controversy over the Texas Pacific Railroad. He was opposed to the Big Four and was an advocate for the extension of the Texas Pacific Railroad to San Diego. Thus, he was a person who brought hope to the two families in the novel, as a railroad to San Diego would bring value to their land.

Readers' hopes are dashed when the joyful news is soon countered in Chapter 12, "Why the Appeal Was Not Dismissed." This chapter describes the postponement of the litigation that Don Mariano hoped would settle his land ownership dispute once and for all. From Chapter 12 on, readers sense frustration as the titles become more and more pessimistic: "The Brewers of Mischief," "Effect of Bad Precept and Worse Example," "San Diego's Sentence is Irrevocable," and "The Sins of our Legislators" are examples of the most negative chapter titles. Though there are significant details contained in the narrative, the paratexts let readers know that the story will not have an entirely happy ending.

The novel's sad ending is prompted partly by the events surrounding the legislation to bring the Texas Pacific Railroad to San Diego. An important paratextual strategy Ruiz de Burton employs is the inclusion of both real people and excerpts from legislation and letters that concern the construction of the Texas Pacific Railroad. Besides the mention of Tom Scott, several other historical figures are included. Perhaps

the most important of these figures to Ruiz de Burton's narrative is Collis P. Huntington. During the trial against the Big Four, Huntington's personal and business correspondence was used against him and became public record. Ruiz de Burton mentions the "Huntington letters" and makes reference to them throughout the novel, again using a paratextual element to emphasize narrative content and making her opinion on the matter crystal clear.

Even when focused on the individual details of the characters' lives, Ruiz de Burton carves out small moments in the narrative to remind her readers of what is at stake. In Chapter Twelve, "Why the Appeal Was Not Dismissed," the narrator takes a moment away from the action of the plot in order to make just such a statement. The narrator notes that at this point in the narrative, during 1873, the public had not yet heard about the Huntington Letters and so were still naïve as to the ways of politicians:

> It was reserved for Mr. Huntington to familiarize the American people with the fact that an American gentleman could go to Washington with the avowed purpose of influencing legislation by *"convincing"* people with money or other inducements, and yet no one lose caste, or lose his high social or public position, but on the contrary, the *convinced and the convincer* be treated with the most distinguished consideration. [144]

The narrator leaves no room for interpretation in this short aside. Readers are not asked to make up their own minds on the matter but are instead given an editorial statement on the situation. While reinforcing the contemporary nature of the novel, Ruiz de Burton continues to shape her readers' opinions. In this case Ruiz de Burton's readers have information that the characters do not have simply because they live during a slightly

later time period. This passage then connects the past to the present in an important way, making the 1885 date of the novel's publication vital to an understanding of part of the narrative and making the novel a kind of reflective tool for political action.

At another point in the narrative, a direct quotation from a Huntington letter is employed when an acquaintance of Don Mariano's tells him that he heard that "Mr. Huntington devoutly prays that a kind Providence may enable him *'to see grass growing over Tom Scott'*" (310). The italics are used to emphasize the quotation from Huntington's letter, and is a visual cue to her readers that Ruiz de Burton is using an outside source. The italics are a formal device that she deploys whenever quoting an outside source, also using it with fictional letters and sources so that she is consistent.

Ruiz de Burton's use of outside sources continues Chapter Twenty, "At the Capitol." Several of the characters in the story travel to Washington, and while there attend a debate in the House of Representatives concerning the Texas Pacific Railroad. The novel reproduces two and a half pages of legislation at this point. Whether they are actual or mock documents matters less than their narrative purpose of displaying legislation that readers wouldn't normally see in a concrete way.[45]

The particular section of the Congressional papers quoted delineate monetary fraud committed by the Big Four, complete with dollar amounts. Ruiz de Burton's choice to include this section of the document is in line with her intent to expose precisely this kind of fraud, and she constructs the paratext in a way that works with the content of her novel. It is also important that this particular excerpt comes from outside the novel. It is not a digression from the narrator or a statement from one of the

---

[45] Ruiz de Burton went to great lengths here to replicate the formal and paratextual features of Congressional papers, in order to include them as a formal element in her own work. Her awareness of the importance of formal elements is only reinforced in this extract.

characters, but is instead a concrete document that Ruiz de Burton appropriated but did not write herself. It is a piece of writing that many of her readers would never have the occasion to see and this contributes to her authority on the issue, along with being another chance to educate her readers.

Though *The Squatter and the Don* is based on contemporary events and many of the excerpts in the text concern those events, Ruiz de Burton is also concerned with establishing her own authority on her subject and reminding her readers of historical parallels. She includes quotations from Thomas Carlyle, Herbert Spenser, and Ralph Waldo Emerson in the narrative in order to expand and strengthen the bounds of her argument. The inclusion of each of these literary figures makes a comment about the kind of novel Ruiz de Burton wants to write and the literary heritage she considers inspiration.

Thomas Carlyle is quoted several times in *The Squatter and Don*, and one of the most prominent of these quotations comes at the very beginning of Chapter 32, "A False Friend Sent to Deceive the Southerners." The lines from Carlyle open the chapter:

> 'Great men are the Fire Pillars in this dark pilgrimage of mankind; they stand as heavenly signs, ever living witnesses of what has been, prophetic tokens of what may still be—the revealed embodied Possibilities of human nature,' says Carlyle. [304]

Carlyle, as a writer of social commentary, is a clear literary predecessor of Ruiz de Burton's. Genette, when discussing epigraphs, notes that an author's choice of epigraph signals his or her "signal of culture" or "prestigious filiation" (160). In other words, authors often choose inserts from other authors with whom they identify and feel some

connection.[46] This quotation in particular comes from an essay Carlyle wrote about the German philosopher Friedrich Schiller and its placement at the head of Chapter 32 provides a stark contrast to the corrupt men of the railroad under discussion within it.

The "false friend" of the title is a fictional ex-Senator named Guller (based on the real Senator William M. Gwin), sent by the Big Four to the southern states to convince them that the Texas Pacific Railroad would be detrimental to their region. Ruiz de Burton takes this moment to remove her narrator from the story for a moment and discuss Carlyle's image of Fire Pillars in terms of California. The narrator tells her readers that the Big Four are their Fire Pillars. "Unfortunately California! if thou art to follow such guides, thy fate shall be to *grovel for money* to the end of time, with not one thought beyond, or above, money" (304). Carlyle's words about Napoleon are used by Ruiz de Burton to describe her own state and the problems that face its people. This digression into real life concerns quickly gives way to the fictional narrative again.

Carlyle and Spenser, though often used by the narrator in asides, are also employed by characters in the novel. During a passage in Chapter XXXIII, "San Diego's Sentence is Irrevocable," Don Mariano and his friends Mechlin and Holman meet with California's former Governor Leland Stanford. It is an interesting scene, in which fictional characters have a fictional conversation with a real life person whose name would have been familiar to any of Ruiz de Burton's readers. This metafictional scene is one of the ways that she combined both historical and formal elements to create her narrative. In this way she links her novel to real events while still maintaining a fictional guise, using formal elements again to connect the two.

---

[46] Ruiz de Burton's choice of Carlyle is not unlike Child's choice of Coleridge poetry as epigraphs in many of her works.

During the fictional conversation, Carlyle and Spenser are mentioned by the participants. While discussing Stanford's position of support for the Big Four, Don Mariano becomes angered and rises from his seat, telling Stanford that "Carlyle, in your place, would not view your position like that, Governor" (317). Holman chimes in, noting that neither would Herbert Spenser. Stanford asks them what they think Carlyle and Spenser would say, leaving Mechlin and Holman to explain. "Carlyle would think you are much to blame for flinging away a magnificent chance to be great and heroic," notes Mechlin. Holman says Spenser writes "that so soon as any one in the pursuit of riches knowingly and willfully will injure any one else, that he then violates the principle upon which commerce should rest" (317). Stanford himself never speaks about the principles of Carlyle or Spenser, except to ask his guests about them. Mariano, Mechlin, and Holman seem to have much more knowledge of literature and political theory than Stanford, and their portrayal as well educated and intelligent in the face of Stanford's arrogance is surely no accident.

Just a few pages later, Ruiz de Burton's narrator invokes Ralph Waldo Emerson at the beginning of Chapter XXXIV ("The Sins of Our Legislators!"). Again the topic of discussion is corruption and the subject is Napoleon: "'Men found that his absorbing egotism was deadly to all other men,' says Mr. Emerson. 'It was not Bonaparte's fault. He did all that in him lay to live and thrive without moral principle'" (321). Ruiz de Burton returns to her often stated belief that corruption breeds corruption, and that many people do not even know how much wrong has been done in the name of business and politics. Between the masses, who represent the majority of her readers, and her legislators, Ruiz de Burton draws a line of culpability. She understands how

inflammatory her material is, and so is careful to be sympathetic toward the average reader, even the squatters among them, in order to more convincingly sway them to her position.

She again invokes Carlyle's "fire pillars" image when she writes that "in heavenly-inspired words Emerson and Carlyle and Herbert Spencer have repeated those burning aphorisms, but our California *"Fire Pillars"* differ with them—differ widely and differ proudly" (321). The narrator's digression leads seamlessly back into the narrative, connecting reality and fiction easily. The two are connected even more clearly when Mechlin laments that he "ought to have quoted Emerson, when he says: 'I count him a great man who inhabits a higher sphere of thought into which other men rise with labor and difficulty'" (322). With the mention of Emerson, the narrator and the three characters occupy the same position and take the same stance on the discussed issues. The narrator's use of Carlyle, Emerson, and Spenser to frame realistic events mirrors the fictional characters' use of the same three figures to frame fictional events. The use of formal elements like literary quotations is just one more technique Ruiz de Burton employs to connect fiction and reality, and even to blur the lines at times.

Perhaps the clearest voice heard in the novel, besides that of the squatter Darrell and Don Mariano, is that of the narrator. While a narrator is not typically considered a paratext, Ruiz de Burton's narrator is one that acts literally outside the boundaries of the narrative and so should be considered a paratextual element of the story. Ruiz de Burton's narrator divorces herself from the story on several occasions, leaving the fictional story in favor of making a political statement. Nowhere is this tendency more pronounced than in the final chapter of the novel.

The Conclusion, an unnumbered chapter at the end of *The Squatter and the Don*, is made up entirely of the narrator's thoughts and is subtitled "Out with the Invader." The fictional narrative ends with Chapter XXXVII and Doña Josefa's final words. Ruiz de Burton begins the Conclusion with a quotation from William Ellery Channing's "Remarks on the Life and Character of Napoleon Bonaparte" in which Channing asks "how long will an abject world kiss the foot that tramples it?" Returning to the Bonaparte comparison, the narrator quickly makes it clear that the "invader" of the chapter title is the monopolists of the Big Four and the congressmen who sanctioned and aided their actions. The language in this chapter is strong as the narrator builds on the Channing quotation:

> If Channing lived now, his 'anguish of spirit' would be far greater to find in his own country, firmly enthroned, *a power that corrupts, ruins and debases* as utterly as that which he so eloquently deplored, and his own fellow-citizens—the free-born Americans—ready and willing to kiss the foot that tramples them! [365]

This passage states clearly that Ruiz de Burton's narrative and message are aimed at "free-born Americans," as opposed to the Californios. At the end of the Conclusion, the narrator goes so far as to call them "the white slaves of California" (372). Ruiz de Burton knows that the white citizens of California are the ones who have enough legal and political power to change the current system, reflecting the prominence placed on the "squatter" of the novel's title. This need to appeal to white Californians may also explain the sympathetic light under which Darrell is portrayed throughout the novel, even though he continuously contributes to Don Mariano's downfall.

The Conclusion is filled with a discussion of the real life issues surrounding the Texas Pacific Railroad and especially emphasizes Huntington's role in the affair. The narrator outlines all of Huntington's corrupt moves, corroborating them with quotations from his letters. She quickly turns her attention to California, and points out that the "fight for greedy accumulation is transferred to California" (369). The rest of the Conclusion is an entreaty to Californians to stand up to monopolists and work to change the policies put in place by them. This approach draws the reader's attention away from the events of the fictional narrative, and focuses them on contemporary issues. So while the narrative occurs over several years and before Ruiz de Burton's novel was published, the Conclusion fulfills the subtitle's promise for a novel about "contemporary occurrences."

To make her points even more relevant and clear to her readers, Ruiz de Burton continues with quotations from California legislators who object to the corruption in the legislature, offering testimony from men who have witnessed the breakdown firsthand. In particular, she quotes a legislator named Mr. Nicol:

> I believe [the California legislature] to be the worst place on the continent. *We are surrounded by a lobby which degrades every man here by constant temptation and offers of corruption; the monopoly has made it no place where a careful father will send his son.* [370]

There could not be a much stronger way to word the situation in the California legislature. If Ruiz de Burton's readers wondered how the Big Four were able to conduct their business and considered her fictional narrative of the events an exaggeration, she assures them that it was not. In this way part of the conclusion corroborate the narrative.

Ruiz de Burton closes the conclusion with a reference to an event that nearly all Californians of her time knew about. In order to demonstrate to her readers that the corruption did not end with the Texas Pacific Railroad, she reminds them of the Mussel Slough incident in which several farmers were killed while protesting the practices of the railroad monopoly.[47] The farmers who participated in the Mussel Slough incident were famous in California for their willingness to stand up to the monopoly. Ending her novel with an invocation of the Mussel Slough dead was a way for Ruiz de Burton to remind her readers of what was at stake for them. Though the events of the novel were fictional, Mussel Slough was very real and fresh in readers' minds, lending a concrete tone to the fictional narrative.

Ruiz de Burton begins the final paragraph with a reminder that everything she has discussed in the conclusion is "historical facts." The tie to history and the need to keep it from repeating is central to her purpose as an author. Her desire for change dictates that her readers not let history repeat itself. Her final words, demanding that legislators change their ways, are a rallying cry for her fellow Californians: "If they do not, then we shall—as Channing said "kiss the foot that tramples us!" and "in anguish of spirit" must wait and pray for a Redeemer who will emancipate the white slaves of California" (372). The fictional narrative, a necessary element for the delivery of her message, is left behind as Ruiz de Burton invokes Channing again and imagines the people of California rising up to protest the political corruption.

[47] Frank Norris' *The Octopus: A California Story*, was inspired partly by the Mussel Slough incident. The incident took place when several farmers were offered a deal by the railroad monopoly. They were told that if they made improvements to their land, they would reap the rewards by only being charged the unimproved price for their land. Once the improvements were made, the railroad monopoly reneged on their deal and instead charged the farmers the improved price and most could not pay. In 1880, several farmers resisted forcible eviction and were killed in the struggle with officers of the law.

****

Paratextual details create a metafictional quality in Ruiz de Burton's novel, and give the narrative an emotional charge. Though she presented the novel as a work of fiction, the paratexts tell us a different story. This other story is one in which reality is barely masked behind formal elements that reveal the narrative's connections to the "contemporary occurrences" of the novel's subtitle. With the inclusion of real life letters and legislation, Ruiz de Burton

EPILOGUE

Paratexts both enable and demand a shift in the way scholars think about and utilize texts. What I have shown in this dissertation is that paratexts demonstrate previously unobserved common areas between disparate authors. Balkanized approaches to "American" literature betray the grounds of comparison that many of us take for granted. Ruiz de Burton, for example, is studied and written about mainly by critics who work on Chicana literature. Schoolcraft is analyzed by those who study American Indian literature, and so on. Paratextual considerations, though, are both pervasive and normative. Instead of reinforcing critical balkanization, paratexts reveal and interrogate our somewhat arbitrary academic boundaries. While factors of gender and ethnicity should not be disregarded, a paratextual approach puts those issues aside to a certain degree and instead focuses on an element that most authors had in common: their entry into the literary marketplace and their negotiation of the space between private and public.

The often used scholarly theme of private sphere vs. public sphere benefits from and is complicated by a paratextual approach. Feminist scholars like Mary Kelley have clearly demonstrated the struggles that female authors faced when moving from the public to the private. These women were "booked," or bounded, by a society with strict formulations about the role of women and their entry into the public sphere as authors. Kelley's work is continued in *No More Separate Spheres!* when Cathy Davidson mandates a move beyond those rigid categories. Davidson's charge is to re-invent the categories of public and private, to move beyond such a strict binary, and paratextual studies enable us to do so. Ruiz de Burton, for example, used a pen name to keep her

identity private while still participating in the public literary marketplace. Child employed the private form of letters to make her public statements. The boundaries between public and private for these authors are not as concrete as some critical scholarship would have us believe. Instead, paratexts demonstrate that the line between the two spheres was more like the threshold that Genette imagines, and this enabled female authors to negotiate it in nuanced ways.

Paratexts, with their ability to transcend scholarly boundaries, can also move us toward more expansive critical perspectives. Betsy Erkillä, in "Revolution in the Renaissance," advocates a new approach toward literature of the nineteenth century:

> […] recent American studies have tended to be organized chapter by chapter as expert, but too often separate (and previously published), readings of individual writers and individual works that bear only a very loose comparative connection to some overarching argument about literature, society, and world. [19]

Erkillä eschews what she calls "critical particularism" in favor of more comprehensive views of an author's career or an idea taken up by several authors. Erkillä advocates the study of revolution as a way to create a unified study of several authors or works.

Erkillä's charge to broaden our vistas when studying nineteenth century American literature is well taken, and a study of paratexts is one way to achieve the depth she advocates. My approach in this dissertation is often comparative, demonstrated by my comparison of Child's *Letters from New-York* to her earlier *Appeal*, or Fuller's two versions of *Woman*. There is much more that could be done, however. Child's career was long and there are numerous texts that could be studied. An approach like this, using paratexts, values an author's entire career over one or two particular works and could

answer several questions. Does an author's paratextual strategy change based on genre or content? Does an author's paratextual approach coordinate with popularity or sales numbers? Paratexts can tell us how an author wished to be received in the literary marketplace, and can also tell us if that changes. Paratexts sometimes indicate what schools of thought an author wishes to align themselves with.

A more comprehensive approach also satisfies the need that many feminist critics in particular cite for female authors. Why, for example, is Harriet Beecher Stowe known mainly for *Uncle Tom's Cabin* when she wrote so much more? A paratextual approach can illuminate not only an author's formal choices, but also the connections between those choices, content, and market demand. This would necessarily provide a more complete and rounded portrait of authors and their careers.

My study of paratexts in this dissertation is necessarily truncated and focuses especially on female authors who wielded formal elements with great skill and dexterity. Fuller, Child, Schoolcraft, and Ruiz de Burton all carefully employed formal elements and clearly understood how paratexts could aid them in the literary marketplace. Furthermore, their level of control over the final product and its paratextual elements is clear. What happens when an author is not so skilled or when paratextual elements are out of his or her control? Genette notes, after all, the many kinds of paratexts that are the purview of the publisher only. Robert Darnton also demonstrates the lengthy "circuit" any book goes through from conception to reception, and many of the steps on the circuit are entirely out of the author's control. When *Moby-Dick* was first published in England, for example, a publishing error omitted the final chapter in which Ishmael explains his escape from the wrecked Pequod. British reviewers' complaints that the narrative was

unresolved or literally impossible influenced reception in America and contributed to the failure of the novel in the literary marketplace. This is only one example of the way that paratexts can lead not only to success, but also to failure in terms of reception.

Genette reminds us that paratexts are not borders, but "thresholds," over which we can and will cross as we discover and describe new kinds and new definitions of paratexts. My use of Schoolcraft's oral heritage is one of these ventures over the paratextual threshold but there are surely many more. What is important, then, is not the particular paratexts outlined in this dissertation but their existence as an aggregate. The four authors under study here are not typically connected in critical scholarship, so disparate are they in terms of genre or critical schools of thought. The study of paratexts is a methodology that brings together previously unconnected authors, pointing out what they have in common rather than their differences. This approach pushes us to move beyond scholarly categories and begin to think of texts in new ways.

In a way, the study of paratexts is a bit like moving backward, in that it asks us to examine those elements that are the foundation of the content that scholars have focused on for so long. Paratexts are the formal choices that undergird the rhetoric we see on the surface of any text. Our job as scholars is to now take a step back and begin from a new perspective. This new perspective demands that we think of traditional academic categories as having permeable thresholds rather than solid boundaries, that balkanization give way in the appropriate context.

It may seem contradictory to write of doing away with a strict reliance on categorization when paratexts themselves can be seen as just another category on the list. What I have shown, however, is that paratexts as a methodology transcends many other

academic categories with its resulting analysis. The grouping of Fuller, Child, Schoolcraft, and Ruiz de Burton is an unlikely example that proves this point. As we move forward in the field of book history, the study of paratexts will help us more clearly understand the issues established by decades of scholarly work and discover new thresholds over which we can cross.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altman, Janet. *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form.* Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1982.

Aranda, José F., Jr. "Returning California to the People: Vigilantism in *The Squatter and the Don*. *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Eds. Amelia María de la Luz Montes and Anne Elizabeth Goldman. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. 11-26.

Bean, Judith Mattson. "Conversation as Rhetoric in Margaret Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*." *In Her Own Voice: Nineteenth-Century American Women Essayists*. Ed. Sherry Lee Linkon. New York: Garland, 1997. 27-40.

Bellin, Joshua David. *Medicine Bundle: Indian Sacred Performance and American Literature, 1824-1932*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Child, Lydia Maria. *An Appeal in Favor of the Class of Americans Called African.* New York: John S. Taylor, 1836.

---. *Letters from New York.* New York: C.S. Francis & Co, 1845.

---. *The Collected Correspondence of Lydia Maria Child, 1817-1880.* Patricia G. Holland, Milton Meltzer, and Francine Krasno, eds. Millwood: Kraus Microform, 1980.

Cole, Phyllis. "Stanton, Fuller, and the Grammar of Romanticism." New England Quarterly 73.4 (2000): 533-59.

Darnton, Robert. "What is the History of Books?" *The Book History Reader*. Eds. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery. London: Routledge, 2002. 9-26.

Erkkilä, Betsy. "Revolution in the Renaissance." *ESQ* 49.1-3 (2005): 17-32.

Fink, Stephen. "Antebellum Lady Editors and the Language of Authority." *Blue Pencils and Hidden Hands: Women Editing Periodicals, 1830-1910*. Eds. Sharon M. Harris and Ellen Gruber Garvey. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2004. 205-21.

Fuller, Margaret. "The Great Lawsuit. Man versus Men: Woman versus Women." *Dial* (July 1843).

---. *The Letters of Margaret Fuller*. Ed. Robert N. Hudspeth. 6 vols. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1983 – 1994.

---. *The Essential Margaret Fuller*. Ed. Jeffrey Steele. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1995.

---. *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*. Ed. Larry J. Reynolds. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1998.

Genette, Gerard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Gustafson, Sandra. "Choosing a Medium: Margaret Fuller and the Forms of Sentiment." *American Quarterly* 47.1 (1995): 34-65.

Holstein, Michael E. "Poet Into Priest: A Reading of Coleridge's 'Conversation Poems'." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 48.3 (1979): 209-225.

"Introduction." *No More Separate Spheres! A Next Wave American Studies Reader*. Eds. Cathy Davidson and Jessamyn Hatcher. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

Jackson, Leon. *The Business of Letters: Authorial Economics in Antebellum America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008.

Karcher, Carolyn L. *The First Woman in the Republic: A Cultural Biography of Lydia Maria Child.* Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1994.

Kauffman, Linda S. *Special Delivery: Epistolary Modes in Modern Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Kolodny, Annette. "Inventing a Feminist Discourse: Rhetoric and Resistance in Margaret Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*." *Nineteenth Century American Women Writers: A Critical Reader*. Ed. Karen Kilcup. Malden: Blackwell, 1998. 206-230.

Memoirs of Margaret Fuller Ossoli. Eds. Ralph Waldo Emerson and James Freeman Clarke. Boston: Phillips, Sampson and Company, 1851.

Mills, Bruce. *Cultural Reformations: Lydia Maria Child and the Literature of Reform.* Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1994.

"Mrs. Child's Letters from New York—Second Series." Rev. of *Letters from New-York*, *The United States Democratic Review* June 1845 (16.84): 569-576.

"Notes Upon Letters." Rev. of *Letters from New-York*, *The American Whig Review* Jan. 1845 (1.1): 60-74.

Okker, Patricia. *Our Sister Editors: Sarah J. Hale and the Tradition of Nineteenth-Century American Women Editors.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008.

Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London and New York: Rutledge, 2005.

Ortiz, Simon J. "The Historical Matrix towards a National Indian Literature." *MELUS* 8.2 (1981): 7-12.

Parker, Robert Dale. *The Invention of Native American Literature*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Pérez, Vincent. "Remembering the Hacienda: Land and Community in Californio Narratives." *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Eds. Amelia María de la Luz Montes and Anne Elizabeth Goldman. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. 27-55.

Rev. of *Letters from New-York*, *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* Feb. 1883 (66.393): 471-472.

Roberts, Heather. "'The Public Heart': Urban Life and the Politics of Sympathy in Lydia Maria Child's *Letters from New York*." *American Literature* 76.4 (2004): 749-775.

Rohrbach, Augusta. *Thinking Outside the Book.*

---. *Truth Stranger than Fiction: Race, Realism and the U.S. Literary Marketplace*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Ruiz de Burton, María Amparo. *Conflict of Interest: The Letters of Maria Amparo Ruiz de Burton.* Ed Rosaura Sánchez. Austin, TX: Arte Público Press, 2001. 647 pgs.

---. *The Squatter and the Don*. Ed. Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita. Houston: Arte Público Press, 1992.

Schoolcraft, Jane Johnston. *The Sound the Stars Make Rushing Through the Sky: The Writings of Jane Johnston Schoolcraft*. Ed. Robert Dale Parker. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Tingley, Stephanie A. "'Thumping Against the Glittering Wall of Limitations': Lydia Maria Child's 'Letters from New York'." *In Her Own Voice: Nineteenth-Century*

American Women Essayists. Ed. Sherry Lee Linkon. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1997. 41-60.

Tuttle, Jennifer S. "The Symptoms of Conquest: Race, Class, and the Nervous Body in *The Squatter and the Don*. *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Eds. Amelia María de la Luz Montes and Anne Elizabeth Goldman. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. 56-72.

Zwarg, Christina. *Feminist Conversations: Fuller, Emerson, and the Play of Reading*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.